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This dissertation concerns the Fonte Gaia, the most significant civic monument in Siena, located in the Piazza del Campo facing the town hall, the Palazzo Pubblico. The complex of reliefs and statues that decorated the fountain is considered one of the major expressions of Italian Quattrocento sculpture. Yet the fountain in its current iteration is not the original, eloquent masterpiece completed in 1419 by hometown sculptor Jacopo della Quercia (c. 1374-1438); rather, it is a nineteenth-century reconstruction commissioned from Tito Sarrocchi (1824-1900) by a committee of leading Sienese citizens.

This study begins with a new assessment of the Fonte Gaia in the Renaissance and follows its history into the nineteenth century. I show how an earlier Trecento fountain on the site influenced the form and decoration of Quercia’s later fountain, and I address the lacunae in the scholarship of the Fonte Gaia that would account for its afterlife. I elucidate Quercia’s complex iconographic program through my analysis of the drawing attributed to his hand and the relationships between his program for the Fonte Gaia and Taddeo di Bartolo’s fresco program in the Antechapel of the Palazzo Pubblico of 1414.
demonstrate the importance of Sarrocchi’s nineteenth-century plaster casts, often overlooked by scholars, in the effort to decipher Quercia’s original sculptures, and I show how the modern restoration (1989-2010) of the fountain by the Opificio delle Pietre Dure can help us to further understand the nature of his stone material, the previously unsuspected presence of polychromy, and the nature of his Renaissance design.

Through an examination of pertinent documents, I explain how the nineteenth-century project to restore the fountain, stimulated by the Risorgimento, was a reflection of the social and political history of Siena and of modern Italy. Visual evidence indicates that Sarrocchi’s revival sculpture, currently in situ, cannot be considered a copy of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia, but rather a variant of it. My dissertation demonstrates how Sarrocchi’s fountain --heavily influenced by the Italian art movement Purism and the prevailing restoration theories that circulated in Siena at the time -- reflects the reception of Renaissance art in the nineteenth century.
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History, Preservation and Reconstruction in Siena: the Fonte Gaia from Renaissance to Modern Times.

Preface

The Fonte Gaia, located in the Piazza del Campo in the heart of Siena, is a sculpted expression of Sienese civic pride and one of the city’s most important monuments. The roughly rectangular fountain opens its arms toward the square and faces the seat of civic government, the Palazzo Pubblico. The fountain inaugurated the first continuous supply of drinking water in the city center. Girolamo Gigli, writing in the eighteenth century, explained that the fountain’s name derived from the gaiety (gaia) felt by the citizens upon seeing the first arrival of water in the Campo.¹ Yet the fountain in its current iteration is not the original, eloquent masterpiece completed in 1419 by hometown sculptor Jacopo della Quercia (c. 1374-1438); rather, it is a nineteenth-century reconstruction commissioned from Tito Sarrocchi (1824-1900) by a committee of leading Sienese citizens. Although Quercia’s Fonte Gaia is considered one of the major expressions of fifteenth-century Italian sculpture and its literature is vast, Sarrocchi’s later version has been left to shape the reputation of the fountain because it has so often been considered a faithful copy of Quercia’s original monument. However a comparison

Unless otherwise noted, all translations in the dissertation are mine. I have preserved the original spelling of all documents.
with Quercia’s newly-restored original fountain at Siena’s Museum of Santa Maria della Scala, reveals that Sarrocchi’s copy was not so faithful after all. With this study I shall show that Sarrocchi’s fountain, while largely faithful to Quercia’s iconographic program, is stylistically a creative interpretation of Quercia’s fifteenth-century fountain. Sarrocchi made important changes to the new fountain with respect to Quercia’s original. These changes concern the style of carving as well as the complete omission of the two full scale statues and several border elements, in addition to a new location for the fountain in the square. Furthermore, I argue that Sarrocchi’s “copy” is heavily influenced by the art movement known as “Purism”, shaped in part by the prevailing restoration theories that circulated in Siena in the mid-nineteenth century. This dissertation will examine both the physical remains of Quercia’s original fountain and Sarrocchi’s replacement in order to reevaluate the iconographic program of the original fountain and discover the extent of its later transformations. I shall elucidate the interrelationship of both fountains and the cultural context that led to the replacement of the original. My intention is to offer a more complete understanding of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia and the sculptor’s place in art history and I shall examine—for the first time—Sarrocchi’s impact on our perception of Quercia’s beloved civic landmark.

Jacopo della Quercia earned his reputation as one of the preeminent Italian sculptors of the early Quattrocento, along with Donatello and Ghiberti, in large part because of his Fonte Gaia. It was this work that, above all others, defined Quercia’s art

---

2 In March of 2011 Quercia’s restored fountain remnants were put on display in the museum of Santa Maria della Scala in Siena. Prior to this new exhibit only the two full-scale female statues (labeled Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia) and two reliefs (The Expulsion of Adam and Eve and the Virtue Wisdom) were on display to the public. I thank Enrico Toti, curator of the museum, for allowing me to study Quercia’s sculptures while in storage.
over the following centuries so that Vasari noted in the opening of his famous *Vite (Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*, 1550 and enlarged in 1568) that the sculptor was known: “forever thereafter no longer as Jacopo dalla Quercia, but as *Jacopo dalla Fonte* [Jacopo of the Fountain]”.³ Rightly considered a transitional figure, Quercia bridged the gap between Gothic and Renaissance art.

The fountain was groundbreaking in its style but also in its form: it was very likely the first monumental public fountain of the Renaissance and the sculptures that once adorned the lateral balustrades of the fountain, often identified as Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia, were among the first free-standing statues of the Renaissance.⁴ The monument’s fame was tied to its particular iconographic program and the sculptor’s prominent carving style, which deeply influenced the work of contemporary and later artists in Tuscany and beyond, although it is Michelangelo who is most often remembered as the heir to Quercia’s legacy.⁵ Quercia’s inventive fountain design is unique within the panorama of other early Italian fountains. Its unusual form, a roughly

---


rectangular basin open to the sky and walled on three sides (as opposed to the usual centrally planned circular fountain basin) was designed specifically for the atypical slanted square that dominates the center of Siena. Further, another aspect of the Fonte Gaia’s importance derives from its practical use as it provided, for the first time, running water in the city center.

The earliest published source to mention Jacopo della Quercia is the contemporary sculptor Lorenzo Ghiberti in his 1447 treatise, “I Commentari.” Here Ghiberti briefly mentions the sculptor in reference to the list of participants for the 1401 competition for the Florence Baptistery doors and gives Quercia’s name, for the first time, spelled with a “Q” instead of a “G”, as it often appeared in Sienese documents. As already mentioned it was Giorgio Vasari’s influential description of the artist, a century later, in both editions of his Vite, which cemented Quercia’s greatness and largely shaped the perception of his art until the nineteenth century. According to Vasari, Quercia was, “the first--after Andrea Pisano, Orcagna, and the others mentioned above-- who laboring in sculpture with greater zeal and diligence, began to show that it was possible to make an approach to nature, and the first who encouraged the others to hope to be able in a certain measure to equal her.” It was Vasari who situated the artist’s biography as the

---

6 “Guercia” is the spelling usually found in the Sienese chronicles and in the records found in the Sienese Archives. Ghiberti knew Jacopo from the competition for the bronze doors of the baptistery of Florence and later from having worked with him on the Baptismal Font in Siena and thus Hanson correctly points out that he certainly knew his name. In any case, thanks to Ghiberti and to Vasari, scholars have since used the form Quercia. Anne Coffin Hanson, Jacopo della Quercia’s Fonte Gaia (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), preface.


first of the Renaissance period; this was fundamental, as will be shown, for a group of nineteenth-century historians of Sienese art.

Renewed interest in the sculptor and his fountain began in the mid-1800s when Gaetano Milanesi, a member of the Accademia della Crusca and an eminent editor of Vasari, published some key records concerning the planning and building of the Fonte Gaia that he discovered while organizing the Sienese archives. Between 1854 and 1856 he published three volumes of archival documents pertaining to Sienese art history and notably to Jacopo della Quercia’s oeuvre. These documents included various transcriptions of documents that dealt with the commission of the Fonte Gaia to Quercia, and included important information such as a description of the penalties Quercia had to pay if he did not respect the project’s timeline, as well as payment notices for materials and labor. The discovery of these documents served to stimulate further research on the sculptor’s oeuvre and provide the basis of what we now know about the commission for the fountain.


9 The Accademia della Crusca is a Florentine institution founded in the sixteenth century by a group of academics who proposed to preserve and disseminate the Florentine volgare, their ideal form of the Italian language. The group is particularly known for the publication of a glossary of the Italian language, il Vocabolario. See Amedeo Benedetti, “L’Accademia della Crusca e la sua biblioteca” in Biblioteche Oggi, n. 9, Nov. 2007, 43-48. Gaetano Milanesi (1813-1897) was born in Siena; in 1834 he graduated from law school and shortly thereafter was appointed “apprendista” in Siena’s public library (Biblioteca Comunale). He was particularly good at discerning Italian scripts and set about transcribing archival documents pertaining to art history. In 1856 he joined the Accademia della Crusca and later in 1883 he was appointed Arciconsolo of the same prestigious linguistic organization. See Piergiacomo Petrioli, Gaetano Milanesi. Erudizione e storia dell’arte in Italia nell’Ottocento. Profilo e carteggio artistico (Siena: Accademia Senese degli Intronati, 2004), 5-11.

10 Gaetano Milanesi, Documenti per la storia dell’arte senese (Siena: Onorato Porri, 1854-6, vols. III) [Soest: Davaco Publishers, 1969]. These volumes provide one of the first steps toward a re-evaluation of the city’s rich artistic patrimony and a renewed interest in Siena’s great sculptor Jacopo della Quercia.
Shortly thereafter, in 1869, Carpellini published a small pamphlet on the Fonte Gaia written on the occasion of the substitution of Quercia’s sculptures with the “copies” made by Tito Sarrocchi. In the pamphlet Carpellini collected the information then known about Quercia’s fountain and contributed another document to Milanesi’s discoveries in the Sienese archives. This document described other penalties to be imposed on the Operaio del Duomo if work on the Campo was delayed further, proving that progress on the fountain was late because Quercia continued to accept other commissions.  

Carpellini’s pamphlet is particularly interesting with regard to the nineteenth-century perception of Sarrocchi’s new fountain. He applauded Sarrocchi’s work and wrote that his new fountain “unearthed Quercia’s fountain from rubble” essentially providing the basis for the opinion of his work as a faithful copy of the earlier fountain. That same year Carpellini participated in the publication of another commemorative book, La Fonte Gaia della Piazza di Siena, where Sarrocchi is said to have virtually forgotten his mentor’s teachings [Giovanni Duprê] and instead worked as if a faithful student of Quercia on the Fonte Gaia sculptures. Two years later Borghesi and Banchi added three more documents to those discovered earlier which also concerned the initial commission.

11 The document is dated June 18, 1412 and the original Latin text is published in Carlo F. Carpellini, Di Giacomo della Guercia e della sua fonte nella Piazza del Campo (Siena: Tip. Dell’Ancora di G. Bargellini, 1869), 37-39. On the other assignments Quercia was working on at the same time as the Fonte Gaia see Beck, 1991, vol. I, 18.

12 The original text reads, “[...] a dissotterrare dalle macerie il Giacomo della Guercia, si è manifestato mirabile: erano avanzi tanto deformi, da porre alla disperazione un occhio che non fosse pratico e perspicace come il suo.” Carpellini, 1869, 32. A copy of the original pamphlet is located in the Archivio Storico del Comune of Siena.

13 The original text reads, “[...] in queste sculture, quasi dimenticando lo studio di Giovanni Duprê, lavoro come un valente discepolo della bottega di Maestro Jacopo” cited from “Programma per rifare la Fonte Gaia della Piazza di Siena” in Luciano Banchi, Carlo F. Carpellini, and Antonio Pantanelli, La Fonte Gaia della piazza di Siena (Siena: Gatti & Lombardi, 1869), pt. ii.
of the fountain. These documents include a request for more funds to complete the fountain and stipulations regarding the project’s timeline.

All of this important archival material was finally collated by Fabio Bargagli-Petrucci in 1906. His two volume publication entitled *Le fonti di Siena e i loro aquedotti* continues to be unrivaled for the quality of the research on Siena’s early fountains. In the first volume the author shed new light on the early history of the Fonte Gaia, revealing that a fountain stood on the site before Quercia’s time. Other important contributions of this work include a survey of the creation of the Sienese underground water system and early medieval Sienese fountains. The second volume contains the transcriptions of relevant archival sources published to date. In 1929 the growing body of critical writing dedicated to Jacopo della Quercia and his fountain was augmented by another Italian scholar Péleo Bacci. He made several discoveries on the subject of Jacopo della Quercia’s early life in Siena and Lucca that added to the understanding of his oeuvre. At about the same time part of Quercia’s preparatory drawing for the Fonte Gaia—the first proof of his artistic and iconographic intentions—was discovered in London’s Victoria and Albert Museum. In 1927 Jenő Lányi identified the London drawing as representing the 1409 plan of the fountain in his article “*Der Entwurf zur

---

14 Scipione Borghesi and Luciano Banchi, *Nuovi documenti per la storia dell’arte senese* (Siena: Enrico Torrini Editore, 1898).
Fonte Gaia in Siena.” In 1952 Richard Krautheimer published another section of the same drawing in New York’s Metropolitan Museum of Art. With two out of probably three fragments of the original 1409 plan in hand, Krautheimer was able to make the first thorough iconographical analysis of the fountain and suggest phases for the creation of the program of sculpture. These exemplary studies greatly furthered the state of knowledge on the commission, design, and iconography of Jacopo della Quercia’s Fonte Gaia and help to inform the first part of my study on the fountain.

Even though the Fonte Gaia is recognized as one of Quercia’s most important commissions, the fountain remained little studied in the secondary literature before 1930. In 1896, shortly after the publication of Milanesi’s important findings the first full-length monograph on Jacopo della Quercia appeared. Since then numerous scholars have mentioned the Fonte Gaia within the larger context of the artist’s oeuvre, however none have taken into account the significant nineteenth-century interventions, which had the effect of changing subsequent perceptions of the fountain. These monographic studies on the artist, by Gielly (1930), Biagi (1946), Carli (1949), Morisani (1962), Bertini (1965), List (1969), Seymour (1973) and Beck (1991), all have sections dedicated to the iconographical problems that surround the identification of the figures on the fifteenth-

---

17 Jenő Lányi, “Der Entwurf zur Fonte Gaia in Siena” in Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst (1927-28, 61), 257-66. He identified the London drawing as representing the 1409 plan of the Fonte Gaia in Siena. He did not, however, believe that the drawing was by Jacopo della Quercia but instead proposed Jacopo’s brother Priamo as its author.
18 Richard Krautheimer published the second half of the New York-London drawing in “A Drawing of the Fonte Gaia in Siena” in Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (n. 10, June, 1952), 265-74. Krautheimer links the two extant parts of the Fonte Gaia drawing, agreeing with Lányi that the 1409 plan is represented in the drawings, and through iconographical analysis suggests phases for the program of sculpture.
century fountain. Twenty To date, there is one full-length, detailed study on the fifteenth-century history of the fountain: Anne Coffin Hanson’s *Jacopo della Quercia’s Fonte Gaia* published in 1965. Her seminal work is a comparative analysis of the documentary references provided by Milanesi, Bargagli-Petrucci and Bacci in the Sienese archives and is fundamental for the first part of my study. Hanson correctly recognizes that “[…] while faithful to the shape of what remained of the original composition, Tito Sarrocchi’s work imposed a flavor and a finish totally foreign to the oeuvre of Jacopo della Quercia”, but she did not explore the issue in greater depth. Further, when Hanson wrote her monograph Quercia’s fountain had yet to be restored, and thus my study addresses not only the nineteenth-century history of the fountain which altered its original appearance, but also critical aspects of the monument’s later history including the important new discoveries made during the latest restoration (1989-2010) of Quercia’s dismembered fountain.

Recently, for example, the curator of Santa Maria della Scala, Enrico Toti, and art historian, Sara Dei, have edited a new publication entitled *La Fonte Gaia di Jacopo della Quercia, storia e restauro di un capolavoro dell’arte senese* which is a collection of articles published for the opening, in March 2011, of an exhibit displaying Quercia’s


21 Hanson, in her introduction, briefly mentions the nineteenth-century restoration in order to point out to the reader that the fountain in the Piazza del Campo is a modern replica and that in order to view Quercia’s sculptures one must go to the Palazzo Pubblico where the pieces were on view at the time Hanson wrote her dissertation. Hanson, 1965, 1-2.

22 Hanson, 1965, 2.
newly restored fountain remnants. The contributions made by Duccio Balestracci, Fabio Gabbirelli, Massimo Ferretti and the restorers Stefano Landi, Daniela Manna and Anne-Katrin Potthoff are not entirely new to the scholarly literature on the fountain, since they were all published previously in another form. The significant new contribution is Sara Dei’s article “La Copia della Fonte di Tito Sarrocchi” which addresses Sarrocchi’s fountain and surveys, albeit briefly, some of the same issues that I too address in this study. Notably, Dei and I both argue that Sarrocchi’s fountain is a Purist re-elaboration of Quercia’s monument. My thesis, elaborated independently of this study, is supported by full historical and visual analysis to a depth much greater than the scope of the essays in the recent book would allow.

It is well attested that Quercia carved his fountain from an unusually porous local marble, marmo senese della montagnola, that proved to be quite fragile. Years of exposure to the elements (and vandals) caused the fountain to disintegrate over time leading to its removal from the square in the nineteenth century. At that time Quercia’s

---

25 Her article is nineteen pages long with six images.
dismembered fountain pieces were transferred to the Palazzo Pubblico where they languished in dirty, fragmentary condition for more than a century before finding a new home, in 1904, in the loggia of the same building. Today, after the conclusion of the Opificio delle Pietre Dure’s nearly twenty-year restoration project, Quercia’s dismembered fountain has been returned to some semblance of its former glory and is on view in the museum of Santa Maria della Scala, Siena. The cleaning and restoration of his fountain has exposed new evidence that I shall use to shed light on Italian restoration practices as they affect the way we perceive Quercia’s Renaissance icon. The restoration of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia has been the subject of several studies in the last decade. These sources, unlike my own, are scientific in nature and provide little art-historical analysis of the monument.

Sarrocchi’s Fonte Gaia has thus been largely overlooked by contemporary scholarship. In 1999, the art historian Marco Pierini wrote a monograph about Tito Sarrocchi, but his principal concern was to catalogue the artist’s sculptural oeuvre. As a consequence, he dedicated only a single catalog entry description to Sarrocchi’s fountain. Nevertheless, his monograph does provide a valuable updated version of the 1924 biography of the artist written by Sarrocchi’s son, Guido, who was an engineer

27 This was on the occasion of the 1904 exhibit organized by Corrado Ricci, *Mostra d’antica arte senese*. Corrado Ricci, *Il palazzo pubblico di Siena e la mostra d’arte antica senese* (Bergamo: Istituto Italiano d’Arti Grafiche, 1904).
28 The project begun in 1990 was terminated in 2011. The documentary and photographic evidence pertaining to the first decade of the project is located in the Archives of the Opificio delle Pietre Dure in Florence and all subsequent documentation is held by the restoration team of Santa Maria della Scala in Siena.
rather than an art historian.\textsuperscript{31} Other than this study and Dei’s article the modern fountain has been almost completely ignored in the literature, a fact that may have contributed to the erroneous evaluation of Sarrocchi’s fountain as a mere copy of Quercia’s original, an idea that has persisted in the scholarly literature from its creation in the nineteenth century to today.

Further, a comprehensive modern study of the complete history of Quercia’s fountain has been hampered by the poor condition of his original marbles. The varying degree of damage suffered by the fountain over the last six centuries has made it difficult for scholars to identify many of the figures, and consequently, divergent theories of interpretation have been put forward.\textsuperscript{32} However, I believe I have found a way to resurrect the master’s original intentions. Tito Sarrocchi made plaster casts of the Fonte Gaia before he sculpted its replacement in the nineteenth century and these models, now located in the museum of Santa Maria della Scala in Siena, provide valuable information on Quercia’s fountain. Thus far these plaster copies have been considered only as artisans’ tools that aided in the mechanical reproduction of the fountain. Instead, as I shall demonstrate, they are crucial to understanding the original Renaissance design because they preserve many figurative elements and details of the originals that have since been lost.

\textsuperscript{31} Guido Sarrocchi, \textit{Cenni biografici dello scultore senese Tito Sarrocchi} (Siena: Lazzeri, 1924).
\textsuperscript{32} I have provided a brief summary of the positions held by more recent scholarship, the author’s names are in parenthesis after the identification of the relief sculpture. On the Virgin’s left are represented Prudence and Fortitude (Hanson, Seymour, Beck), to her right Justice and Charity (Hanson and Seymour), Beck instead identifies Charity with Humility. On the left side arm are identified Hope, Wisdom, and the Creation of Adam, matched on the right side arm by Temperance, Faith and the Expulsion of Adam and Eve (Hanson, Seymour, Beck). The identification of the two statues often called Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia are even more widely debated. See my discussion in chapter two. Hanson, 1965, 51-77. Seymour, 1973, 44-53. Beck, 1991. 81-94.
This dissertation thus explores a number of crucial questions: What were the circumstances of this renovation? Was the impetus a matter of renewed local civic pride in light of the evolving new national identity or were the planners more concerned with the fountain’s state of conservation? By 1844, Quercia’s fountain was in a near-ruined state and was a source of embarrassment to the patriotic Sienese, as we learn from the official request to remove the fountain made to the commune by Gaetano Milanesi and the engineer Gaspero Pini. The evidence I have unearthed in the commune’s archives suggests that the country’s political upheaval also affected the restoration even as the fountain became a visual emblem of Siena’s role in the process of reunification.

My research also demonstrates Milanesi’s pivotal role in the removal and replacement of Quercia’s fountain. It was in the middle of the nineteenth century that he was occupied with the publication of a newly annotated version of Vasari’s *Vite*. The most complete work to date on Gaetano Milanesi is Piergiacomo Petrioli’s 2004 study which brought forth the importance of Milanesi as an archivist, art historian, connoisseur, and further underscored his great concern for the fate of Italy’s artistic patrimony. I argue that the poor condition of the Fonte Gaia and Vasari’s recognition of Quercia’s primacy in the Renaissance inspired Milanesi to herald the fountain’s rescue. Moreover, it appears that Milanesi’s reading of Vasari’s text set the stage for a renewed interest in the sculptor by a group of nineteenth-century Renaissance revival sculptors in Siena,

34 Apart from the Fonte Gaia project Petrioli also discusses, for example, Milanesi’s role in the relocation of Michelangelo’s David, and his role in the church restorations of Santa Trinita and the façade of Santa Maria del Fiore in Florence. The most complete discussion of Milanesi’s biography, prior to Petrioli’s study, is Alessandro Lisini, “Necrologia di Gaetano Milanesi” in *Bullittino Senese di Storia Patria* (vol. II, 1895), 182.
known as Purists. Purism was stimulated by the impassioned aesthetic debates between proponents of Neoclassicism and Realism. Purists like the Primitifs, Nazarenes, and Pre-Raphaelites aimed to impart moral and/or religious messages to their art and were inspired by the ideas motivating fifteenth-century artists. Thus, in Siena it was natural that purists were particularly interested in the revival of the art of their legendary forebear, Jacopo della Quercia. This study argues that the Fonte Gaia’s new appearance was influenced by the current artistic movement called Purism. This is made apparent through a comparison of Sarrocchi’s fountain with Quercia’s original reliefs and Sarrocchi’s nineteenth-century casts of Quercia’s reliefs, and further underscored by the relationship that Sarrocchi’s work establishes with the art of contemporary Purist masters.

Another important aspect of Sarrocchi’s fountain is revealed in the nineteenth-century perception of “restoration” and “copy”. These terms had very different meanings then as opposed to today. To the nineteenth-century restorer “restoration” could mean sculpture carved anew and “copy” signified, rather frequently, a free interpretation of the original. Thus when Sarrocchi created exact plaster copies of the sculptural components of Quercia’s fountain intended to aid the creation of a faithful copy, he saw nothing wrong with not using them exactly for that purpose. Why did Sarrocchi make these decisions? The answer to this question raises others, like what did it mean for a nineteenth-century Italian sculptor to “copy” the work of another? Was the result expected to be a facsimile of the original or was the spirit of the original enough for the patron?

------------------

In this context Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc and his theories on restoration are noteworthy. He codified stylistic restoration in the middle of the nineteenth century in these terms: “The term restoration and the thing itself are both modern. To restore a building is not to preserve it, to repair it, to rebuild it; it is to reinstate it in a condition of completeness which may never have existed at any time.” My study explores a complex web of unsuspected political and artistic associations that determined the fountain’s history. Documents including letters, payments, and contracts between the communal government, Tito Sarrocchi, and the project’s architect, Giuseppe Partini, that date from the early 1840’s to the 1870’s provide the support necessary to shed light on the intellectual milieu of nineteenth-century Siena. My study argues for Viollet-le-Duc’s influence on the practice of the Sienese architect, Giuseppe Partini (1842-1895) and his influence on Sarrocchi’s creation of the new Fonte Gaia which, although evident from the formal qualities of the fountain, has not been explored before. The unique intersection of Milanesi’s intellectual power, the nineteenth-century art movement Purism, the incorporation of Siena into the emerging Italian state, and the changing notion of restoration all play important roles in the Fonte Gaia’s nineteenth-century history and


37 These documents are located in the Archivio Storico del Comune (ASC), X A Categoria Lavori Pubblici/Fontane and Categoria Conservazione.

38 On Partini see Maria Cristina Buscioni, Giuseppe Partini (1842-1895), architetto del Purismo senese (Firenze: Electa Editrice, 1981).
form just a few of the considerations that this study intends to clarify in the history of the Fonte Gaia.

Outline of Chapters

Considering the monument’s multifaceted history and its survival for about six centuries, I have organized my study into four chapters and subdivided each into smaller sections to further guide the reader. Chapter One introduces the city of Siena, her geographical position, foundation history and government. I discuss the city’s particular water engineering system—the bottini— and highlight the differences between this system and the more common form of the Roman aqueduct employed in other Italian cities. I also discuss extant medieval fountains that predate the Fonte Gaia in both Siena and Italy. The location, form, and patronage of these earlier fountains is important for my study as this information allows the reader to consult and compare early Italian fountain design in one place and serves specifically to highlight the unique elements of Quercia’s Renaissance work. In the second section of chapter one, I introduce what is known about the patronage, plan, and design of the fourteenth-century Fonte Gaia. This is the fountain that existed on the square before Quercia’s fountain and thus for clarity I shall refer to it as the first Fonte Gaia. Careful study reveals that the first Fonte Gaia influenced the design of Quercia’s fifteenth-century fountain more than has hitherto been recognized.

I begin Chapter Two by outlining the patronage, plan and design of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia. Subsequently I address the iconographical questions posed by other scholars related to the Fonte Gaia sculptures, and next I propose a new interpretation of the fountain’s iconographic program. My identification of the female figures, usually identified as Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia, as references to the maternal figure Gaia is
related to then contemporary debates regarding the foundation history of the city and Quercia’s relationship to the Sienese painter Taddeo di Bartolo.

This dissertation then moves to an examination of the activities from 1430 to 1830 that caused damage to Quercia’s fountain. Chapter Three, entitled “A History of Disrepair”, is a chronological record of the fountain’s later vicissitudes, derived largely from archival sources. From this research I am able to draw conclusions about the condition of Quercia’s fountain and the use of both the fountain and the square over the period mentioned above.

Chapter Four is dedicated to the life of Tito Sarrocchi, the circumstances of the new Fonte Gaia’s commission, and the perception of restoration in the nineteenth century. I discuss the art movement Purism and explain how this Renaissance revival style contributed to the replacement of the fountain and its new design. My intention is to locate the renewal of the fountain within the context of an elevated consciousness of cultural heritage influenced by the then-fashionable trend of Renaissance Revival Art.
Chapter One
Siena: Water and Power

Siena was founded upon a hilltop, approximately sixty-five kilometers east of the Tyrrhenian Sea and almost a quarter mile (320 meters) above sea level on the Chiana mountain range; this placed the city several kilometers away from the closest river and upstream from any nearby tributaries. Siena’s elevated location, however, did have its advantages: it served to protect the city by providing a natural defense from invaders. Her location along one of the most important pilgrimage routes from Northern Europe to Rome, the *Via Francigena*, provided the city with her main source of revenue. [Fig. 1] Beginning in the Middle Ages Christian pilgrims, bankers, and merchants, as well as popes and emperors, traveled along the *Via Francigena*. In 1300 alone, when Pope Boniface VIII proclaimed it a Holy Year, tens of thousands of pilgrims stopped in Siena along their journey to Rome and the city thrived as a consequence. Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV visited Siena after his coronation in Rome in the eleventh century as did Frederick Barbarossa (1122-1190) and Frederick II (1194-1250) and later Giovanna of Naples and Emperor Sigismund. One Emperor did more than just stop in Siena for a night. In 1469 Frederick III (1415-1493) celebrated his grandiose marriage to Eleanor of

---

39 The closest river is the Arbia (nine kilometers from the city) followed by the Staggia (twelve kilometers) and the Merse (thirty kilometers). The more important limiting factor, however, is that all of the headwaters of these rivers are at a lower elevation that that of Siena. Michael Kucher, *The Water Supply System of Siena, Italy: The Medieval Roots of the Modern Networked City* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 50.


Portugal in Siena, as Pinturicchio’s renowned fresco records in the Piccolomini Library in the Duomo.

The city grew as a result of this wealth. From the city proper new suburbs were created, forming three principal districts: the Terzo di Città, the Terzo di San Martino and the Terzo di Camollia, as they are known today, where the rural inhabitants settled. The tripartite division of the city into Terzi derives from the three earlier nuclei of the city: Castelvecchio or Castel Senio, the oldest center, Camollia to the north, and to the east Castello di Montone. These areas correspond geographically to one of the peaks of the three ranges of hills upon which Siena was built which, by the end of the thirteenth century, were included within the ancient city walls. The principal attractions the city provided the rural population were: the possibility to learn professional skills for various kinds of work, increased prospects of protection, and a regular supply of food and water. Naturally, the supply of water was a major concern for Siena’s inhabitants and, as shall be discussed further on, the Fonte Gaia was of vital importance for the growth of the city.

Siena’s foundations are generally thought to date to at least the Middle Ages, though several historians trace the foundation of the city further back to either an Etruscan or a Roman settlement. It is only within the last fifty years, with the discoveries made by archeologists in the area of Siena, that light has been shed on the

44 Hook, 1979, 9.
foundation history of the city. As is well known Etruscan cities were founded in Tuscany. Around the second half of the eighth century B.C. the first nuclei were formed in Tarquinia, Cerveteri, Veio, Vulci, Bolsena, Chiusi, Roselle, Vetulonia, Populonia, Arezzo, Cortona and Perugia. These cities were known as the twelve capitals (Dodecapoli). Later on several smaller centers were established such as Cosa, Talamone, Pistoia, Fiesole, Volterra and Sovana. In the second half of the twentieth century the hypothesis that Siena was also founded by the Etruscans was strengthened by the discovery some twelve kilometers from Siena (near the town of Murlo) of archeological remains from the fifth-fourth century B.C.47 Because of the large size of one of the buildings (70 x 100 meters long) archeologists have variously identified the structure as the Temple of Poggio Civitate or even the long sought after shrine known as Fanum Voltumnae, a political sanctuary that functioned as a meeting place and as a site for religious ceremonies and games.48 While debates regarding the nature and identification of the temple or sanctuary are ongoing, the discovery of an Etruscan presence so close to the modern city of Siena does suggest that the city was founded by this early civilization.

Kyle M. Philips, In the Hills of Tuscany: Recent Excavations at the Etruscan Site of Poggio Civitate; Murlo, Siena (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archeology and Anthropology, 1993).

This may be further confirmed by the recent excavations within the city walls that have revealed the existence of two necropoli: the first at S. Marco and the second at Campansi, where numerous Etruscan utensils have come to light dating from the last quarter of the fourth century B.C.\textsuperscript{49}

In the Renaissance firm evidence to support an Etruscan or Roman foundation was unknown as Siena, unlike Florence or Rome, did not have any knowledge of surviving ruins from this early period. In the scheme of Renaissance politics where a firmly established and verifiable Roman pedigree were considered imperative for sovereignty, cities such as Siena and Venice which lacked these credentials created suitable foundation histories in order to claim equality with, if not outright superiority over, neighboring city states.\textsuperscript{50} This is one of the reasons why the Sienese in the fifteenth century were particularly invested in creating a visual expression of their foundation history, and it was this history that came to be expressed in the fresco cycle of Palazzo Pubblico and on the fountain in front of that building, the Fonte Gaia.

The foundation myths portrayed in the Palazzo Pubblico and on the Fonte Gaia are derived from a fifteenth-century interpretation of the classical writings of Livy and Florus, both of whom relate Camillus’ victory over the Gauls and his restoration of


\textsuperscript{50} Venice looked to Constantinople and the Byzantine east for many of its models. In this way Venice competed with the roman histories of other Italian city states by claiming another “Rome”, that founded by Constantine in the east, as ancient predecessor. Paololetti and Radke suggest that this story evolved because the actual Roman remains of the city (discovered some ten feet below the ground line of the modern city) were probably long forgotten as the inhabitants continuously built up the islands to escape the encroaching sea. John T. Paololetti and Gary M. Radke, \textit{Art in Renaissance Italy} (New York: Abrams, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition, 2002), 50.
Although the interpretation of the historical record was first recorded in the fifteenth century, the story of Camillus’ foundation myth was probably, as Rubinstein points out, of earlier origin. Agostino Patrizi wrote, in his *De antiquitate civitatis Senesis*, that the Sienese of his time believed that while the Galli Senones had founded Siena, Camillus was responsible for the area of the city known as the *terzo Camollia*, for it was there that Camillus had pitched his tent before defeating the Gauls. This account was followed in the Quattrocento by Francesco Patrizi, who expanded on the idea. In his *De origine et vetustate urbis Senae* he wrote that not only was Camillus responsible for establishing the *terzo Camollia* to which he gave his name, but the entire colony.

The legendary founding of the city by the Gauls was first recorded in the twelfth century by the English author John of Salisbury (1120-1180). His account explains that the Gaulish chieftan Brennus, head of the Senones, founded the town of Senna Gallica from which the name of the city Siena was believed to have come. In reality, however, this was a mistake; the misinterpreted etymology of Senna as Siena instead of the correct

---

53 Agostino Patrizi served Pius II and from 1483 was bishop of Pienza. Original citation: “Gallos deinde in his locis commorantes, a Romano dictatore Furio Camillo defectos; locumque ubi dictator tetenderat appellatum Camillian; hinc, castrorum loca, ab accolis militiae etememiris viris habitari coepta, et urbis principium.” *De antiquitate civitatis Senesis*, Biblioteca Comunale, Siena (BCS), MS. A. VI. 3, f. 83r.
Senna Gallica pertained to Senigallia, a town on Italy’s Adriatic coast founded by Brennus. In any case this story was circulated throughout the Renaissance by historians such as Villani, Biondo, Volaterrano and Alberti.

The Gallic foundation of Siena was one of the two prevailing explanations for the origin of the city. The other local tradition is recounted in the Tisbo legend, named in honor of the Roman Tisbo Colonnese who is supposed to have first recorded it. The story maintains Siena’s Roman origins and involves the twin sons of Remus, Senus and Aeschius, and is thus related to the foundation story of the city of Rome, as recounted in Livy’s *Ab Urbe Condita*. According to the story, Rhea Silvia, the Vestal Virgin, was raped and claimed that Mars was the father of her twins. She was imprisoned, and the King ordered that her offspring be thrown into the Tiber River. Due to the river’s sluggish waters, the basket with the children Romulus and Remus was left high and dry by the receding waters. A thirsty she-wolf heard the children’s cries, and nearing the river, discovered the children. She saved them by giving them her own teats for nourishment. Faustulus, the master of the royal flock, found the wolf licking the children

---

57 See Rondoni, 1968.
59 The oldest codice is from the fifteenth century. ASC, A VI, 8. The legend is also found in several other codices in the same archive labeled A, VI, 12; A VI, 10; A, III, 25; A, III, 28; and B, III, 1; A, VI, 11; A, VI, 4. For a discussion of dating and differences in language see Rondoni, 1968, 15.
61 Rhea Silvia was made a priestess of Vesta by her uncle Amulius so that she would not be able to procreate. The goddess of the hearth, Vesta, was worshipped as a living flame in the center of a shrine in the Roman Forum. The flame was tended by her priestesses, the Vestals, who had to remain chaste for the duration of their service to the goddess.
gently and, as the story goes, took the children back to his wife Larentia. Livy goes on to give two versions of the death of Remus, explaining that for this reason Romulus became the sole ruler of Rome and the city took his name.

According to the Tisbo legend, the twins Senus and Aeschius, escaping the anger of their uncle Romulus, took the ‘sacrarrio’-the image of the wolf and the twins- from Rome to the spot that is now Siena. There they built a temple to house the shrine and founded the city. On the spot now known as Castelvecchio they built a strong castle to which they gave the name Castel Senio. The danger of capture along their journey prompted the twins to vow to build a temple to Apollo, should they escape from Romulus. The god sent them two noble horses, one as black as night, and the other of purest white, with which they managed to escape. They ordained great sacrifices to Apollo and Diana in gratitude for having overcome such opposition. From the altar of Apollo the fumes were densely black, while a white smoke ascended from Diana’s sacrifice. The brothers took these smoke signs as the colors for their emblem, known as the balzana, which was later adopted as Siena’s coat-of-arms.

Regardless of its secular beginnings, by the twelfth century, Siena was in the hands of the Church as it was governed primarily by the city’s bishop. This arrangement

---

62 It may be that the miraculous story originated because Larentia, a former prostitute, was called she-wolf among the shepherd community, since Lupa (she-wolf) is also the Latin word for prostitute. “Una donna ebbe costui, Messalana, tanto lussuriosa, che palese con l’altre lupe stave ne la tana.” Fazio degli Uberti, Il Dittamondo, Ed. Giuseppe Corsi (Bari: Laterza, 1952 [1345-67], L. 2, ch.5, 101, lines 52-54. “Intorno a quella Riviera si stave una meretrice commune, la qual femmina si chiamava in latino Lupa. Trovati da costei li due fanciulli, preseli e nutricollo molto dolcemente. E per ciò fu ditto, che ellino furo figliuoli della Lupa.” Brunetto Latini, Tesoro volg. (ed. Gaiter) XIII L 1, ch 35, 98, lines 3-6. I thank Prof. Simone Marchesi for bringing these sources to my attention.

63 Livy, 6-13.

64 The balzana is a shield of which the upper half is white and the lower black. On the legend see Rondoni, 1968,13-27. Douglas, 1902, 6.
persisted until 1167 when the city declared its independence from Episcopal control and a republican government was established that lasted to the sixteenth century. The most important and durable rule was that of the Nove, the Government of the Nine, which governed the city from 1285 to 1355. This body was made up of members from the burgher class and marked a particularly peaceful and prosperous period of Siena’s history. During this period many new buildings were built, such as the Cathedral, Baptistery, the Palazzo Pubblico, and the churches dedicated to St Francis and St Dominic. From 1260 to the second quarter of the fourteenth century Siena flourished politically and economically. The Ghibelline city had vanquished Guelph Florence at the Battle of Montaperti in 1260, and a period of prosperity and relative political security followed this victory. In 1326, however the population was tested by famine and then, in 1348, brought to its knees by the plague. A vivid description of the city at this time is recorded by Agnolo di Tura del Grasso in his *Cronica Maggiore*,

And it is found that at this time there died in Siena 36,000 persons twenty years of age or less, and the aged and other people (died), to a total of 52,000 in all in Siena. And in the suburbs of Siena 28,000 persons died; so that in all it is found that in the city and suburbs of Siena 80,000 persons died. Thus at this time Siena and its suburbs had more than 30,000 men, and there remained in Siena less than 10,000 men. And those that survived were like persons distraught and almost without feeling. […] I will not write of the cruelty that there was in the countryside, of the wolves and wild beasts that ate the poorly buried corpses, and of other cruelties that would be too painful to those who read of them [...] The city of Siena seemed almost uninhabited for almost no one was found in the city.

---

[...] At this time in Siena the great and noble project of enlarging the cathedral of Siena that had been begun a few years earlier was abandoned [...].

Following these disastrous events discontent among the two social classes excluded from government rule, the nobles and the working class, peaked, and in 1355 with the arrival of Charles IV of Luxembourg, the Government of the Nine was suppressed. Following this tumult a new government was formed of twelve commoners assisted by a group of twelve nobles that established the Government of the Twelve. Shortly thereafter, in 1385, this government was replaced by the so-called Fifteen, and in turn, several different numbered governments followed each other until finally Siena was turned over, as seignory, to the Milanese lord Gian Galeazzo Visconti in 1399. The incorporation into the Visconti fiefdom was a maneuver that the Sienese hoped would protect them from Florentine expansionism. This, however, ultimately failed as Siena was ceded to the Grand Duchy of Tuscany in 1555 and remained under its control until the unification of Italy in the nineteenth century.

Water

In stark contrast to the majority of other Italian cities that had been founded close to a direct source of fresh water such as a river or tributary, Siena was forced to devise several methods for acquiring enough water for its inhabitants. For cities such as Florence, Rome, Milan and Turin, river water supplied the best quality of water and was relatively easy for the city’s inhabitants to access. For cities built in valleys, such as

---

67 For most of the peninsula water was carried from the river by women. In Rome, however, the Tiber’s water was transported by acquaioli, members of a confraternity that met in the local church of Santa Maria
Florence or Rome, hand-dug wells were problematic as they were especially vulnerable to contamination from nearby cesspools (or agricultural waste) and thus could not assure potable water.\textsuperscript{68}

Ancient Rome was known for having had an abundant water supply; eleven aqueducts delivered water to hundreds of fountains and public baths.\textsuperscript{69} Renaissance Rome, on the contrary, had a severe water shortage. Of Rome’s numerous ancient aqueducts only one, the Acqua Vergine (or Aqua Virgo), had been spared from disruption and destruction. Until the papacy of Sixtus V (1585-1590) this aqueduct was the sole source of running water for the city. Throughout the fifteenth century the scanty water supply permitted only small lavabos or wall fountains.\textsuperscript{70} In both Florence and Rome monumental sculpted fountains, comparable to the Fonte Gaia, appeared only in the sixteenth century when wealthy patrons either commissioned new aqueducts and/or restored the ancient aqueducts. In the last quarter of the sixteenth century Pope Gregory XIII and Pope Sixtus V had partially restored Rome’s aqueducts, providing a surplus of

---

\textsuperscript{68} Kucher, 2005, 45.
\textsuperscript{70} A lavabo is not considered a fountain, it is a basin that is supplied by running water controlled by a tap and turned on only when needed. Quattrocento wall fountains are engaged in the wall (usually at the end of a square or courtyard) and require much less water than a freestanding fountain. Bertha Harris Wiles, \textit{The Fountains of Florentine Sculptors and their Followers from Donatello to Bernini} (New York: Hacker Art Books, 1975), 5.
water that made possible the fountains for which Rome is now famous. This was part of an ambitious renewal program that aimed to reestablish Rome as the center of spiritual and political life.\footnote{71}{Wiles, 1975, 16-19.} In Florence it was not until the reign of Cosimo I that sufficient water was brought to the city via a new aqueduct paid for by the Grand Duchy.\footnote{72}{A medal, dated 1567, cast by Pietro Paolo Galeotti commemorates the new water supply. The reverse is decorated with an aqueduct and a fountain. See Igino Benvenuto Supino, \textit{Il medagliere mediceo nel museo nazionale}, nos. 384-385 and especially page 134.}

Similar to Siena the city of Orvieto in the region of Umbria was also founded by Etruscans on a hill-top location. However, in that city an extensive water supply system survived from the city’s foundation. Under the city lies an elaborate labyrinth of caves, tunnels, cisterns, and rooms that date to the Etruscan and Roman eras. The ancient underground water supply consisted of a large system of cylindrical tunnels cut directly out of the rock substructure of the city. The tunnels were covered with a thick layer of waterproof clay and used to transport water to cisterns for storage and use. This system provided the citizenry with water until the Medieval period when, in order to augment the water supply, the city built a new public aqueduct that ran from the plateau Alfina (\textit{altopiano dell’Alfina}), some five kilometers north-west of Orvieto, directly to the city’s fountains. They will be discussed separately in the section of this chapter dedicated to Italian fountain design.

After the Sack of Rome in 1527, Pope Clement VII chose Orvieto for refuge. In order to protect himself and his entourage should Charles V’s troops attack the city, Clement VII had a spectacular well, known as the \textit{Pozzo di San Patrizio}, built by the
Florentine architect Antonio da Sangallo the Younger. The great well, constructed between 1527 and 1537, was dug fifty-three meters deep and was devised with a double helix ramp which permitted mules laden with water jars to go continuously up and down the well shaft unobstructed. [Fig. 2] An inscription on the entrance to the well records, “What nature stinted for provision application has supplied” (Quod natura munimento inviderat industria adiecit). This principle may also be applied to the creation of Siena’s water supply system. Indeed low precipitation levels (less than one meter of rain in the winter months) meant the city could not rely on the collection of rain water alone to supply enough water for the city’s growing population. Thus, in order to provide adequate water for the city’s inhabitants the Sienese government used four means to procure water: the collection of rain-water in cisterns, the construction of wells dug into the aquifer, the excavation of spring banks and the excavation of underground aqueducts (bottini).

As mentioned earlier, one of the government’s most important duties was to provide its citizens with an abundant and fresh supply of water. As Hook aptly writes, “Just when and how Siena’s system of city fountains began we cannot be sure. But early in her days as a Roman colony, if not even sooner, there must have been a complex system for supplying the city with water.” Initially, considering the available evidence,

76 Duccio Balestracci et al., I bottini medievali di Siena (Siena: Alsaba, 1992), 15.
77 Hook, 1979, 4.
Siena had to rely upon naturally occurring springs and erratic rainfall to supply her citizenry with fresh water. We know that as early as the twelfth century the Sienese began to dig under the city in search of an abundant source of water, probably hoping to find La Diana, the great subterranean river that legend said flowed beneath the city. Their early excavations turned out to be a boondoggle and earned the Sienese the derision of Dante: “You will find them part of that vain people who pinned their hopes on Talamone and will lose more hope thereby than in their search for the Diana […]” Although the mythical river was never found, the search for La Diana likely led to the invention of a new type of water collection system, the bottini. Their existence in Siena was first recorded in 1226, although it is likely that the tunnels were in use earlier. The bottini are tunnels carved into Siena’s substructure of tufa (a soft, porous, calciferous, sedimentary rock) that collected the mineral-laden water as it dripped down from the ground layers above. The water collected in these channels formed a subterranean aqueduct. [Fig. 3] Their innovative structure provoked the wonder of the Emperor Charles V, who declared in 1536 that “Siena was more beautiful below ground than above.”

---

78 The Bisdomini chronicle, from the late fourteenth century, recounts how in 1176 the friars of the Carmine located a small source of water near Castelvecchio. This discovery legitimized a renewed search for the underground river. Balestracci et al., 1993, 25.


80 Tronti et al., La fonte di Follonica e le fonti medievali di Siena (Firenze: All’Insegna del giglio, 2005), 3.

Today, the Sienese bottini are ninety percent intact and still in use. They rank among the best preserved medieval underground aqueducts in Europe. A trip to the underground bottini reveals the arduous maintenance required to keep them functioning properly. The rich calcium deposits in the water quickly obstruct the porous surface of the bottino and form stalactites that must frequently be scraped away in order for water to continue to permeate the surface of the bottini. [Fig. 4] As opposed to the more common type of Roman aqueduct, the bottini do not lead to a source of water but rather they meander through the ground where they collect water. Thus, in order to augment the water supply the surface area of the bottino must be increased. Conversely, the Roman aqueduct (whether built above or below ground) was engineered to carry the flow of water from the source to the city based on various gradients and the use of gravity to maintain a continuous flow of water.

Early Medieval Italian Fountains

In 1419, when the new Fonte Gaia was completed, few Italian cities could boast access to running water via a similarly complex sculpted fountain. In the following section an examination of other noteworthy early Italian fountains will serve to underscore the Fonte Gaia’s unique form and decorative program. As we shall see, the majority of early Italian fountains were civic structures erected in town squares to supply

---

82 I first visited the bottini in the summer of 2007. I would like to thank Giacomo Luchini, Director of the association La Diana, for his time. Today, the bottini continue to supply water, but only for irrigating local gardens. The water supply system of the city was replaced in 1914 with a pressurized aqueduct that runs fifty-six kilometers, carrying water from Monte Amiata to Siena.

83 Roman aqueducts were built of stone, brick and a volcanic rock known as pozzuolana. Their visible remains consist of only about thirty miles of approximately two hundred and sixty miles of underground aqueducts which flowed into enormous cisterns located at their terminus. From here water was then directed, again via gravity, into lead pipes for fountains, public baths and villas. See A. Trevor Hodge, Roman Aqueducts and Water Supply (London: Duckworth, 2002), particularly pages 93-125.
the communes with water. From the surviving examples it appears that the preferred fountain design was the freestanding, centrally planned fountain with either a circular or polygonal receiving basin. The “engaged” (or wall) fountain placed against a wall at the end of a square or courtyard was a less popular alternative.\textsuperscript{84} Generally, sculpture carved in low relief decorated the sides of the polygonal receiving basin and imagery was confined to the coats-of-arms of the town or its dignitaries. Around the central shaft conventionalized masks or gargoyles frequently spouted water into the receiving basin. Figural sculpture, if used, was kept subordinate to the architectonic lines of the basins and shaft. Its subject matter was chiefly religious or civic.

In the thirteenth century, with anti-papal forces threatening Rome, Viterbo became a favorite residence for the papacy.\textsuperscript{85} The construction of the immense papal palace funded by the commune was intended to demonstrate that the Viterbese could rival or (as they hoped) even replace Rome as papal seat.\textsuperscript{86} In the mid-thirteenth century the city served as home to Alexander IV and his successor Urban IV, who was elected in Viterbo.\textsuperscript{87} The many fountains built in Viterbo over the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries testify to the wealth generated by this papal city. The success of their designs is attested in their progeny elsewhere in Italy.\textsuperscript{88}

\textsuperscript{84} Wiles, 1975, 5.
\textsuperscript{85} It was the pope who could crown the Holy Roman Emperor and at this time conflict arose between the Angevin and Hohenstaufen claimants to the title. Seven popes resided in Viterbo. Alexander IV (1254-1261), Clement IV (1265-1268), Adrian V (1276), John XXI (1276-1277), Nicholas III (1277-1280) and for a time Urban IV (1261-1264) and Martin IV (1281-1285).
\textsuperscript{87} Radke, 1996, see in particular chapter one.
\textsuperscript{88} Cecilia Agostinetti. \textit{Fontane a Viterbo: presenze vive nella città} (Roma: Palombi, 1985), 17.
Viterbo’s medieval fountains demonstrate the prevalence of specific design characteristics that reflect the papal presence in the city. As we shall see, the preferred form was a freestanding, centrally planned fountain with a roughly circular water basin.\textsuperscript{89} This was a particularly influential model in other Italian cities as well; a notable example is the Fontana Maggiore in Perugia, to be discussed further on.\textsuperscript{90} Viterbo’s desire to compete with Rome led to the assimilation of Roman decorative motifs into the ornamental vocabulary of their fountains. The pinecone, which is the shape of the central fountain in the courtyard of Old St. Peter’s, for instance, is the form surmounting the spindle-shaped shafts of virtually all of the medieval fountains in Viterbo.

The pine cone, a symbol of fertility, was particularly well suited to the decoration of fountains. The Etruscans used the motif on tomb markers and the Romans adopted it on various monuments, including fountains.\textsuperscript{91} The best known example, a bronze pinecone four meters tall, dates from the second century A.D. and presides over the uppermost court of Bramante’s Cortile del Belvedere, in the niche built by Pirro Ligorio known as the Cortile della Pigna. In antiquity the fountain stood near the Pantheon, at the terminus of the Roman aqueduct \textit{Vergine}. Later, under the papacy of Adrian I (772-795), the bronze pinecone fountain was moved to the atrium of Old St. Peter’s where it was used for ablutions. Finally, in the sixteenth century it was moved to the courtyard of the

\textsuperscript{89} See Appendix I for more information.
\textsuperscript{90} Also strictly linked to this fountain typology is the now lost fountain of Cortona, which dates to the last quarter of the thirteenth century. The fountain had a circular basin decorated with reliefs of the twelve months similar in decoration to the Fontana Maggiore in Perugia. See Francesco Santi, “Di una scomparsa fontana duecentesca a Cortona e dei suoi rapporti con la Fontana Maggiore di Perugia” in \textit{Atti del VI Convegno di Studi Umbri} (Gubbio: Centro di Studi Umbri, 1971), 73-82.
\textsuperscript{91} Agostinetti, 1985, 27.
Vatican Palace. The fountain was viewed as a symbol of Paradise, and water flowed from various holes located around the point of the pinecone. [Fig. 5] The Carolingians imitated the Roman pinecone in a smaller form on a fountain placed in the atrium of the Palatine Chapel in Aachen, Germany. Fonts adorned with pinecones are also documented in late antique and early medieval reliefs, miniatures, and mosaics. In the Christian world the pinecone was often used in the iconography of the mystic fountain, the *fons vitae*, in which water’s purifying quality symbolized the role of Christ in redemption.

Thought to be the oldest fountain in Viterbo, the Fontana Grande or del Sepale dates to the early thirteenth century. The fountain’s water supply derives from an ancient Roman aqueduct built in the ninth century by Mummio Nigro Valerio Vigeto to conduct water to his residence, the Villa Calvisiana. The fountain embodies a myriad of religious references to purification, baptism, and salvation. Located in the Piazza Fontana Grande directly in front of the Chiesa dei Santi Giuseppe e Teresa, the fountain was commissioned by the commune. The inscription on the lower cup records that Bertoldo

---

94 See Josef Strygowski, “Der Pinienzapfen als Wasserpeier” in *Mitteilungen des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Institut* (Roemische Abteilung, 18, 1903), 185-206.
95 A fountain is noted on the site as of 1192 according to a document dei Censi della Chiesa Romana, compiled by Camerario Cencio which cites “fontem Sepalis” while other chroniclers cite the date of 1206 for the construction of the fountain. Agostinetti, 1985, 56.
96 The aqueduct is still in use today and continues to supply the fountain with water. Alessandra Perugi, “Fontana Grande” in Maria Giuseppina Gimma ed., *Il Centro Storico di Viterbo* (Viterbo: Betagamma, 2001), 123.
and Pietro di Giovanni began work on the fountain in 1212, and that in 1279, it was finished under the rule of the Podestà Orso Orsini.  

The Fontana Grande, an imposing Gothic structure terminating in a large pinnacle, is laid out in a Greek cross plan. [Fig. 6] A tall central column rises from the center of the basin and is articulated with stylized acanthus leaves which seem to blossom into the lower of two superimposed quatrefoil cups of decreasing size. The fountain is raised on a high base surrounded by steps that mimic the cruciform shape of the water basin. It is clear that since the commune commissioned the fountain, the religious implications of the monument were intended to please particularly the curial residents of the city. The idea, it would seem, was to place a sort of “fons vitae” in one of the main squares of Viterbo. In 1422, the sculptor Benedetto da Perugia restored part of the basin and added the four lion-mouthed spouts to the base of the central column. This is the only specific reference to the commune, as the lion was a symbol of the city. It was frequently found on the fountains of Viterbo. The decoration of the cup indicates a precise desire to emulate Roman antiquity through the use of classical ornamental motifs. In Viterbo the most common type of medieval fountain is spindle-shaped, a form which seems to be inspired by the *metae*, the principal Roman fonts. The Meta Sudans, for example, was a conical fountain located near the Colosseum that was thought to mark

---

98 Perugi, 2001, 122.
the exact center of Augustan Rome. A variety of tapered monuments came to be called metae, including tapered sepulchers such as the Meta Romuli, the pyramidal tomb near the Castel Sant’Angelo, and the Meta Remi, the pyramid of Gaius Cestius, where Romulus and Remus were said to be buried. The thirteenth-century fountains of S. Tommaso, San Faustino, and Pianoscarano are characteristic of the type of fountain prevalent in Viterbo. These fountains, whether commissioned by private or public patrons, demonstrate a continuity of form and homogeneity in design. The basic design of a centrally planned fountain is common to all. They each have either a circular or polygonal basin often elevated on a base or several steps. From the center of the basin a vertical shaft rises in the shape of a spindle and water cascades from spouts organized around the shaft.

Wall fountains are a much rarer type of medieval fountain. The Fontana delle Novantanove Cannelle (the ninety-nine spouts), located in L’Aquila in the central Italian region of Abruzzo, is one of only two extant examples. The fountain, built in 1272 by Tancredo di Valva, and later modified, appears u-shaped with two water basins. The three walls of the polychrome fountain extend around three sides of a square built into a hillside. [Fig. 7] Water spouts from the mouths of gargoyles aligned along the base of the wall into the first narrow basin and then spills into the larger basin below. The walls are

101 The Meta Sudans, or “sweating cone”, is so named because of water issuing from small orifices on its surface. The term meta derives from the name for the conical turning-post in a circus race track; a meta marked the half way point of one complete circuit. Margaret Finch, “The Cantharus and Pigna at Old St. Peter’s” in Gesta (vol. XXX, 1991), 21.
103 See Appendix I for further information.
104 The epigraph reads: “Magister Tancredus de Pentoma de Valva fecit hoc opus” and is dated “Anno Domini MCCLXXII”. Ferdinando Bologna, La Fontana della Rivera all’Aquila detta delle “Novantanove Cannelle” (L’Aquila: Textus, 1997), 40.
faced with red and white marble, a reference to the city’s heraldic colors. The ninety-nine spouts purportedly celebrate the ancient origins of the city when Frederick II, Holy Roman Emperor and King of Sicily, united several existing villages (ninety-nine, according to local tradition) and formed the city. Originally, however, the fountain appears to have had far fewer spouts, only one basin and one wall. This proposition is based on the analysis of fifteen spouts which have been dated to 1272 and associated stylistically with Nicola Pisano’s œuvre. Supporting this thesis is the account provided by De Ritiis that in 1494 the fountain counted twenty spouts. The side walls, which were added later, were probably deemed necessary to protect the fountain’s waters from mud slides from the hillside, much like the protective vaulting employed for this same purpose on Siena’s medieval fountains.

The earlier Fonte ai Canali, dated 1248 and located in Piombino, is also a u-shaped wall fountain. The fountain is built of verrucano stone; along the lower section of the central wall are five figurative spouts. The spouts pour water into five circular openings that apparently serve to define the water’s flow into the basin. [Fig. 8] Located on the old port of Piombino, the fountain served primarily for the mariners whose ships docked there. The figurative spouts sculpted in white marble from Carrara depict animal heads: three canine, one equine, and a fifth unknown. It has been

suggested that Tancredo must have been familiar with this fountain whose unusual u-shaped design led to the design he elaborated (with a larger number of spouts) on the fountain in L’Aquila. The fountains of L’Aquila and Piombino represent the only surviving examples of the type of u-shaped plan that characterizes the Fonte Gaia in Siena. Their similarities, however, lie almost exclusively in their plan and method of water delivery (from spigots located at the base of the walls), as neither arrive at the level of sculptural ornamentation that distinguishes the Fonte Gaia.

Prior to the construction of the Fonte Gaia, only a handful of similarly large, sculpted fountains had been built in other Italian cities that, like Siena, had to engineer water to their cities. As in the case of Siena, the central Italian city of Perugia was geographically distant from a direct source of fresh water. Perugia, the capital city of Umbria since 1860, is located in a mountainous region east of the Apennines. In the last quarter of the thirteenth century the communal government selected the Venetian hydraulic engineer Buoninsegna to build an aqueduct to provide the city with an adequate supply of water. Ultimately Buoninsegna’s plan was carried out by the Benedictine monk Bevignante, as Buoninsegna was called to Orvieto for work on another fountain. The aqueduct carried water from Mount Pacino, north of Perugia, to the city center and was paid for through a special tax on the entire community. As was the case for Siena’s Fonte Gaia, the fountain in Perugia also celebrated a newly constructed aqueduct.

113 The city already had a water supply provided by the original conduit which was subsequently replaced by the construction of the new aqueduct. White, 1993, 88.
114 He was employed in Orvieto on another fountain. Cavallucci, 1993, 12-14.
A lengthy Latin inscription located on the rim of the basin in Perugia records the date 1278.\textsuperscript{116} The Fontana Maggiore, still in situ, is located between the cathedral and the Palazzo dei Priori, the communal palace.\textsuperscript{117} Nicola and Giovanni Pisano, the father and son team responsible for the fountain, organized the polygonal fountain around a form reminiscent of Nicola’s sculpted pulpits in Pisa and Siena.\textsuperscript{118} The lower basin is divided into fifty panels framed by columns, while the middle basin is divided into twenty-four panels framed by columnar figures. [Fig. 9] The circling steps lead up to the first twenty-five sided polygonal basin. Above it there is a second basin with twelve plain concave sides that culminate in a bronze amphora held by three bronze female statues from which water spouts and cascades down into the successively larger marble basins below. Each panel is carved in relief; on the lower basin are depicted the labors of the months, allegories of the arts, signs of the zodiac, and scenes from Biblical and Roman history, as well as the lion of the Guelphs, and the gryphon of Perugia. On the middle basin the columnar figures represent saints, kings, prophets, and heroic figures from Perugia’s history as well as personifications of Lake Trasimeno, the fishery, and of Chiusi, the granary of Perugia.\textsuperscript{119}

The relief panels and columnar statues form an encyclopedic program that refers to the religious and civic ideals appropriate to the fountain’s location in the ceremonial

\textsuperscript{116} Also inscribed on the fountain were the names of the engineers, the sculptors Nicola and Giovanni Pisano, and the civic dignitaries; the Podestà and Capitano del Popolo. Cavallucci, 1993, 30.
\textsuperscript{117} When the fountain was inaugurated it was located next to the Romanesque Duomo which had not yet been replaced. White, 1993, 88.
\textsuperscript{118} See Nicola Pisano’s pulpit from 1260 in the Baptistry in Pisa and his pulpit from 1265-8 in the Duomo of Siena. White, 1993, 88.
\textsuperscript{119} White, 1993, 90.
center of the city. The Fontana Maggiore’s decorative program served to celebrate the city of Perugia, her prosperity, and her grandeur. It is far more complex and ornate than the ornamentation found on the medieval fountains of Viterbo even though the basic design of the Fontana Maggiore is Viterbese. Visual comparison of the Fontana di San Faustino [Fig. 10] to the Fontana Maggiore, for example, clarifies the connection, and the link is corroborated by the fact that Perugian authorities had even sent for craftsmen from Viterbo.  

In 1281, shortly after Nicola and Giovanni Pisano had completed the Fontana Maggiore, Arnolfo di Cambio was commissioned to sculpt another fountain in Perugia. This smaller fountain was built south of the Fontana Maggiore, located in a lower piazza in the commercial area of the city. Three of the figures, known as the Assetati or Thirsty Ones, depict a kneeling woman, a crippled man, and a woman leaning back, stretching in thirst toward the fountain’s water. [Fig. 11] In the first quarter of the fifteenth century Arnolfo’s fountain was dismembered; the five surviving pieces of the fountain are now located in the museum of the Galleria Nazionale dell’Umbria. 

In a hypothetical reconstruction of the fountain, two rectangular basins of decreasing size are positioned against a back wall. Water pours from one spout, located

---

120 See Appendix I for further information. The renown of the Viterbese maestri is attested by Signorelli who refers that in the XIII century a request for collaboration to construct the Fontana Maggiore arrived from Perugia. The relationship between the two cities is further confirmed by the presence in Viterbo of a Perugian artist, who at the beginning of the fifteenth century was responsible for the restoration of the Fontana Grande. White, 1993, 89. See also Agostinetti, 1985, 20.

121 In 1277 the City of Perugia requested that the sculptor Arnolfo di Cambio be released from the service of Charles of Anjou in order to come to Perugia. It is thought that he was called to work on the Fontana Maggiore, but for some reason he did not participate on the project as his name is not included among those noted in the fountain’s inscription. Anita Fiderer Moskowitz, *Italian Gothic sculpture: c. 1250-c. 1400* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 45.

122 White, 1993, 100.
on the back wall, into the first basin and out over its walls into the second basin. The thirsty figures are positioned so that the water of the upper basin seems to cascade over them, and thus their expressive body language underlines the importance of water as a life source. [Fig. 12] The two other extant pieces of the fountain, identified as scribes, may have been located on the lower of the two superimposed basins.\footnote{Gustavo Cuccini has suggested that there were two superimposed basins and that the Assetati were on a different level than the scribes. The Assetati appear to be looking toward an intermediary element on a higher level, either a figure or possibly a water spout. Anita Moskowitz agrees with Cuccini’s suggestion which is based on the analysis of the direction of their glances. Cuccini, 1989, 114-116. Moskowitz, 2001, 48, n. 10.} The scribes (one of which is now headless) are shown writing or pointing to passages. [Fig. 13] Anita Moskowitz has suggested that the scribes may have been indicating records of expenditures for the fountain or city statutes concerning its appropriate use and maintenance.\footnote{Moskowitz, 2001, 48.} If this were the case, then all five extant pieces served to remind the urban community using the fountain of the stark ramifications that could have ensued had the commune not built the fountain. Indeed, the fountain’s message seems to encourage recognition of the necessity of such a basic life source, while at the same time celebrating the commune responsible for bringing the precious commodity to the heart of the city.\footnote{They may also allude to the satisfaction of spiritual thirst. Moskowitz, 2001, 45.} Ironically, it has been suggested that the fountain was removed due to the failure to bring enough water to the site.\footnote{Gustavo Cuccini, \textit{Arnolfo di Cambio e la fontana di Perugia “Pedis Platee”} (Perugia: Guerra Ed., 1989), 114.} Had the dry fountain remained in situ, it would have been especially embarrassing in light of its purported message to the citizenry.

Neither one of the roughly contemporaneous Perugian fountains provides a plausible model for Siena’s Fonte Gaia. The Fontana Maggiore offers a somewhat closer
parallel, although only in general terms: both are monumental sculpted fountains, located in main public squares, with iconographies reflecting the civic and religious ideals of their respective communes. The Fontana Maggiore did serve as an important model for fountains elsewhere in Italy.  

**Sienese Fountains**

In medieval Siena, the shortage of water was of perpetual concern to the General Council, as water was “one of the four elements, without which life is impossible.”

Aquifers under the city collected the rain that fell on Siena each year between October and May. The rain water seeped into the ground’s permeable layers where it was trapped by a layer of clay, and tunnels were made to extract water from the aquifers and fill Siena’s medieval fountains. Siena’s oldest fountains are all located on the periphery of the city, at a lower elevation from the ridge along which the city is built. They were built into the hillside and connected to the water-bearing aquifer via a short tunnel. The tunnel basically functioned as a horizontal well shaft that supplied water from a pre-existing spring bank or a place where water naturally emerges from the hillside. Siena’s early fountains are large structures that constitute industrial fountain complexes. These fountains -- the Branda, Vettrice, Follonica, Ovile, Peschaia, and Nuova -- all date from before 1250.

In general, the structure of each fountain is roughly rectangular; the surrounding

---

127 See, for example, the fountain of Fabriano, in the Marche. This fountain, dating from 1285 and redone in 1351, is derived (albeit in simpler terms) from Perugia’s Fontana Maggiore. Tognarini, 1978, 135.
128 Balestracci and Piccinni, 1977, 56.
130 Kucher, 2005, 63.
131 Fonte Follonica would be enclosed by the city walls in the following century, while both Fonte Ovile and Peschaia remain outside the city walls today.
building is constructed in red brick and crenellated. One façade is pierced by two or three
ogival arches which allow entry to the fountain’s basins. In their fortress-like appearance
crenellations recall the type of defensive architecture later employed for the seat of civic
government in Siena, the Palazzo Pubblico. This association is not incidental. Since the
provision of water was an essential prerequisite for a flourishing urban community, the
fountains constructed by the Commune were made an integral part of Siena’s defensive
system. Built at a lower elevation than the rest of the city (to access water from the spring
bank) they were dangerously outside of the city’s walls and thus had to be protected from
possible invaders in order to assure the city’s survival in the event of attack. The
fountains were thus structured like a fortified strong point, as can be admired in the
architecture of the Fonte di Pescaia.\textsuperscript{132} The Fonte di Pescaia’s waters were covered by a
vaulted structure surmounted by battlements. If necessary the Sienese could defend their
fountains from the battlements just as they could the Palazzo Pubblico. The fountains’
structure was also dictated by their function. The typology of the covered fountain
(vaulted chambers with arched openings) was both dependent upon the fountain’s
location (built into the spring bank and supplied directly by the aquifer) and by the
necessity to protect the precious waters (due to their location along the ridge of the city)
from cave-ins.

The division of the water into several basins (usually three) was common to
virtually all of Siena’s medieval fountains. Their design was based on the model provided
by the city’s oldest fountain, the Fonte Branda, which first appeared in the records in

\textsuperscript{132} Hook, 1979, 26-27.
The Fonte Branda is located in the valley below the Basilica of San Domenico, near the city gate and built directly into the hillside. [Fig. 14] Of all of Siena’s early fountains the Branda had the most abundant waters, and was even celebrated by Dante in his *Divine Comedy*. In the twelfth century the fountain was enlarged, and at the beginning of the thirteenth century, it was rebuilt as an imposing Gothic structure of brick and grey stone with interior groin vaults in the vaulted chambers. The fountain is open on two of its four sides to provide access to the three rectangular water basins. The southern, open face is framed by three ogival arches that delineate the separation of the basins below. The other medieval Sienese fountains – the Vettrice, Follonica, Ovile, Peschaia, and Nuova -- all follow the same basic design principles of the Fonte Branda.

They are all vaulted chambers with arched openings whose solid brick construction was partially dictated by the practical necessity of protecting the springs from cave-ins and contamination. Inside, these fountains’ basins were designed according to a hierarchical use of water that served both to maintain the purity of the waters and to facilitate the recycling and reuse of this precious resource. Generally, there were three basins. The first held the cleanest water and was used for drinking water; the second basin, set at a lower elevation, collected the water from the first basin and was used to provide water for

---

134 The aquifer to which Branda is connected has the largest recharge area (its bottino measures four kilometers) and thus has the most potential for bearing water. Kucher, 2005, 58.
136 The fountain measures twenty-four meters across the front (southern) face, is nine meters high, and nine meters deep. It was enlarged in 1198 and rebuilt in 1246. John White, *Art and Architecture in Italy: 1250-1400* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 230.
livestock. The third basin, positioned at a still lower elevation, collected the water from the second basin and was used for clothes washing.  

The first fountain to be built within the city walls was the Fonte Nuova, begun in 1298. The fountain, situated between via di Vallerozzi and vicolo di Borgofranco, lies at a much lower elevation than the main part of the city. The fountain’s location had been chosen by a special committee composed of several well-known artists, including the sculptor Giovanni Pisano and the painter Duccio di Buoninsegna. The Fonte Nuova was also originally separated into three basins (as opposed to the two present today). Notwithstanding the fountain’s location within the city walls, the main basin was further protected by a wooden fence in order to prevent livestock and other animals from drinking directly from the fountain. The fountain’s structure is based on the earlier prototype; it is covered by groin vaults, and ogival arches that frame the water basins positioned below. Here, however, sculptural interest is added to the arches. The voussoir is decorated with a simple geometric motif and the jamb of the arch is made up of a progression (from large to small) of decorative moldings that give sculptural interest to the otherwise plain exterior. [Fig. 15] This circumspect addition of decorative ornamentation is absent from the other early Sienese fountains and may be attributed to the participation of the artists Pisano and Buoninsegna in the fountain’s design. Nevertheless, the additional moldings are the fountain’s only decorative elements, in marked contrast to the elaborate sculptural program of the Fonte Gaia.

137 Tronti et al, 2005, 3.
138 The fountain was built between 1298 and 1303. Tronti et al, 2005, 5.
139 Ibid.
140 Ibid.
It is clear from my overview of early Italian and Sienese fountains that the Fonte Gaia reflects an entirely different formal solution to the design of a city fountain. This essential fact raises important issues. Why was the u-shaped plan chosen for the Fonte Gaia? To what imperatives did the plan owe its existence? How did it function? How successful was the design and to what degree did it inspire formal progeny? I will examine these matters in the following chapter.
Chapter Two
The early history of the Fonte Gaia

Introduction

The Fonte Gaia’s form and decorative program are unique and unprecedented in the history of early Italian fountains. This monumental sculpted fountain embodied an entirely different set of features not only with respect to Siena’s characteristic medieval fountains but also with respect to the majority of earlier extant Italian fountains. Its unusual form, a roughly rectangular basin open to the sky and walled on three sides (as opposed to the usual centrally planned circular fountain basin) was designed specifically for the sloping topography of the city’s central piazza. Its u-shaped configuration is unique, but why was it chosen? To what imperatives did the plan owe its existence and how did the new fountain function? This chapter attempts to answer these questions by interpreting the information provided in the contract for Quercia’s fountain and considering the fountain within the larger context of Sienese myth-making and art patronage in the early Quattrocento.

In the first section of this chapter I argue that Quercia’s fountain was dependent on the design of the first Fonte Gaia to an extent far greater than has previously been recognized. I contend that both the form and part of the iconography of Quercia’s later fountain were inspired by the earlier fountain. I also explain why the first fountain, completed in 1342, was replaced -less than a century after it was built - by Quercia’s fountain. Section Two summarizes the complex evolution of Quercia’s project for the Fonte Gaia. The decade-long project underwent several changes after the original, now
lost, contract was written on December 15, 1408.\textsuperscript{141} From surviving copies of that contract made in 1412 and 1413 and two surviving drawing fragments, we know that the plan was modified at least three times before the fountain was finally installed in the square in 1419. I will lay out the general circumstances of Jacopo della Quercia’s commission, a history largely derived from Hanson’s authoritative monograph on the fifteenth-century commission. The majority of scholars agree, as do I, with the identification of the relief sculptures, which do not present major iconographic problems. The same cannot be said for the two sculptural groups located on the fountain’s parapets, on which there is little scholarly consensus. [Fig. 16] These sculptures are thus the main focus of this section, in which I shall clarify their identification and explain how they relate to the rest of the sculptural program.

I begin by first synthesizing other scholars’ interpretations of the identification and meaning of Quercia’s fountain sculptures, with particular attention to the two sculptural groups. The large number of differing opinions and the rather poor state of preservation of Quercia’s fountain have made it difficult to interpret the fountain’s iconographic program definitively. Using newly discovered documentary and visual sources as evidence, I reinterpret the two sculptural groups. Finally, I shall discuss the influences that shaped the fountain’s iconography and the Fonte Gaia’s influence upon other art.

The first Fonte Gaia

The terms of the 1408 contract between the commune and Jacopo della Quercia stipulated “that he must build and have built a marble fountain in the Campo where there is a fountain at present, within twenty months beginning April 1409.” From this contract we learn that Quercia’s Fonte Gaia was to replace an earlier fountain located in the Campo known by the same name. This first Fonte Gaia was built in 1342 as the conclusion to the decade-long project to bring water to the city center.

In 1334 the Government of the Nine commissioned Jacopo di Vanni Ugolino, a master stone worker or engineer, to find a way to bring water up to the Campo, which would have been a considerable feat of engineering since, as previously mentioned, Siena’s water supply in the fourteenth century was largely derived from aquifers located below the elevation of the city center. Consequently most of the city’s medieval fountains were located outside of the city walls and below the water source. Ugolino’s initial solution was to convey water from the Fonte Branda, located under the Basilica of San Domenico, to the Campo in bottini three braccia high by one and a half braccia wide without taking water from the other fountains of the city. From extant documents we learn that Ugolino hoped, at least initially, to complete the project in three years. The Commune was evidently anxious to see the work completed quickly since it put forth a

142 Hanson, 1965, 19, Doc. 15. The original contract was dated December 15, 1408 [1409] and is now lost. The terms of this contract appear in a copy written by Cino di Guido Belforte in 1412. This document dated June 1, 1412 is located in the Archivio di Stato. Scholars generally agree that this document reflects the terms of the original 1408 contract. A further notice, in the records of the Consistory, records the contract with a ‘certain Master Jacopo’ to build a fountain in the Campo. See note 1.
144 Hanson, 1965, 6.
145 Ibid. The standard unit of length was the braccia which measured 0.584 meters.
146 Hanson, 1965, 105, Doc. 82.
large sum of money to finance the project. Government officials certainly did not expect the job to reach its ultimate conclusion some eighty-five years later. Nevertheless, that is precisely what happened when Ugolino’s three-year undertaking evolved into the extensive construction of the Bottino Maestro, the vast web of underground bottini that would eventually supply Quercia’s Fonte Gaia with running water. From the surviving documents it is clear that comfortable access to running water in the city center was of prime importance and no price was too high to maintain that commodity. In 1339 when Ugolino had failed to make any progress two men were appointed to help him, Lando di Pietro and Agostino di Giovanni. This new committee was also a failure, and so in 1341, the project was turned over to Naddo di Stricha, Meuccio di Neri Baldinotti, and Fredi di Neri de’ Ponzi. Their salaries and the project’s ever growing expenses were financed by the taxes from Grosseto. Despite these problems, a letter written in 1349 by Ugolino’s son Giovanni states that Ugolino—whom the letter refers to as ‘Jacopo dell’Aqua’ [or of water] —had brought water to the Campo and built the first Fonte Gaia. However, as we shall see, this water supply was not yet a secure source of continuously running water. In fact, in the letter Giovanni petitioned the Commune to be allowed to finish his father’s work. From this correspondence and other petitions it is clear that while the first Fonte Gaia had been built, the fountain’s water supply was precarious. Indeed it has even been suggested that Ugolino’s nickname (dell’Aqua) originated in ironic reference to his repeated failures to bring water to the fountain, although this is highly unlikely.147 In 1356, and again in 1366, Giovanni’s sons, Domenico and Jacopo, in turn petitioned the

government requesting a pension for the great honor their grandfather Jacopo dell’Aqua had brought to the city through his work on the Fonte Gaia and the other fountains of the city.\textsuperscript{148} For a decade their request was granted and they received a yearly stipend of twelve gold florins.\textsuperscript{149} The Commune’s generosity to Jacopo’s heirs demonstrates the high esteem for the man who had at long last constructed the first fountain in the city center, the piazza del Campo. This was an important achievement even if the fountain’s water supply had yet to be secured. Thus although he would not engineer water to the Campo within his lifetime or those of his heirs, Ugolino did manage to build the \textit{first} Fonte Gaia on the square.\textsuperscript{150}

Only toward the end of the century did the Commune’s investments of money and time begin to pay off, when the project seems to have made some headway, albeit short lived. Allegedly the old bottini were connected to the Staggia River, which flowed from Castellina in Chianti (a small town located about thirteen kilometers from Siena) through the towns of Castelnuovo Berardenga, Monteriggioni, Poggibonsi, and Radda in Chianti by means of 1,600 meters of pipes that ran across a deep valley to the springs at the river’s source. In 1800 Battini attempted to confirm this information by chemical analysis of the residue in the pipes to the fountain. He concluded that water from the Staggia did appear to have once flowed through them.\textsuperscript{151} However, if the River Staggia’s waters ever supplied the fountain, the system functioned only for a short period because the Sienese

\textsuperscript{148} Hanson, 1965, 107 and 108, Doc. 93 and Doc. 98.
\textsuperscript{149} Hanson, 1965, 107, Doc. 93. Milanesi, 1854-56, vol. III, 278, no. 6 provides a shortened transcription which omits the notice of a yearly stipend.
\textsuperscript{150} His death was probably in 1348. Hanson, 1965, 8.
recognized that placing pipes far into Florentine territory was both impractical and perilous.\footnote{Bargagli-Petrucci, 1906, vol. I, 219 and 223; and “Come i senesi antichi ricercando la Diana trovarano l’acqua per la loro città” in Conferenze tenuta nell’aula magna della R. Università di Siena per i corsi estivi per gli stranieri; il 6 settembre 1928, (Siena, 1929), 21.}

**Decoration of the first fountain**

A description of the *first* Fonte Gaia can be gleaned from the contract for Quercia’s later fountain. It suggests that the first fountain was of moderate size and built of marble, some of which was carved with vegetal reliefs;\footnote{“Sansesi avendo fatto molti grandi buttini sotterra per trovare acqua e condurla nel Canpo di Siena, I quali bottini furono cominciati già più tempo e sono sotterra fuore de la città circa a Quattro miglia, in più rami de’ quali ve n’è molti che non n’àn(n)ò trovato acqua, e molti ve ne sonno che gittano acqua abundante, e tutti sonno fuore de la città a la porta a Camullia per infino sul Canpo, e avendo già in questo tempo condotto l’acqua, che potea venire, ordinoro e cominci oro a murare del mese d’aprile una fontana sul Canpo di Siena, non molto grande.” ‘Cronaca Senese di Agnolo di Tura del Grasso’ in Cronache Senesi, ed. Alessandro Lisini and Fabio Iacometti (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1931), 537, line C147v} it was probably open to the sky, unlike the city’s medieval fountains; and it was surrounded on three sides by walls.\footnote{The 1412 contract reads: “Item, che tutto e’ lavoro vechio de la muraglia si leverà da la fonte vechia [...].” Muraglia is the old Italian word for muraglia, wall in English. See item 9 of the contract transcribed in Beck, 1991, vol. II, 349.} The contract gave Quercia permission to use the materials of the old fountain as he pleased, and it appears that he took full advantage of these terms.\footnote{“[…] sia e essere s’intenda del detto maestro Iacomo.” Bargagli-Petrucci, 1906, vol. II, 307. Also transcribed in Beck, 1991, vol. II, 349. For an English translation see Hanson, 1965, 92, Doc. 15.} When Quercia’s fountain was removed in the nineteenth century, a basket of acanthus leaves described as “being in the style of the fourteenth century” was found on the reverse of one of the marbles.\footnote{See Banchi et al., 1869, pt. i. The whereabouts of this relief are presently unknown. See also Hanson, 1965, 9.}

Besides the information provided in the contract with Quercia, Ghiberti tells us that at one point the *first* fountain was adorned with a life size female statue. Lorenzo Ghiberti in his *I Commentari* (1447) described the statue as a figure of Venus supported
by a dolphin.\textsuperscript{157} It had been found in 1325 during the excavations for the foundations of some houses in Siena but may not have been immediately placed on the fountain.\textsuperscript{158} It does not appear in Lorenzetti’s renowned views of Siena in the Sala dei Nove in the Palazzo Pubblico, dated 1338-1340, which precedes the completion of the fountain in 1342. On the other hand the statue may well have been installed on the first fountain sometime after 1340 and before 1346, when Agnolo di Tura praised the fountain at this time for its great beauty.\textsuperscript{159} Ghiberti stated that the statue was signed by Lysippus and had been placed on the fountain where it was much admired, impressing the artists of the city. He reported that Ambrogio Lorenzetti made a drawing of it just prior to his death in 1348, which would provide us with a terminus ante quem for its installation.\textsuperscript{160} He also recounted that the statue was eventually removed because it was believed to cause misfortune, or \textit{malocchio}, and was buried in Florentine territory so as to transfer Siena’s bad luck to her age-old foe.\textsuperscript{161} However, only part of Ghiberti’s story may be corroborated by documentary evidence. This concerns a record in the \textit{Concistoro Deliberazioni} for the year 1357, which confirms the date the statue was removed.\textsuperscript{162}


\textsuperscript{158} Known as the castellare dei Malavolti. Aldo Cairolo and Enzo Carli, \textit{Il palazzo pubblico di Siena} (Roma: Editalia, 1963), 46.

\textsuperscript{159} “El Canpo di Siena si finì di siliciare a mattoni a di 30 di dicembre [1346] ed è tenuto lo più bel Canpo, co’ la bella e abundante Fontana, co’li belli e nobili casamenti d’intorno e buttighe, che altra piazza d’Italia.” Cited in \textit{Cronache Senese} [1300-1351], 550.

\textsuperscript{160} Veronica Wiegartz, \textit{Antike bildwerke im urteil mittelalterlicher zeitgenossen} (Weimar: VDG, 2004), 197. Lisini thinks the statue was found about 1345. \textit{Cronache Senesi}, 175-6.

\textsuperscript{161} It was alleged that by placing a pagan statue on the fountain the Sienese were led to idolatrous behavior.

\textsuperscript{162} “Pro statua fontis Campi. Item quod statua marmoreal ad presens in Fonte Campi posita, quam citius potest tollatur et inde eam inhonestam videatur: et fiat ex inde et de ea quod Dominis Duodecim videbitur et placebit”. Cited from Hanson, 1965, Doc. 92. The date is recorded as November 7, 1357. Concistoro A.S.S. 1357. Also cited in Cairolo and Carli, 1963, 49.
Ghiberti’s identification of the statue as a representation of Venus has recently been contested in the scholarly literature. Norberto Gramaccini identified the lost Sienese statue with one in the collection of the Palazzo Borghese in Rome on the basis of visual analysis. Further, he hypothesized that the Sienese would have believed the statue represented not Venus but Diana, who at one time was the city’s mythological patron.\(^{163}\) I am also inclined to think that the statue was understood as Diana even if it had resembled an antique statue of Venus because of the importance of Diana for the city. The appropriation of one esteemed sculpture to represent another can be documented in the case of the statue, known as the Madonna Verona, which adorned another Italian fountain from the fourteenth century.

Around the middle of the century Cansignorio della Scala (+1375), lord of Verona, began improvements to the communal center of the city, Piazza delle Erbe, which had been paved since 1243 and shortly thereafter outfitted with a fountain fed from the Adige River. Cansignorio added a clothed female statue to the center of the fountain. Wiegartz identified the statue as a Claudian adaptation from the fourth century B.C.E., similar to the Demeter type that was frequently used for portraits in the house of the Emperor.\(^{164}\) The marble statue appears crowned with a scroll that diagonally crosses her chest inscribed “Madonna Verona.” [Fig. 17] The head and arms of the statue are


restorations attributed to the eminent sculptor Bonino da Campione (1357-1397). The crown and scroll were also added when the statue was transformed into the “Madonna Verona” in the fourteenth century.

Madonna Verona is first mentioned by sources in 1372. At this time a certain Magister Marzagaia described the brilliance of the marble and fittingly branded her Simulacrum Veronae. The statue was probably one of the many remains that had been discovered during the excavations intended to reveal Verona’s antique foundations. Cansignorio had it restored and adapted, and finally placed in a conspicuous location demonstrating that the statue could serve new needs. Siena’s antique statue may have been similarly re-appropriated, which would therefore become another example of the reuse of the ancient heritage in a Renaissance fountain.

Diana, Siena’s mythological patron, would have been a fitting ornament for the fountain located in the city center. Yet, if the statue was perceived as Diana and not the scandalous Venus, why was it later removed? In the nineteenth century, Ettore Romagnoli, who also identified the statue as Diana, recounted that the people of Siena, persuaded by a preacher, removed the statue because the figure was scantily clad. Both this explanation and Ghiberti’s earlier account that the Venus statue was removed

---

165 Bonino da Campione is particularly renowned for his Monument to Bernabò Visconti in the Castello Sforzesco in Milan and the tomb of Cansignorio della Scala at S Maria Antica in Verona. See Rossana Bossaglia and Gian Alberto Dell’Aqua eds. I maestri Campionesi (Bergamo:Bolis, 1992).
166 The crown and scroll both appear in a wood cut dated 1477. These elements were renovated in 1869. Wiegartz, 2004, 202.
because it caused misfortune are unsubstantiated elsewhere. The archival source is clear: in the Deliberazione of 1357 the city councilors described the statue as “inhonestum” (dishonorable or shameful). The question, then, is why the statue that adorned the fountain for more than a decade was now considered dishonestum. I believe that the contemporary political climate sheds light on the story and suggests that the removal of the statue was tied to a political exploitation of the fountain sculpture.

In 1355, two years before the statue was removed, the government of the Nine was defeated and replaced with the government of Twelve. The overthrow of the government chronologically followed the severe epidemic of plague that had decimated the population. The period following the Black Death was particularly serious for the regime; the magistrates faced charges of dishonesty, corruption and favoritism that ultimately led to their downfall. It is plausible that the removal of the statue was an extension of the post-plague mentality that had instigated the revolution. In the wake of such an epidemic the statue’s removal may have been intended to symbolize the government’s transformation. This transformation of the Fonte Gaia was completed when the statue was later replaced by a painted image of the Virgin, a religious, rather than mythological, symbol more consonant with the aspirations of the new government.

A representation of the Virgin was not a casual choice for the new decoration of the first Fonte Gaia. As mentioned, the city of Siena had been dedicated to the Virgin
from the Battle of Montaperti in 1260. According to Sienese tradition, it was under the Virgin’s protection that the city staved off Florentine attack. Beginning in 1279, Sienese coinage carried the motto “Sena Vetus Civitas Virginis”, demonstrating the tie between the city and the Mother of Christ. She had already been featured in other major artistic commissions as well. In 1315, Simone Martini showed her as supreme ruler and protectress of the city in the Great Council Hall of the Palazzo Pubblico. In his Maestà the Virgin is both the mother of Christ and the protector of Siena.

On an ancient seal from the twelfth century the city of Siena is shown surrounded by the legend “Salvet Virgo Senam veterem quam signat amenam” together with the Virgin and child, and with an angel on either side. The same disposition of figures would later be repeated in the center of the back wall of Quercia’s fountain. Further, we are told that candles were burnt in her honor both before her painted image on the first Fonte Gaia and her sculpted image on Quercia’s Fonte Gaia.

---

174 September 4, 1260. “E la mattina che dovevano andare a pigliare la bataglia fecero celebrare una messa solenne e feceno grande offerte alla Vergine Maria. […] E l’vescovo, chor una solene processione, dettero le chiavi in mano a la Vergine Maria, e ine se ne trasse le charte e fu titolata la città della Vergine Maria. E per questo modo e orazione fatta alla Madre di Misericordia, ci difese da tanto pericolo.” Cited from Cronache Senesi in Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, Tomo XV, Parte VI, 58.


176 Rubinstein, 1958, 179.

177 The Virgin is seated on an altar. She holds a rose in her right hand and under foot is a serpent, symbolic of the enemies of the Republic. The seal is recorded in the archives of the Spedale della Scala. Girolamo Gigli, Città diletta di Maria (Rome: Francesco Gonzaga, 1716), 39 and fig. 1 on page 73. See also William Heywood, Palio and Ponte, An Account of the Sports of Central Italy from the Age of Dante to the XXth century (Siena: Enrico Torrini, 1904), 38.

178 “Un ornamento nondimeno, e forse l’unico, era una immagine della Madonna dinanzi alla quale ogni buon operaio accendeva delle candele di cera prima e durante i suoi lavori sotteranei, per metter se, la sua ventura e quella del Comune sotto la protezione del cielo.” Bargagli-Petrucci, 1906, vol. II, 284. Hanson, 1965, 109, Doc. 103. December 31, 1394. Reg. 1393-1406, f. 49. Ragione of the operaio of the fountains which includes the following item, “anche troviamo che a spesi per candeli de sevo comprati per cagione de’ buttini e per aguti e per li cavalletti de le dette fonti e per ceri arsi a la Madonna de la fonte del Canpo, per tutto, le quali cose a comprate Checho di Cenni piziciuolo.” The same ritual of burning candles also took place before Quercia’s sculpted virgin indicating the continuation of the cult over the period. See Hanson, 1965, 112, Doc. 123. 1434, 19 May. Reg 1428-35, f. 245. Ragione of the operaio of the city water
As Diana Norman recently demonstrated, art played a crucial role in presenting the Sienese ideology of the Virgin as protector and defender of Siena. During the course of the first half of the fourteenth century the decoration of three emblematic locations within Siena (the cathedral, the Palazzo Pubblico, and the Spedale di Santa Maria della Scala) were embellished with programs dedicated to the Virgin. Subsequent acts of rededication were repeated countless times over the course of Sienese history. One of the most recent, in June of 1944, is recorded on a piece of parchment displayed before the entrance to the Cappella del Voto in the Cathedral, noting when the city petitioned the Virgin for protection from the threat of bombardment during the Second World War.  

Thus the decision to place an image of the Virgin on the fountain was logical, considering the celebration of her cult in Siena, and considering the lascivious nature of the previous image there.

This change redefined the meaning of the Piazza del Campo. The Piazza was the civic center of the city where secular authority went unchallenged since the Palazzo Pubblico held pride of place there. Religious authority was concentrated to the northwest of the Piazza del Campo at the Cathedral. The decision to place a painted image of the Virgin on the first fountain, followed later by a sculpted image of the Virgin on Quercia’s Fonte Gaia, was a conscious attempt on the part of the civic authority to unite secular and sacred forces in the city and to show that Siena was ruled peacefully thanks to the intervention of both of these powers. These were the same ideals that had been projected

supply which includes among other items payment “per cera arsa a la Madonna de la fonte del Campo.” Bargagli-Petrucci, 1906, vol. II, 358.

in the fresco decoration within the Palazzo Pubblico; specifically Simone Martini’s *Maestà* (1315) in the Great Council Hall (*Sala del Consiglio*) which, as Rubinstein explains, was much more than a depiction of the Madonna and Child. She addresses the spectators who are the councilors assembled in the hall as the mother of Christ and as the protector of Siena. The mural’s text explicates two concepts: that of justice and the subordination of private interest to that of the community,\(^\text{180}\) the same concepts that would later underlie the complex philosophical allegory painted by Ambrogio Lorenzetti in the adjoining council chamber of the Government (*Buon Governo and Mal Governo, Sala dei Nove, 1338-1340*).\(^\text{181}\) And directly adjacent to the room painted with Martini’s *Maestà* is Taddeo di Bartolo’s painted chapel (*Cappella dei Signori*, 1407) depicting scenes from the Last Days of the Virgin together with prophets, saints, angels, and the civic emblems of Siena.\(^\text{182}\) Thus the new decoration of the Fonte Gaia followed the ideals of such earlier programs.

We know from the contract for the work that the figure of the Virgin on the first Fonte Gaia was painted, and judging from the cost of its execution (thirty *soldi*) the painting was not very large.\(^\text{183}\) The Virgin was probably painted in fresco on the rear fountain wall and, although fresco does not seem like a practical choice for fountain decoration, it was not unprecedented. For example, the Fonte dell’Abbondanza (1265) in

\(^{180}\) The Christ child holds a scroll that reads “*Diligite iustitiam qui iudicat terram*” and below the Virgin “*Li angelichi fioreceti, rose e gigli, Onde s’adorna lo celeste prato, Non mi diletan più ch’e buon consigli, Ma talor veggio chi per proprio stato Dispreza ma e la mia terra ingannò...*” Cited from Rubinstein, 1958, 179, n. 5 and n. 6.  
\(^{181}\) Rubinstein, 1958, 179-207.  
\(^{182}\) Norman, 1999, 195- 196.  
the medieval city republic of Massa Marittima, which Siena had conquered in 1335, was decorated in fresco. While future scholarship may reveal that painted fountains are more common than they appear, the fountain in Massa is, to my knowledge, the only surviving example in Tuscany which predates our fountain. It is logical to assume that fresco decoration may occasionally have been preferred over sculpture for the decoration of fountains because it was more economical.

The public fountain in Massa was completed in 1265, and, as I shall explain, may have served as prototype for the choice of fresco at Siena’s first fountain. The fountain at Massa is composed of three water basins framed by three ogival arches that are open toward the main piazza. The structural organization reminds us of numerous similar medieval examples in Siena. The fresco that adorns Massa’s fountain was only recently discovered (in 2000) during restoration work on the façade of the communal fountain. The painting was concealed under layers of old plaster; a condition that had effectively preserved the mural. The fresco dates to the end of the thirteenth century and was positioned on the back wall (framed by the left side-arch) of the fountain, visible to the entire community. The painting depicts a tree covered with phalluses, with a number of eagles flying around it, and women positioned under the tree. [Fig. 18] Although further

---

184 Massa Marittima was an independent city state from 1225 to 1335, their affluence derived from the mineral rich hills around the city, known as Le colline metelifere. The city mined thirty different types of ore ranging from gold to lead. From their technological expertise, developed through the construction of galleries and shafts in mining, the citizens of Massa had managed to channel water to the heart of the city at a time when most other towns still had their water source in low lying areas well outside the city walls.

185 The fountain was built in 1265 under the Pisan Podesta Ildebrandino. Today the fountain is the ground floor of a one storey building; the first storey (directly above the fountain) is thought to have been added in the fourteenth century. The building was used for wheat storage and for this reason it was named “dell’Abbondanza”. Vittoria Gugelmi and Alfredo Scanzani, La Maremma e le sue colline metalifere: storia, leggende, attualità di Follonica, Gavoranno, Massa Marittima, Monterotondo Marittimo, Montieri, Scarlino (Firenze: Ed. Medicea, 1992), 56.
study is necessary, an initial interpretation of the unusual iconography of the Massa mural has associated fertility images with the life-giving properties of water.\textsuperscript{186} In any case, the Sienese must have been impressed to find that the hill town had a direct supply of water to the center of town—an achievement that Siena had yet to accomplish. And it is probably not accidental that shortly after the conquest of Massa the Sienese managed to build the first Fonte Gaia and, as on the fountain at Massa, later decorate it in fresco.

**Source of water for the First Fountain**

The first Fonte Gaia can not be considered a true fountain because it did not supply continuously running water;\textsuperscript{187} rather it was a terminus of the archaic water supply system. Prior to the construction of the Bottino Maestro, cisterns provided the Campo’s water supply. The cistern of St Paul (San Paolo) located in the Campo supplied some of the water for the first Fonte Gaia. This supply was augmented by rain water collected in the fountain’s own basin. The cistern stored the rainwater collected from the roof of the eponymous church. Saint Paul’s church, first mentioned in reference to the privileges conceded to it by Henry IV in 1081,\textsuperscript{188} once stood on the present location of the Loggia

\textsuperscript{186} This hypothesis was put forth by Alessandro Bagnoli who is responsible for the restoration of the mural. George Ferzoco instead suggests that the mural was a Guelph commission intent on showing allegorically the political and moral effects of Ghibelline rule. George Ferzoco, *The Massa Marittima Mural* (Florence: Regional Council of Tuscany and Centre for Tuscan Studies at the University of Leicester, 2004), 32-35.


\textsuperscript{188} On the 3 June 1081 it is recorded that Henry IV confirmed the same concessions made to “S Paolo in Burgo de Sena” to the monastery of Sant’Eugenio. ASS, Pergamene dell’Opera Metropolitana and A. Lisini, *Inventario delle pergamene conservate nel R. Archivio di Stato di Siena, dal 736 al 1250* (Siena, 1908). See also Alfredo Liberati, “Chiese, Monasteri, Oratori e Spedali Senesi ricordi e notizie” in *Bullettino Senese di Storia Patria* (1940), 244. The no longer extant Church of S. Paolo is not to be confused with the church and monastery founded in the XIV century and located in Via San Marco. See Piero Pallassini, *Il monastero e la chiesa delle monache di S. Paolo in Siena* (Siena: Graf. Pistolesi, 1982).
According to the Constitution of 1262, all Sienese churches were responsible for the repair and maintenance of their cisterns and were obligated to make their cisterns’ water available for public use. It was under the auspices of this ordinance that Saint Paul’s cistern provided an early public water supply on the Campo.

St Paul’s cistern was covered, as was usual, to protect the collected waters, and had steps to facilitate public access. As at the cistern, the first fountain also had stairs which led to the water basin to make available its waters. Special restrictions were placed on the cisterns in the Campo, and Saint Paul’s was required to reduce the height of its cistern to conform to the ruling that the top of the vault must be a braccio and a half below the level of the Campo. We also know that the site of the cistern was just a short distance (about four meters) from the future location of the Fonte Gaia. This was particularly fortuitous as its location probably helped to supplement the first fountain’s water supply.

**History of the First Fountain**

Although little is known of the earlier fountain’s exact form, the available evidence suggests that the design plans for Quercia’s later fountain drew more heavily upon the design of the first Fonte Gaia than has previously been noted. In this section I shall depend on the available evidence regarding the form of the first fountain in order to

---

189 The church stood on this site up to the middle of the fourteenth century. Today this site is the corner of Via di Città, Via Banchi di Sotto, and the Via Banchi di Sopra. Milanesi, 1854-6, vol. II, 93.
191 Hanson, 1965, Doc. 104.
193 Hanson, 1965, 6.
suggest that this fountain served as the prototype for the distinctive plan of Quercia’s later fountain.

Ottavio Morisani suggested that the layout of the first Fonte Gaia resembled an ecclesiastical choir, but this assertion is unconvincing. He provided no further analysis, leaving us to infer that the comparison was based on a similarity in form. For Morisani, the question was apparently resolved. He was not a great fan of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia and does not appear to have given the issue further thought. His unflattering opinion that the monument was a failed attempt that illustrated nothing more than architectural zeal, rather than true accomplishment, remains isolated in the literature on the fountain.

Contrary to Morisani’s claims, the shape of the Fonte Gaia was specifically designed for its location. The steep incline of the piazza was a formidable challenge for the design and placement of a fountain. We know that the open u-shaped plan was a variation on the form that had previously been used in both L’Aquila and Piombino. In both cases a wall fountain was constructed in the terrain, and the lateral walls served to counteract the thrusts provoked by the hill above. A circular, centrally planned fountain, like Perugia’s Fontana Maggiore, would have been impossible to build in the inclined piazza without creating a raised level platform for the fountain to stand on. The ingenious solution of an open trapezoid adapted the fountain perfectly to the terrain, ensuring the

---

194 Ferretti also refers to this liturgical form but with reference to the position of the fountain in the square in front of the Palazzo Pubblico and not the fountain’s form. He writes, “la Fonte Gaia guardava verso quell fulcro liturgico come un coro ligneo verso l’altare (prima della Controriforma i cori stavano ante aram). Non si vuole rispolverare l’idea di una parentela con i cori monastici; non si sta andando in cerca di qualcosa che somiglia una filiazione tipologica.” Massimo Ferretti, “Gli ambigui destini della Fonte Gaia” in La Fonte Gaia di Jacopo della Quercia, 2011, 145.

195 The original citation reads, “La fonte Gaja, per l’importanza della commissione e per il fatto d’esser destinato a colmare una secolare aspirazione dei senesi, vorrebbe essere opera di grande impegno architettonico: e non lo è.” Morisani, 1962, 20.
fountain was integrated harmoniously with the unusually shaped piazza. Further, considering the rarity of the form and the evidence which describes the first fountain’s walls, it is conceivable that the u-shaped plan of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia was adopted from the design of the first fountain. This supplied the basis for the trapezoidal shape which, as we shall soon see, was a specific modification that was made to Quercia’s fountain only later (after the second plan for his fountain was drawn up).

This first Fonte Gaia also gave its name to Quercia’s later replacement. Although scholars have hypothesized various origins for the name Fonte Gaia, such as Gigli’s eighteenth-century explanation that the fountain’s name derived from the gaiety felt by the citizens upon seeing the first arrival of water in the Campo or Beck’s later hypothesis that the name was given to the fountain because of the spirited movement of the water, we know that the first Fonte Gaia never provided copious amounts of fresh water. Furthermore, Gigli’s description of the fountain’s inauguration (and his explanation of the origin of its name) is not substantiated by the official records, as there is no description of such a celebration. Instead this information derives largely from later chronicles.

Agnolo di Tura del Grasso, writing at the end of the fifteenth century and copying an earlier Sienese chronicle, recorded that water first arrived in the month of June 1345 and that the magnificence of the celebration was impossible to describe.\textsuperscript{197} In the sixteenth century Sigismondo Tizio, undoubtedly familiar with Agnolo Tura’s chronicle, recounted that a copious amount of water flowed in the fountain in the month of June.\textsuperscript{198} In one of the books of the \textit{Biccherna} a marginal note in the expense account for 1342 indicated instead that “water arrived in the Campo on Sunday, 5 January MCCCXLIJ”.\textsuperscript{199} The January record, however, does not agree with either of the later chronicles. On the other hand, this reference does appear close to the time that the fountain was first mentioned in fifteenth-century sources.

In December 1343 the fountain’s custodian Figarino (responsible for the fountain’s maintenance) received payment for the care of the fountain for the previous six months.\textsuperscript{200} It could be that water arrived in June and then shortly thereafter was interrupted only to flow again with some continuity in January. It is unlikely that the

\textsuperscript{197} The chronicle was copied in 1490. Antonio di Martino da Siena, Cronaca dal 1170 al 1431, MS. Biblioteca Comunale, Siena, A. VII, 44. “L’ acqua de la fonte del Campo di Siena vene per la prima volta nel Campo a di….di giugno in domenica la mattina di Paschua Rosada de la Pentecoste; per la qual cosa i Sanesi per Siena si fe’ gran festa e fu tale che è incredibile a scrivere e narare la magnificenze che per ognuno era fatto. Si per li Nove e cosi per li grandi e popolari e artefici d’ ogni arte di per sé a gara più l’uno con l’altro di nuovi giuochi e belli e svariati infiniti con grande spendio di cera e confetti e solenni vini e mangiari e cene senza alcuna parola di scandolo, che sempre con canti e balli e gioia e festa omini, done e fanciulli e religiosi e contadini tanto, che sarebbe incredibile a scrivere.” 1343. Cronaca dal 1170 al 1431, BCS, MS. A VII 44, f. 148, 148 v. “Cronache senesi” in \textit{Rerum Italicarum Scriptores}, vol. XV, pt. VI, fasc. 282, 537.

\textsuperscript{198} Hanson, 1965, 106, Doc. 89. The expense account is dated June 1343. SigismondoTizio, \textit{Historiae senenses} [1528]. BCS MS. B III 8, 178b. A copy of the original from 1725-26 is in the Vatican library (Chis. G.I. 35).

\textsuperscript{199} The modern date would be January 5, 1343. “Sia memoria che venne l’acquua nel campo domenicha, cinque di gennaio anni MCCCXLIJ” Cited from Bargagli-Petrucci, 1906, vol. I, 26, n. 6.

\textsuperscript{200} Hanson, 1965, 107, Doc. 91. The document is dated December 31, 1343. Bicch. Usita, 213, f. 67 v. Twelve lire are paid to eight custodians of fountains for their salaries for six months at the rate of thirty soldi each for this period. Five lire, five soldi are paid to Figarino, the custodian of the Fonte Gaia, for keeping the fountain clean and clear during that time. Bargagli-Petrucci, 1906, vol. II, 209.
custodian would have been paid to keep a dry fountain clean. Furthermore, we know that throughout the fourteenth century, and even later, the lack of a sufficient supply of water plagued the area of the Campo. Tizio’s account should therefore not be taken literally as it is improbable that the first fountain ever provided abundant water. On the contrary, it is likely that the numerous failed attempts to bring enough water to the Campo inspired the government of the Nine to initiate the construction of what would become the Bottino Maestro.

The first fountain, walled and open to the sky, could not have been structured like the typical vaulted edifices that characterize Siena’s medieval fountains, as they did not provide a place for the display of full-scale sculpture.  

We also know that as in the case of Saint Paul’s cistern, it had stairs which led to the water basin to facilitate access to its waters. And further, the usefulness of the first Fonte Gaia to the public, despite the fountain’s shortcomings, demonstrated the need for a real fountain on the site. As soon as the underground aqueducts were sufficiently complete, another Jacopo, Jacopo della Quercia, was commissioned to sculpt a new marble fountain in its place.

Quercia’s Fonte Gaia and the chronology of its execution

Siena’s city council (Concistoro) commissioned Jacopo della Quercia to carve the Fonte Gaia on December 15, 1408. The new fountain was commissioned to inaugurate the arrival of running water in the Campo. The water delivery system was complete and

---

201 Hanson, 1965, 9.
the commune wanted a new fountain to contain it. A contract was drawn up that specified that Quercia be paid 1,600 florins and required a full-scale drawing of the fountain be made on a wall of the Palazzo Pubblico overlooking the intended location of the fountain on the Campo. Apparently some party was dissatisfied with the terms of the first contract, because a second contract was drawn up just over a month later on January 22, 1409. It modified the first with the requirement that another drawing be made on parchment, and that Quercia be paid 2,000 florins (or 400 florins more than allocated in the first contract) and that work be completed in twenty months, by December 1, 1411.\textsuperscript{204} The parchment drawing, presently in two parts, in two collections, has always been identified with this document, and there is no reason to doubt this assumption.

The original concept for the fountain’s design is unknown because the full text of the 1408 contract has been lost. The terms of that contract, however, do exist in a later confirmation from 1412 and 1416, but they do not specify the fountain’s intended subject matter or figural program.\textsuperscript{205} A general idea of the original design of the fountain is provided by the surviving drawing, preserved in two fragments, that was included in the notary’s file with the second contract.\textsuperscript{206} The fragments are preserved in London’s

\begin{footnotes}
\item[204] Milanesi, 1854-56, vol. II, 100. Bacci, 1936, 158, no.1. Hanson, digest 4, 89-90. Beck, 1991, vol. II, 347. The terms of the 1408 contract appear in a document from 1412 written by Cino di Guido Belforte. As correctly pointed out by Hanson the inconsistencies regarding payment make it clear that Cino copied from two documents. He took the terms from the first contract (sum to be paid between 1,500 and 1,600 gold florins), now lost, and the paragraph that preceded it (establishing the definite price of 2,000 gold florins) from the record of a second contract (January 22, 1409). Hanson, 1965, 11.


\end{footnotes}
Victoria and Albert Museum and New York’s Metropolitan Museum.\textsuperscript{207} These two fragments, together with a missing center strip that, judging from the sculpture of the completed fountain, probably showed the Madonna and Child, give us a sense of what Quercia and his patrons had in mind when they devised the second contract for the fountain.

The drawings show that the Sienese were concerned that the fountain help in portraying their city as virtuous and just. The left fragment of the drawing (Metropolitan Museum of Art) shows, from left to right: the Angel Gabriel, Temperance, Fortitude, Faith.\textsuperscript{208} The two statues on the parapet depict Acca Larentia and an ape. The right fragment of the drawing (Victoria and Albert Museum) shows, from left to right: Justice, Humility, Prudence, and the Annunciate Virgin.\textsuperscript{209} The two statues on the parapet depict Rhea Silvia and a dog. We know from the terms of the 1415 contract that the iconographic program was modified, bringing the total number of Virtues to eight (three theological Virtues, four cardinal Virtues, plus the Christian Virtue, Wisdom).\textsuperscript{210} The

\textsuperscript{207} The London drawing is pen and brown ink on vellum, 13.4 cm x 21.2 cm, Dyce collection, n. 181. The New York drawing is pen and brown ink on vellum, 19.9 x 21.4 cm, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1949, n. 49.141. The London drawing is more narrowly cut at the bottom and is larger at the sides than the drawing fragment in New York. The London drawing was also cropped, probably when the drawing was dissected, as can be seen on the lower left side of the drawing where only half of the she-wolf is visible and at the top where the crown of the standing female figure is located. It is also less finished than the drawing in New York as, for example, the feet of the Virtues are not drawn or the lower base of the fountain. Beck hypothesized that the greater detail given to the New York side of the drawing may be because Jacopo, like Leonardo and Michelangelo, was left-handed. Beck, 1991, 71.

\textsuperscript{208} The drawing shows four seated figures in niches. On the side wing Gabriel holds a lily and Temperance a jar. On the back wall Fortitude is shown with a column and Faith with the cross.

\textsuperscript{209} On the back wall is Justice with a sword and Humility with a burning candle (or Hope see Beck, 1991, 149) and on the side wing Prudence with three eyes and the Virgin Annunciate (only her bust is visible as the rest of the dawing is cropped).

revised scheme deviated from the earlier drawings in the addition of figural components, and it required the walls of the fountain to be lengthened.

According to Hanson, the fountain sculpture was begun on January 10, 1414 with the carving of the relief of the Virgin and Child. The basis for her assertion comes from her interpretation of the documentation which includes a document from 1415 that speaks of the beautiful work being done on the interior of the fountain. This reference, together with the relief’s more traditional carving style and its location on the back of the fountain, led to her conclusion. On the other hand Seymour and Beck believe that work was not begun before 1415 as they see Hanson’s start date as overly optimistic. According to Hanson, Jacopo della Quercia carved the remaining figures during four periods of intense activity: first Prudence, Justice, Fortitude and Charity; followed by the two angels located next to the relief of the Virgin and Child; and then Temperance, Hope, the right-hand parapet statue, the Creation of Adam, Faith, Wisdom, the left-hand parapet statue; and finally the relief of the Expulsion. We know that work dragged on for some time beyond the original twenty-months stipulated in the contract because Quercia was admonished several times for his delays, as in 1413 when Francesco di Valdambrino was ordered to make Quercia return to Siena to continue work on the fountain. And indeed the

---

211 Hanson, 1965, 78.
212 Seymour agrees with the rest of Hanson’s proposed chronology but specifies, “Considering the documentation, it would seem that a date of 1414-15 for this phase is over-optimistically early. Rather than ending in January 1415, I would see the first phase as beginning, still with the Madonna, at about that time or even several months later.” Seymour, 1973, 47. Beck, 1991, 84.
fountain was only finished some ten years after the initial contract; the final installation of the fountain was made on September 1, 1419.\textsuperscript{215}

Identifying the Fonte Gaia’s parapet sculptures

Unlike Bonannus’ door for the Pisa Duomo from 1180 or Nicola and Giovanni Pisano’s Fontana Maggiore in Perugia from 1278, both of which have inscriptions to clearly indicate what figures are represented, the Fonte Gaia bears no such explicit evidence to help us read its iconographic components. This situation, common at the time, has led to scholarly debates and disagreements over the subject matter of some of the reliefs and sculptures whose attributes are not readily identifiable. The sculptural groups originally located on the outer parapets of the fountain have been the subject of the most intense debate. Each of these two groups is comprised of a standing woman with two boys, one held in her arms while the other stands at her feet with arms outstretched as if wanting to be picked up. [Fig. 16] According to the prevailing interpretation of the fountain’s figural groups provided by Supino (1926), Krautheimer (1951-52), and Hanson (1965), the two women represent Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia, the birth and adoptive mothers respectively of Romulus and Remus.\textsuperscript{216} The same figures have also been identified as double images of Acca Larentia (Tizio, 1525-28), representations of public Charity (Piccolomini, 1638), a combination of either of the aforementioned

\textsuperscript{215} Hanson, 1965, 80-81.
\textsuperscript{216} Livy, \textit{Ab Urbe Condita} (The History of Rome), Book I, Ch 3 and 4. Trans. Valerie M. Warrior, 6-13. The story is also recounted by Plutarco in his \textit{Vita di Romolo}, 4.
identifications (Vasari, 1568), Amor Dei and Amor Proximi (Beck, 1991), Eve and Rhea Silvia (List, 1985), and Mother Earth (Bacci, 1936).\textsuperscript{217}

The legend of the founding of Siena was central to establishing the city’s civic identity, and this is why most scholars argue that the female figures must represent the two mothers of Romulus and Remus, legendary founders of Siena. The twins were born from the alleged rape of Rhea Silvia by Mars and were thrown into the Tiber River in a basket following the orders of Rhea’s father, King Numitor. Romulus and Remus were saved from certain death by the river’s receding waters, which left the basket on dry land where a thirsty she-wolf was able to nurture them until Faustulus, the master of the royal flock, took them home to his wife Larentia to be cared for.\textsuperscript{218} These figures were appropriate for the fountain’s adornment because of the obvious allusion to the Roman foundation history of Siena. It is also possible that Acca and Rhea were a particular reference to the function of the monument to deliver water to the city; a common iconographic theme is the life-saving properties of water. The Tiber’s waters saved the children from death, and thus the story of Acca and Rhea with Romulus and Remus was an allusion to the vital life force that the Fonte Gaia provided the populace. However, as I shall argue, although the identification of Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia with Romulus and Remus is probably correct for the depictions of the groups shown in the drawing fragments of the fountain that represent the artist’s original intent in 1409, such attributions are not correct for the monument as executed according to the modifications.


\textsuperscript{218} See note 62.
made to the program in 1415. Instead, I argue that the figures as executed were both meant to represent Gaia, the Greek goddess of the earth, following Bacci’s suggestion of Mother Earth.

The earliest source to identify the Fonte Gaia’s lateral parapet groups dates to the sixteenth century and identified them as the double image of Acca Larentia. In the seventeenth century, Giulio Piccolomini interpreted the two figures as representations of pubblica Carità, or public Charity. In the nineteenth century Gaetano Milanesi attempted to justify both these earlier theories and hypothesized that the two statues could be figures of Charity, or alternatively, a double image of Acca Larentia with Romulus and Remus. More recently James Beck suggested that the groups were double images of Charity. He interpreted the left group as Divine Charity, or Amor Dei, and the group on the right as Public Charity, or Amor Proximi.

These theories are difficult to sustain because two important details negate them: neither one of Quercia’s statues is actually shown nursing a child, and Charity is already represented as a Virtue seated on Mary’s left on the finished fountain and there is no viable reason (or precedent) why her personification should be repeated. When we try to reconcile the figures as described by Beck with the remainder of the sculptural

---


221 He mentions four statues on the balustrade “Erano nella fonte certi putti cavalcanti ad alcune lupe che gettavano aqua, e sopra I quattro lati di essa altrettante statue; della quail non restano che due, poste sul dinanzi, e figuranti la Carita’, oppure Acca Laurentia con Romolo e Remo” Milanesi, 1878-85, 117.


223 According to Beck’s view this figure was instead a figure of Humility. Beck, 1991, 83.
program and function of the monument, his hypothesis becomes particularly difficult to accept. Divine Charity or Amor Dei is the active love that originates with God, not the act of charity to or from God. Had the latter been the intended meaning then the statue would have been fitting for the adornment of a fountain, since the water could have been interpreted as God’s gift to Siena, but this is not the case. Claudia List suggested that the figures were Eve and Rhea Silvia, but I disagree with her identification. She based her identification of the left-hand statue as Eve on the presence of depictions of the Creation of Adam (left) and the Expulsion (right) on the end of the lateral wings of the fountain. In my opinion, the presence of these scenes is more likely a reminder that spiritual salvation is possible through redemption; they do not need to imply the identification of Eve in the left-hand statue.

From this brief summary it is clear that there is no consensus regarding the identification of Quercia’s figural groups. There was some clarity after the discovery of the drawing fragments, but in the end they raised more questions than they answered. Two different views have since coexisted in the scholarly literature, one harking back to the city’s origins, and the other to the allegory of public charity. Igino Benvenuto Supino first suggested (1926) that the figures were Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia. Although his theory was followed by several modern scholars, including Richard Krautheimer and Anne Coffin Hanson, it was no more than a nineteenth-century modification of Tizio’s

224 “Caritas divina effuse in cordibus nostris diserte vocatur effectus Spiritus Sancti” Romans 5.5.  
It is important to realize that, when the fountain structure was replaced by Sarrocchi in the second half of the nineteenth century, the figural ensemble was not included in the work. In fact, replacements for the figural groups were never executed. The decision to omit the statues was primarily due to a lack of funds, which I shall discuss in chapter four. However, the fact that the statues were never executed (even when funds did become available) indicates that, at this later date (1869), the figural groups were not considered vital to the monument’s overall meaning. This point may provide a key to understanding the fifteenth-century monument. As I will explain later in this chapter, the changes made to the iconography of the statues facilitated a more tangible and universal understanding of the fountain as a whole.

**Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia**

Local tradition confirms the identification of the figural groups as Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia. However, this tradition does not appear in the sources before the second half of the fifteenth century and thus dates to after the construction of the Fonte Gaia. Therefore the sculptural groups on the Fonte Gaia are likely the legend’s source.

The legend, named in honor of the Roman Tisbo Colonnese who is supposed to have first recorded it, involves the twin sons of Remus, Senus and Aeschius. According to this account, the twins, escaping the anger of their uncle (Romulus), took the ‘sacramento’ of the

---


227 The Tisbo legend, the oldest codice dates from the second-half of the fifteenth century. ASC, A VI, 8. The legend is also found in several other codices in the same archive labeled A, VI, 12; A VI, 10; A, III, 25; A, III, 28; and B, III, 1; A, VI, 11; A, VI, 4. For a discussion of dating and differences in language see Giuseppe Rondoni, *Tradizioni Popolari e leggende di un comune medievale e del suo contado :Siena e l’antico contado senese* (Bologna: Forni Editore, 1968), 15.
wolf from Rome to the spot that is now Siena.\textsuperscript{228} They founded the city on the spot now known as Castelvecchio and ordained great sacrifices to Apollo and Diana in gratitude for having overcome the opposition of Romulus. From the altar of Apollo, the fumes were densely black, while a white smoke ascended from Diana’s sacrifice. The origins of the colors (black and white) of the city’s emblem, the \textit{balzana}, derive from this story.\textsuperscript{229}

In the preface to his publication of the Tisbo legend, the nineteenth-century archivist Luciano Banchi attributed the story to Agostino Patrizi, a late fifteenth-century historian.\textsuperscript{230} Modern historians dispute the chronicle’s date. Rubinstein thought it derived from the fifteenth century, while Rondoni and most other Italian scholars believe that the story existed as a popular legend well before then.\textsuperscript{231} Similar tales concerning other cities’ foundations existed before written sources appear for them.\textsuperscript{232} Thus, although this hypothesis is unsubstantiated, it is possible that the oral tradition was widespread, permitting the recognition of the figural groups. Nonetheless, the question remains: would the Tisbo legend have been so well known that a fifteenth-century viewer could readily identify the statues on the Fonte Gaia? And are there any visual sources that can corroborate the existence of the oral tradition earlier?

The first problem with the identification of the statues is that there are no precedents for similar depictions of Acca Laurentia and Rhea Silvia in Sienese art, nor

\textsuperscript{228} The sacrario is the image of the wolf and the twins.
\textsuperscript{229} The balzana is a shield of which the upper half is white and the lower black. Rondoni, 1968, 13-27. Douglas, 1902, 6.
\textsuperscript{230} Published from one of the later copies in the Bichi Collection, ASS. Luciano Banchi, \textit{Le origini favolose di Siena second una presunta cronica romana di Tisbo Colonnese} (Nozze Papanti-Giraudini, Siena, April 22, 1882). As Rubinstein points out Banchi provides no evidence for his suggestion. Rubinstein, 1958, 202.
are they part of the standard visual repertory in Italian art. In Perugia, for example, Rhea Silvia appeared in a diptych on the lower basin of the Fontana Maggiore, but she was shown in a completely different format, sitting in profile facing left toward the she-wolf and twins. Her hair is pulled back in ornate netting and on her lap she holds a bird cage. [Fig. 19] In Roman art Rhea Silvia is often shown in repose, usually illustrating the moment when Mars descended from Olympus to impregnate her.\footnote{233} [Fig. 20] This imagery is continued in later representations, for example in the seventeenth-century \textit{Mars and Rhea Silvia} painted by Peter Paul Rubens in the Prince’s collection in Liechtenstein.\footnote{234}

Depictions of Acca Larentia are even rarer. In the few known images she is usually represented not as a woman but as a she-wolf. In ancient Roman times Acca was called Luperca (as the \textit{Lupa}: she-wolf) wife of Lupercus, and a yearly celebration (known as the Lupercalia) was held in her honor.\footnote{235} In antiquity a statue of a wolf was probably located by the Cave of the Lupercal (\textit{Grotta del Luperco}) close to where Acca’s tomb was located in the Velabrum marketplace.\footnote{236} Thanks to the popularity of the story it is not surprising to find that in art the female figure was identified as a wolf. A simulacrum is

\footnote{233}{See for example the mosaic from Ostia Antica now preserved in Palazzo Altieri in Rome. Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (Zürich: Artemis Verlag, 1981-1999).}
\footnote{234}{The painting is dated 1616-17 and was acquired by Prince Johann Adam Andreas I von Liechtenstein, it is now in the Liechtenstein Museum (Vienna, Austria).}
\footnote{235}{The celebration known as the Lupercalia was held every December 23 from the late years of the Republic to A.D. 494 when the practice was ended. The history is recounted in the “Fasti Praenestini” (C.I. L. 1 319). Cited in Mario Marazzi, “Sul mito di Acca Larenzia” in \textit{Strenna dei Romanisti}, XLVIII (Roma: Editrice Roma Amor: 1980), 349-362, see in particular page 354.}
\footnote{236}{The Lupercal is the cave at the foot of the Palatine hill in Rome where Faustulus allegedly found Romulus and Remus saved by the female wolf that suckled them. See T. P. Wiseman, \textit{The Myths of Rome} (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2004), 140. Regarding the statue of a wolf see Marazzi, 1980, 351, n. 4: “\textit{Il passo liviano che riferisce questo si trova al Libro X.25. Ma questo passo ha dato origine a diverse interpretazioni giacché non è chiaro se la Lupa a cui si riferisce Livio sia la stessa attualmente esposta nel palazzo del Conservatori in Campidoglio di sicura fattura etrusca e citata da Cicerone}.”}
the famous Etruscan statue of a wolf (now in the Musei Capitolini). Occasionally Acca
Larentia is shown in human form, especially in half bust on coins; an example from the
Republican era shows her in simple profile. [Fig. 21]

The second problem with identifying the sculptural groups as Acca Larentia and
Rhea Silvia is that the evidence used for this is related to the 1409 plan and not the 1415
plan. The majority of modern scholars use the two drawing fragments of the fountain to
prove this attribution. However, the drawing dates between December 1408 and
January 1409, when extensive modifications to the first plan required that a second
drawing be made for the Priors’ approval. At that time the cost of the fountain was raised
twenty to twenty-five percent. As Richard Krautheimer first suggested, the difference in
cost probably corresponded to the addition of the two sculptural groups. The drawing
is missing the central section. Unlike the present state of Quercia’s finished statues, the
female figures in the drawing fragments are clearly differentiated and identifiable. The
left-hand figure of the Metropolitan Museum’s segment of the drawing wears a wreath of
leaves on her head and is dressed in a furry cloak. This specifies that she is Acca
Larentia, the goat herd’s wife who cared for Romulus and Remus. The right-hand figure
(in the Victoria and Albert Museum) wears a crown on her head and is dressed in finer
garments. This attire suggests that she is Rhea Silvia, the daughter of King Numitor and
birth mother of Romulus and Remus. Both female figures are accompanied by the twins
Romulus and Remus. [Fig. 22] The possibility that two different sets of twins appear on

238 Krautheimer links the two extant parts of the Fonte Gaia drawing, agreeing with Lànyi that the 1409
plan is represented in the drawings, and through iconographical analysis suggests phases for the program of
the fountain -- Romulus and Remus, and Senus and Aeschius -- has also been suggested. According to this hypothesis, the figural groups refer to two distinct generations of the family. Unfortunately, there is no specific evidence to support this tempting hypothesis.

The drawing fragments make clear that the figural groups of Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia served to strengthen the civic aspect of the second program by alluding to the city’s historic origins. The animals seated on the corners of the parapet support this reading. A monkey appears in the left hand section of the drawing while the right hand section includes a dog. The animals may be symbols related to the theme of Good Government, of which the fountain is certainly a symbol. The dog is probably a symbol of loyalty and the monkey faithlessness.

The interpretation of the fountain depicted in the drawing fragments is relatively straightforward; the same is not true for the completed fountain. We must take into account another complicating factor when evaluating the drawing’s utility: it illustrates an intermediate phase and not the final plan of the fountain. Whereas Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia appear in the drawing, they do not on the finished fountain. Krautheimer explained the discrepancy in these terms,

239 Hanson, 1965, 33.
240 Hanson had also come to this conclusion. Ibid.
241 Krautheimer, 1952, 271. The usual meanings attached to the image of a dog are friendship, faithfulness, and also may represent a good prince or judge, and thus may relate to the Virgin as ruler of Siena. The ape, as subhuman and a mimic of man, can represent any sort of Vice. In this case, the ape may be representative of the sinful nature of the Old Adam, in contrast to the New Adam who is to be born into the world for the salvation of mankind. See Hanson, 1965, 25. Instead Bisogni interpreted the animals according to a medieval allegory, the Psychomachia, whereby the dog is a symbol of envy and the monkey avarice. According to his interpretation, the animals on the parapet illustrate that the female figures are instead Charity and Liberality; Charity (Rhea Silvia) fights against envy while Liberality (Acca Larentia) fights against avarice. Bisogni, 1977, 110.
Hence the over-all program of Good Government, with specific reference to Siena, is fully consistent in the drawing—infinitely more so than in the fountain as executed. With the change in program in 1415 Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia are out of place, so much so that their identifying attributes and garments were played down, to a degree which rendered them unrecognizable for centuries.242

While Krautheimer recognized that the mothers were out of place on the fountain, I contend that the changes made to the statues’ iconography (from the time they appeared in the drawing fragments to their final execution) was not just a “playing down” of their attributes. Rather, this was a conscious choice made to change our understanding of the groups fundamentally, and as a result, the overall meaning of the program. I am suggesting that the figural groups on the executed monument were not intended to represent the founders of Rome or Siena. The identifying attributes, shown in the drawings, were instead purposefully omitted in order to facilitate a more general reading of the monument.

In this regard a comparison of the drawings and the final monument is enlightening. Numerous changes were made including, in particular, the omission of the other two parapet sculptures depicting a monkey and a dog. While some scholars believe these statues were lost, I doubt that the animals were ever included in the final project for the fountain.243 The only evidence supporting their existence is circumstantial at best. Milanesi recounted that four statues once adorned the parapet of the fountain.244 This has often been used in support of the existence of the missing animal statues. However,

242 Krautheimer, 1958, 271.
243 Hanson suggested that the two animals may have disappeared before the fountain was photographed in the nineteenth century. Hanson, 1965, 25.
244 “Erano nella fonte certi putti cavalcanti ad alcune lupe che gettavano acqua, e sopra i quattro lati di essa allettante statue; della qual non restano che due, poste sul dinanzi, e figuranti la Carità, oppure Acca Laurenzia con Romolo e Remo.” See Milanesi, 1878-85, 117.
Milanesi only discussed the female groups and made no further description of the form or subject of the other two sculptures. Instead it appears that the project was modified once again and, instead of animals, statues of seated children adorned the fountain. At least one of these statues was visible to viewers at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Tizio recounts that a statue of a seated boy, located on the rim of the fountain, was broken and lost because of the actions of some “awful youths.”245 According to a witness in the nineteenth century, the base of the statue was still visible on the edge of the fountain in front of the relief of the Madonna and Child. Allegedly the remnant even led commissioners to evaluate whether or not the lost statue should be remade for Sarrocchi’s new fountain.246 The art historian Guglielmo Della Valle recorded this information in the eighteenth century; it may be that he had also seen the remains of the now lost statue.247 Since Milanesi mentioned that there were indeed four parapet statues and we already know that two are the surviving groups of standing female figures with two small children, and there is evidence that the third was a seated boy, it is likely that the fourth was a companion to the third. Thus even though this figure is not described in any of the early sources, it too probably depicted a seated child. If this assumption is correct, then the statue must have been damaged and lost shortly after the inauguration of the fountain.

Krautheimer recognized several design changes made after the drawing that led him to the conclusion that the drawing represented the second plan of 1409. He argued that the plan must have been found unsatisfactory, based on changes in form and

245 Sigismondo Tizio, *Historiae senenses*, c. 236.
246 Banchi et al., 1869. See also Gabbrielli, 1994, 313-314.
iconography, since another scheme that corresponds to the finished fountain was drawn up shortly thereafter. Among the changes noted by Krautheimer are the enlargement of the fountain; a change in shape from rectangular to trapezoidal; the modification of niches from a pointed to a round profile; and the replacement of the *Annunciation* scenes (The Virgin Mary seated and reading from her prayer book in the London drawing, and the angel Gabriel grasping a fleur-de-lys scepter in the New York drawing) with two new Virtues. There are only two further points that I would like to add to reenter into this argument. First, as explained above, the animals located on the parapet of the drawing were probably never executed, and second, the figural groups were changed so they were no longer readily identifiable as Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia. The missing animal statues and the significant changes in design mean that the fountain’s program was also changed, and as a result, the female statues on the fountain, as it was completed, may not be securely identified as Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia. To conclude, even without the evidence of the central section of the drawing, we can believe that Quercia’s finished fountain was not executed according to the drawing fragments and respects the second plan only generally.

The finished statues have similar sinuous poses to those in the drawing, and the positions of the children vary only slightly. However, the statues as executed feature both women clad in identical garments.²⁴⁸ Had the intent been to distinguish Acca Larentia

---

²⁴⁸ Three later drawings also demonstrate this point. The artists of these drawings show the figures with identical garments, clearly drawn after the statues of the finished monument. They each identify the statues as either Charity or Liberality. Thus pointing, once again, to the difficulty viewers had in deciphering the iconography of the figures. None of the artists identify the figures as Acca Larentia or Rhea Silvia. See the drawing of Liberality and Charity in the Gabinetto dei Disegni degli Uffizi by an artist active at the beginning of the sixteenth century, sometimes attributed to Sodoma. See Bernhard Degenhart and Annegrit
from Rhea Silvia on the finished fountain, Quercia would have made them identifiable, as he had in the drawing, through their garments.249 Sometime during the planning process, after the second drawing and before the final design, the decision was made to modify the figural groups. Furthermore, even if Quercia’s final statues reflected the iconography from the drawings, they would not necessarily have been recognized by the general public. As discussed above, the depictions of Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia were rather complex and probably would have been unfamiliar. Moreover in Siena, the iconography of Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia (distinguished by their garments) had not entered into the city’s artistic vocabulary. The more common reference to Rome was instead the depiction of the she-wolf suckling Romulus and Remus.

The depiction of the wolf suckling twins had become the standard visual symbol representing Siena’s foundation.250 It was a common, readily identifiable and established reference to Rome. The wolf suckling twins is illustrated under the figure of Good

---

249 The drawing does reflect, whether “di sua mano” or not, Jacopo della Quercia’s plans for the fountain. Clearly the problems of attributing the drawing to Jacopo’s own hand can not definitively be resolved at this time. There are no other drawings by Quercia, and in any case, the rarity of fifteenth-century drawings does not provide enough analysis to permit such an affirmation. See Krautheimer’s discussion of the subject. Krautheimer, 1958, particularly 273ff. The drawing has been attributed to Jacopo by Kauffmann, 1929, 9; Foratti, 1933, 513-516; Degenhart, 1937, 261. Degenhart and Schmitt, 1968, 204-208; Hanson, 1965, 11-13; Cinelli, 1975, 107; Bisogni, 1977, 109-114; Bellosi, 1978, XX-XXI; Carli, 1980, 29; Ames-Lewis, 1981, 128-131; Beck, 1991, 69 and 150; Bellosi, 2003, 14 and Fattorini, 2005, 27. Instead Pope-Hennessy suggested the drawing was made by a Veronese artist. Pope-Hennessy, 1939, 44, n. 56. While Seymour suggested it was made by Martino di Bartolommeo, under Jacopo’s instruction and supervision. Seymour, 1968, 93-105.

250 By 1344 the Roman wolf suckling the twins Romulus and Remus had become accepted as the official seal of the city. See Douglas, 1902, 6. In the middle of the thirteenth century a live wolf was even kept in the Palazzo Pubblico. Rondoni, 1968, 28.
Government in Ambrogio Lorenzetti’s fresco in the Sala dei Nove in the Palazzo Pubblico.  

251 [Fig. 23] The wolf and twins are also shown on a Biccherna cover from 1344 attributed to Lorenzetti.  

252 [Fig. 24] In 1429, a bronze sculpture of the Roman wolf was commissioned by the Commune and placed on a Roman column in the Piazza del Campo.  

253 The Roman column was brought to Siena from Orbetello; its placement in the Piazza del Campo demonstrated the city’s ties to Rome not only through the iconography of the column, but also its context. The column statue was a Roman model that linked the appearance of the Piazza del Campo to that of a Roman forum; furthermore, until the first half of the thirteenth century the Piazza del Campo was even called Campum Fori.  

255 Allusions to the city’s Roman origin were also present in the sculpture located on the lower border of the fountain. In both the drawing and on the finished fountain the she-wolf is present in varying form. In the drawing she projects from between two niches on the lower wall. On the finished fountain, there are multiple images of the she-wolf: one on the right balustrade and several more serving as water spouts.

---


253 The bronze wolf was cast by Giovanni and Lorenzo di Turini Cristofani, 1979, 117. See also Carl Brandon Strehlke, “Art and Culture in Renaissance Siena” in Painting in Renaissance Siena (New York; Abrams, 1988), 38.

254 Peleo Bacci, “La colonna del Campo proveniente da avanzi romani presso Orbetello (1428)” in Rassegna d’Arte Senese e del Costume (Anno 1, n. 5, 1927), 227.

Quercia’s Parapet Statues

The theory that the female statues may be reminders of the appearance of the lost statue of Venus or Diana that once adorned the first Fonte Gaia has been advanced by Campbell, but this is not plausible since there is no evidence that Quercia ever saw the earlier statue. The parapet statues do seem to evoke a common trope, as some scholars have suggested: the depiction of Charity as a woman with children at her breast. Although the association may be inferred, I think that the sculpture groups were not meant to be depictions of Charity per se. While depictions of Charity or Caritas differed widely in the fourteenth century, by the fifteenth century she was usually shown as a woman nursing her children. Robert Freyhan has treated the subject extensively, and among other things his study traces the possible origins of the various symbols (fruit, flame, heart, candle, and flower) used to symbolize Charity. It is interesting to note how these attributes are more often than not a conflation of other sources influenced by secular love symbols such as the torch of Venus. In any case, by the fifteenth century all of these symbols are nearly abandoned in favor of the familial group of a woman with children. Particular to this iconography is the woman generally shown nursing at least one child. Indeed the portrayal of Caritas in the predella of Raphael’s Entombment in

257 Robert Freyhan, “The Evolution of the Caritas Figure in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries” in The Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes (vol. 11, 1948), 68-86. In sum the Caritas iconography seems to have been a modification by the Pisano school of the new iconography introduced by Giovanni Pisano for his figure of Ecclesia in the Duomo of Pisa.
258 Freyhan, 1948, 75 and 86.
259 Freyhan, 1948, 85.
260 An early example is Andrea Orcagna’s figure of Caritas from Orsanmichele or Tino di Camaino’s Caritas in the Opera del Duomo of Florence.
the Vatican, which shows her with four children (two of whom appear to be nursing) and the older symbols of Amor Dei (with the flaming vase) and Amor Proximi (with the fruit basket), is characterized as a “stylistic retrogression” because of the presence of Amor Dei and Amor Proximi.²⁶¹

Mother Earth and Gaia

In the twentieth century, Péleo Bacci proposed an alternate meaning for the sculptural groups. He observed that the two females could represent Terra Madre, or Mother Earth, but did not reveal any reason for this identification.²⁶² The aim of his monograph was not to explain the fountain’s iconography, but to demonstrate through connoisseurship his attribution of the right hand figural group (facing the fountain) to Francesco da Valdambrino, Jacopo’s friend and collaborator. This attribution is implausible considering the available evidence.²⁶³ With regard to the iconographic

²⁶² Bacci, 1936, 306.
²⁶³ His attribution was based on two points. The first was the testimony of a late fifteenth-century chronicle, the Chronica senese 1170-1431. (BCS, Cronaca dal 1170 al 1431) The original text belonged to the jeweler (orafo) Paolo di Tommaso and was allegedly faithfully transcribed in 1490 by Antonio di Martino of Siena. Bacci deduced that since some of the events recorded in the chronicle regarding the Fonte Gaia were traceable to archival documents then the passage regarding Francesco da Valdambrino may also be considered accurate. The passage reads, “master Jacopo of master Pietro della Quercia of Siena composed the fountain and all its figures [fighurie] and other carvings as one can see; also master Francesco di Valdambrino of Siena made one of the above mentioned figures [fighura], and master Sano of Siena walled the fountain around the year 1419.” ( [...] maestro Jacomo di maestro Pietro della Guercia da Siena e lui compose la Fonte e fe’ tutte le fighurie e altri intagli come si vede; ancho maeestro Francesco di Valdanbrino da Siena fece una di detta fighura, e maestro Sano da Siena murò la fonte d’intorno l’ano 1419.”) BCS, Cronaca dal 1170 al 1431. A. VII, 44, c. 474. Bacci read fighura as necessarily one of the two female figures situated on the parapet of the Fonte Gaia, yet the term does not necessarily imply sculpture in the round nor is fighura necessarily specified as one of the lateral parapet statues. The first problem then concerns the interpretation of the text. Indeed fighura could conceivably refer to one of the other sculptures such as one of the reclining wolves, as indirectly suggested by Seymour, or possibly one of the reliefs of virtues. (Seymour attributes the reclining wolf (Palazzo Pubblico, Siena) at one time part of the Fonte Gaia to an assistant of Jacopo della Quercia. Seymour, 1973, 46 and fig. 44.) Second, to further support his attribution through visual analysis Bacci located Valdambrino’s carving style in the left-hand figure. He attributes this group to Valdambrino and the right hand group to Quercia and he notes “clear
implications of Bacci’s proposal, I contend that the figural groups were intended as a universal reference to Mother Earth. They translated into visual form the fountain’s name, Gaia, the name of the Greek goddess of the earth. The Greek poet Hesiod was the first to describe the birth of the deity. Chaos was the first deity to come into being, followed by Gaia, and then Eros. Gaia gave birth to herself, to the landscape, sea, and sky. She mated with Ouranos, the god of the Sky, and created the succeeding generations of gods and ultimately humans. She nurtured all life on earth and is mother of all. Gaia, the goddess of the Earth, is likely depicted as the nurturing mother shown on the fountain in the two sculptural groups. Her solicitude toward the children stands for her care of humankind and the fountain provides her gift of the vital life force of water. Lending some weight to this hypothesis is the fact that manuscripts of Hesiod’s *Theogony*, which

stylistic differentiations” in their carving. He sees the general folds of the drapery as “flowing” for Valdambrino’s figure and “fractured” for Quercia’s figure. He describes the children in Quercia’s group as “meaty and heavy” while he sees Valdambrino’s children as “thin and graceful.” (“Dai confronti fra i due gruppi allegorici emergono altre chiare dissomiglianze stilistiche. Per esempio, la piegatura de’ panni, più fluente in Francesco da Valdambrino, più spezzata in Jacopo della Quercia; la concezione e riproduzione plastica dei putti, carnosa, pesante, deformes quasi in m. Jacopo, snella, vivace, aggraziata in m. Francesco.”) Bacci, 1936, 309. He was convinced that the sculptural groups on the Fonte Gaia represented an example analogous to the one he had found with the putti carved on Ilaria del Carretto’s funerary monument. (Bacci, 1936, see specifically pages 89-114) The trouble with his argument is that the areas where he sees a change in carving style (drapery and children) are areas that were restored. (The left-hand female figure was restored by Mazzuoli and Bacci knew of his restorations since he mentions them on page 308 but he does not discern any differences that this fact implies for an attribution of the sculptural group to Valdambrino.) Seymour, in his monograph on Jacopo della Quercia, correctly recognized that such later restorations flaw our view and interpretation of the statue. He concludes, from an analysis of the sculpture’s rear, that the statue is entirely quercesque in its carving style. (Seymour, 1973, 52) It is plausible, he writes, that the restorations taint our view of Valdambrino’s style as opposed to Quercia’s but nonetheless is convinced of Quercia’s authorship. It is however Hanson who has put forth the most convincing arguments on the question of Valdambrino’s participation. She explains succinctly that Francesco da Valdambrino was Operaio dell’acqua (overseer; technically ineligible to take part in the project since he was in titular charge of it as operaio and, as probable guarantor, morally responsible to remain uninvolved); Jacopo della Quercia was sculptor; and Sano was assigned to work on decorative ornaments under Francesco’s direction. (Hanson, 1965, 71. Valdambrino was Operaio from October 1409 to January 1418. See Hanson, Docs. 70, 71, 73, 74, 75. Seymour, 1973, 105).

presents this myth, did circulate in the Renaissance and several copies from the thirteenth and fourteenth century were known in Tuscany.265

Although it is commonplace to recognize the importance of Latin antiquity in the Renaissance, Greek antiquity was similarly pertinent for many of the period’s artists, scholars, and patrons. The Greek humanist Demetrius Chalcondyles, who is credited with the first publication of Hesiod’s *Works and Days*, taught in Florence later in the fifteenth century.266 This was followed shortly after, in 1495, by the publication of Hesiod’s complete works at Venice by Aldus Manutius.267

If we agree that Quercia’s lateral sculpture groups may well refer to Gaia then it is possible that she is depicted elsewhere in the pictorial arts. Indeed a quite early precedent may be seen on the Ara Pacis where the Roman equivalent of the Greek Gaia, Tellus, is represented as a mother with two children in her arms.268 Another representation of the goddess with children is visible in a large mosaic of Mithras in the Zodiac from the Roman villa in Sentium dated 200-250 CE.269 Although neither example was known in Siena in the early fifteenth century, in Roman art Tellus was frequently depicted on urns

265 These copies are preserved in the Laurentian library in Florence. Laur. XXXII 16 [13th c], Florence, Laur. Conv. Suppr. 158 [14th c].
266 Demetrius Chalcondyles was born in Athens 1424. He was a Greek humanist, scholar and professor who taught in Italy at Padua, Perugia, Milan and Florence. The first printed version dates to 1493 probably in Milan.
267 Aldus Manutius 1449/50-1515 was an Italian humanist who founded the Aldine Press at Venice.
268 The Ara Pacis was not excavated until the mid-sixteenth century. The relief is located on the Eastern facing long side of the Ara Pacis, the altar erected in honor of Augustus between 13 and 9 B.C., in the area of Campo Marzio. Marilena Caciorgna suggested that Bacci must have had this relief in mind when he suggested the figures depicted Mother Earth. She argues that the later excavations of the Ara Pacis, begun in 1903 and terminated in 1937-38, coincide with the publication of Bacci’s monograph. Caciorgna, 2001-2002, 77. A temple (Aedes Telluris) was dedicated to Tellus on December 13, 268 BCE on the Esquiline Hill near the Templum Pax.
269 The mosaic is now in the collection of the Munich Glyptothek.
and sarcophagi decorated with mythological scenes, and thus it is possible that another model was available to Quercia in the Renaissance.\textsuperscript{270}

The roughly contemporaneous frescoes painted by Taddeo di Bartolo in the antechapel of the Palazzo Pubblico are further confirmation that my identification of the figural groups on the Fonte Gaia is plausible. As I shall explain in the following section the frescoes demonstrate that the commune had chosen an official foundation legend that probably influenced Quercia to eliminate the attributes that made his figural groups recognizable as Acca Laurentia and Rhea Silvia.

The frescoes depict a program of Roman personages and political Virtues accompanied by inscriptions in Latin hexameters. The paintings adorn the antechapel, or entrance to the Consistory chamber, located in the center of the piano nobile between the great hall and the smaller rooms to the front of the palace. The cycle continues the fresco decoration in the contiguous rooms, and is especially linked to Ambrogio Lorenzetti’s frescoes in the Sala dei Nove. Lorenzetti’s frescoes established the ideological structure of good governance, justice, and the common good that continues in Bartolo’s frescoes.\textsuperscript{271}

---

\textsuperscript{270} Thus far I can not establish that there was a firm iconographical tradition known to the Sienese in the Renaissance. There was a healthy tradition in antiquity and thus considering this evidence it is likely that some model was available to Quercia. Attested representations of Gaia are not known before the second quarter of the sixth century B.C. In Greek art Gaia is often shown as a supplianting mother in the Gigantomachy and in Apollo’s struggle with Tityos. After five hundred B.C. Gaia is often shown as a torso emerging from the ground as in depictions of the Birth of Erichthonios. On a stone relief from the Sebasterion, from the second century A.D. Gaia is instead shown reclining with a cornucopia and a child. See Mary B. Moore “Ge” in \textit{Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae} (Zürich: Artemis Verlag, 1981-1999), 171-177. In Roman art Tellus is either shown in repose with one hand holding an attribute (either a basket of flowers or fruit) or, as on the Ara Pacis, with small children which allude to her fertility. See Elena Ghiselli “Tellus” in \textit{Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae} (Zürich: Artemis Verlag, 1981-1999), 879-889.

foundation for both pictorial cycles. He introduces the group of Roman heroes on the walls and advises the Sienese to follow the civic virtues of the Romans,

   I am he who inquired into the causes of things and taught the means by which every public power could maintain itself for ever: Oh illustrious city of Siena, I will show you those men whose civil examples you should follow, and as long as you faithfully tread in their sacred footsteps, your glory will grow and in all the world liberty will flourish among you.²⁷²

   In the doorway opposite appear Caesar and Pompey, who serve warnings against selfish ambition.²⁷³ Located under the Virtues are figures from Roman history that exemplify the virtue depicted above it. Directly below the personification of Magnanimity, we find Curius Dentatus, Furius Camillus and Scipio Africanus. [Fig. 25]

   The inscription located below Furius Camillus elucidates his significance; he is acclaimed as founder of the city. The titulus reads, “I refounded the nation, the destruction of the Gauls is my glory; and as I pursued the routed stragglers across the country my name was adopted for Camollia, the third part of your city of Siena.”²⁷⁴ I believe the presence of Furius Camillus in the Ante chapel fresco program and the specific reference in the titulus to his foundation of Siena help to elucidate why the Fonte Gaia’s sculptural groups were changed.

---


²⁷³ Caesar and Pompey are faulted with provoking the decline of Rome, and particularly the downfall of the Republic. This view was based on the notion that they were the root cause of civil strife. Rubinstein points out that this idea had been newly voiced by Leonardo Bruni, in opposition to that of his teacher Salutati as documented by the epigram written in 1385 for the image of Caesar in the Famous Men cycle in Florence. Rubinstein, 1958, 197-198. See also Solberg, 1991, 931.

²⁷⁴ Curius Dentatus was Roman consul when the colony of Siena was founded and Furius Camillus was a founder of the city after whom the Terzo di Camollia was named. The titulus reads: “Restitui patriam, consumpti gloria galli Sunt mea, quos etiam victor dum multa ruentes Haec per rura sequor, nostro de nomine dicta est Camillia tue pars urbis terna senensis.” Solberg, 1991, 886.
Reasons why the parapet sculptures were changed to refer to Gaia and other precedents for the iconography of the Fonte Gaia

According to a Sienese legend based on the historical record in Livy and Florus, Siena had been founded by the Roman general Camillus. This account was, however, denied by the majority of Florentine historians. Unlike Siena, Florence was fortunate to have proof of her classical origins via Roman remains that had survived through the Middle Ages. Giovanni Villani, the early fourteenth-century Florentine writer, was the first to assert Florence’s primacy over Siena based on the city’s demonstrable Roman foundation, and his argument was later repeated in Leonardo Bruni’s *Historiae florenti popoli*. Villani deprived Siena of any antique foundation by claiming that the city had been founded by Charles Martel. To add insult to injury, Villani added that the city’s initial inhabitants were the aged and infirm men that Martel left behind when he departed from Italy. The majority of other Florentine historians were a bit more generous. However, they too confirmed Bruni’s theory about Siena’s foundation by the Franks, as it had been first recorded by John of Salisbury. The tradition recounted that Siena owed its origins to the Galli Senones under Brennus, rather than to the Romans.

---

275 Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, V, 46ff. Florus, *Epitoma*, I, 8, 17ff. These classical authors relate Camillus’ victory over the Gauls, and his restoration of Rome. That Camillus took part in the foundation of Siena was part of the Sienese legend that is first recorded in the fifteenth century although probably of earlier origin.

276 Bruni’s history was begun around 1415. Strethlke, 1988, 55.


The controversy over Siena’s foundation history was of particular concern in the Quattrocento. The myth of Siena’s Roman origins was taken up again in the 1480’s by Cardinal Francesco Todeschini Piccolomini and by Pandolfo Petrucci. This debate has been linked to the revival of classical motifs in the art of Sienese artists active at this time such as Vecchietta, Antonio Federighi, and Francesco di Giorgio.  

I believe that a similar situation may be demonstrated in the first half of the century by the tangible relationship between the Antechapel frescoes and the Fonte Gaia. Bartolo’s frescoes, initiated in October of 1413, were completed before the final plan for the fountain had been conceived. According to the contract between Jacopo della Quercia and the Commune, he was supposed to finish the Fonte Gaia within twenty months. We know that he did not respect this stipulation and instead completed the fountain a decade later. The second plan, shown in the drawing fragments, was followed by a third plan and the majority of the sculpture, if not all of it, was executed after that plan, between 1415 and 1419. As discussed earlier, on January 18, 1415, the supervisory committee asked permission to change the project, and the fountain was altered significantly.  

What were the reasons behind such drastic changes nearly two years after the fountain’s initial commission?

---

BCS, MS. A. VI. 3, f83r. Agostino Dati explains that the Gallic foundation of Siena was one of the two prevalent explanations of the origins of the city. The other maintained Siena’s Roman origins. “Urbis, originem, de qua Galli praesertim Senones ac veteris Romani certant.” Orationes, III, in Opera, Siena, 1503, f. lxviii v.


280 Full payment was received by Quercia in October of 1419. Krautheimer, 1958, 267. For a proposed chronology of the execution of the sculpture see Hanson, 1965, 80-81.
In the following section I suggest that the fountain’s program was changed as a response to the commune’s concern for a preferred foundation legend following that chosen for the roughly contemporary fresco cycle painted in the Antechapel of the Palazzo Pubblico by Taddeo di Bartolo in 1414. Quercia was familiar with both Bartolo and his fresco cycle. In 1416 Taddeo di Bartolo, together with the Priors, was appointed to insure that the Fonte Gaia project was brought to completion; he was also in charge of determining Quercia’s pay.\(^{281}\) As Solberg correctly pointed out, Bartolo was an appropriate choice to oversee Quercia’s project. He was about fifty-six years old, he was one of the governing officials of the Consistory board, and was considered a senior artist who had concluded his own commissions from the Priors in good time.\(^ {282}\) Quercia, on the other hand, needed a guarantor. The Fonte Gaia project was over-due and in the interim Quercia had come and gone from Siena numerous times and, while working on the Trenta Altar in Lucca, he was accused of theft, rape and sodomy along with his assistant Giovanni da Imola.\(^ {283}\)

Like other Sienese artists of the period Quercia was familiar with the rooms in the Palazzo Pubblico; indeed the terms of his contract stipulated that he “was to draw, or have drawn a plan of the fountain in the Sala del Consiglio.”\(^ {284}\) The full-scale drawing probably served primarily for the commissioners and Council members to visualize and

\(^{281}\) He was appointed along with a certain Marco di Angelo. ASS, Conciotoro 303, c 6r. Milanesi, 1854-56, vol. II, 51-52. See also Solberg, 1991, 241.
\(^{283}\) He and his assistant Giovanni da Imola were allegedly involved in a trist with the wife of a wealthy Lucchese merchant. The two men were accused of theft, rape and sodomy and Giovanni served three years in prison while Jacopo returned (or escaped) to Siena. Hanson, 1965, 16-18.
\(^{284}\) Contract 1408/09, January 22. “In prima, che maestro Iacomo predetto sia tenuto e debba fare o far fare uno disegno d’una fonte nella sala del Consiglio con intagliamenti, figure, fogliami, e cornice, gradi, pilastri e beccatelli e altri lavorii ragionati”. Cited in Seymour, 1973, 119.
approve the project, as was consonant for the practices of the period. The antechapel functioned as a vestibule for the chapel, but also as a corridor between council chambers. It was used by magistrates and council members as they passed from the Sala dei Nove, or from the Sala del Consiglio (or Mappamondo), along the new chapel to the new Concistoro and the Sala del Balia.\textsuperscript{285} Throughout his career Jacopo would pass through the rooms frequently, eventually as a member of the Sienese Council when he was nominated by the district of the Monte dei Riformatori.\textsuperscript{286} In any case, what was so important about Bartolo’s Antechapel frescoes for Quercia and the patrons of the Fonte Gaia to request the above mentioned modifications to the plan in 1415?

The antechapel fresco program had been worked out by a Doctor of Law, Pietro Pecci, and the Chancellor of Siena, Ser Cristofano di Andrea, and commissioned by the city Priors. The frescoes depict a series of Virtues (Justice, Prudence, Fortitude and Magnanimity) surrounded by medallions of famous men. These men are figures from the Roman Republican age and are a reference to the importance of the Sienese republic as opposed to more monarchical forms of government. On one wall Bartolo painted the allegories of Justice and Magnanimity in lunettes under the arches. Beneath these Virtues he placed figures from Roman history that exemplified the corresponding concept; below Justice (left) is Cicero, M. Porcius Cato, and P. Scipio Nasica; below Magnanimity (right) is Curius Dentatus, Furius Camillus, and Scipio Africanus. Each group of Roman heroes is labeled with an inscription in Latin, and each figure bears a further Latin inscription below his feet. The inscriptions between M. Curius Dentatus and F. Furius

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
Camillus claim them as founders of Siena, while others under Cicero and Cato speak of their fight for liberty and justice. The figures of Caesar and Pompey are not associated with any of the virtues, as the other figures, but likely serve as a warning to the Sienese governors about the effects of selfish ambition and disunity.

It is thought that Leonardo Bruni, the Florentine humanist, may have met with Pecci to discuss the program when the latter traveled to Florence as Siena’s ambassador to confer with Pope John XXIII. Although Curius Dentatus and Furius Camillus were included in the program as Sienese references, Pecci’s encounter in Florence probably prompted the idea. Rubinstein pointed out that the program as a whole was inspired by Florentine humanists. He argued that the antechapel frescoes and the writings of Leonardo Bruni articulated the view that the decline of Rome began with the fall of the Republic. For this reason the Roman heroes depicted in the antechapel frescoes are all from the Republican period of Roman history.

Even though Siena was enjoying a period of peace with Florence, competitive spirits may have led officials to establish firmly their city’s ties to Republican Rome. The inscription under the figure of Camillus constitutes the first formulation of the city’s new Roman past that was purposefully orchestrated at this time. The contract for the fresco decoration made clear that the honor of the Commune motivated the

---

287 On November 1, 1413 Pecci was sent to Florence, at the time Bruni served as apostolic secretary. Rubinstein, 1958, 204.
288 Rubinstein, 1958, 203. The Republican emphasis was first noted by Milanesi in 1878.
289 The Sienese had thrown off Milanese rule in 1404. Hanson suggests that some level of competition must have been present since the Florentines had managed to preserve their freedom during the period of Visconti rule. Hanson, 1965, 29-31.
290 Rubinstein also points out that the inscription is, in fact, based on Livy. Rubinstein, 1958, 203. See also Solberg, 1991, 943.
undertaking.\textsuperscript{291} Although several political concerns lay behind the conception of the program,\textsuperscript{292} one is particularly significant for the iconography of the Fonte Gaia’s figural groups. This was the intention to illustrate the version of Siena’s Roman foundation by Furius Camillus. [Fig. 26]

According to Agostino Patrizi, the majority of Sienese affirmed that although the Galli Senones had founded Siena, Camillus had been responsible for establishing the terza Camollia because he pitched his tent there before defeating the Francs.\textsuperscript{293} The story of Camillus could be loosely corroborated by classical evidence (such as the Roman historian Florus who makes some connection between Camillus and the terzo Camollia, and from the authors Pliny and Tacitus, as well as coins)\textsuperscript{294} and so it prevailed over all the others, including that recorded by Tisbo. It was deemed far more convincing because all the other foundation myths lacked any support from classical authorities. The depiction of Camillus in the antechapel frescoes made the figural groups illustrated in the drawing fragments passé since they reflected the discarded version of Siena’s foundation story.

Quercia and his patrons, the city Priors, must have noted that the ideators of the antechapel program had consciously negated the foundation legend where Siena was founded by Romulus’s sons Senus and Aeschius. Briefly, to restate important elements of

\textsuperscript{291} The words honor or honorable are used no less than four times in the document. Solberg, 1991, 226 and 900.
\textsuperscript{292} Solberg suggests the frescoes reflect the political problem posed by King Ladislas of Naples and his threat of invading Siena. Earlier authors such as Southard (1979) and Strehlke (1988) instead linked the fresco program to the fear of invasion by Giangaleazzo Visconti. For a discussion of these concerns see Solberg, 1991, 231ff and 918.
\textsuperscript{293} Agostino Patrizi, \textit{De Antiquitate}, f.83v. “Gallos deinde in his locis commorantes, a Romano dictatore Fario Camillo defectos; locumque ubi dictator tetenderat appellatum Camillian; hinc, castro rum loca, ab accolis militia [e] que emeritus viris habitari coepta, et urbis principium.”
\textsuperscript{294} Rubinstein, 1958, 202.
the chronology already discussed above, in 1412, Quercia’s contract for the Fonte Gaia was reconfirmed, and by 1414 Jacopo had returned to Siena. At this time the lower part of the fountain had been built but the figural groups (the so-called Acca and Rhea) were probably not sculpted until the end of the year 1417 or the beginning of 1418.

Bartolo’s fresco program was painted in the interim between Quercia’s drawing fragments and the execution of the figural groups. Furthermore, Bartolo’s frescoes demonstrate that the commune had chosen an official foundation legend that probably instigated the decision to change the second program of the fountain and eliminate the attributes that made Quercia’s figural groups recognizable as Acca Laurentia and Rhea Silvia. It is important to realize that Bartolo had terminated the cycle in 1414, just a year before the commissioners of the Fonte Gaia had specifically requested a change to the design of the fountain on January 18, 1415. The temporal intersection of the two projects, both of which promoted moralizing civic iconography must have necessarily influenced one another or responded to a common mutual influence. It is also natural to suppose that the Commune, the mutual patron of the frescoes and fountain, expected both works to reflect the same Roman foundation history. The change in iconography of Quercia’s lateral figure groups, then, was not a matter of chance but rather the reflection of a governmental policy reflected in both the antechapel and fountain programs. There is no doubt that the Commune intended these major civic monuments to serve as vehicles of

295 A document dated January 11, 1418 refers to the tearing up of the work done before 1415 when the fountain was enlarged. Hanson, 1965, 18 and Doc. 72. Hanson proposes that Rea Silvia was sculpted before Acca Laurentia, both groups executed in the final period of his work on the fountain. Hanson, 1965, 81.

296 The form and dimensions of the fountain were changed on January 18, 1415. ASS, Concistoro, Deliberazioni 206, cc 261-2; ASS, Concistoro 303, c 6.
expression and, as I have demonstrated, a major concern of the Commune at this time was the illustration of a credible Roman foundation history.

In sum, the antechapel frescoes demonstrate that the city had chosen an official foundation story that was reflected in the seat of government, and so the second program for the Fonte Gaia would no longer be appropriate for the fountain that sat directly in front of it. For the Sienese the necessity to qualify their city by demonstrating its classical origins through the more credible foundation history of Camillus was of central importance.

The sculptural groups, stripped of their distinguishing garments, were now more appropriately reflections of Gaia for the Fonte Gaia. The iconography of the rest of the fountain accords with this reading; the Virtues surrounding the Virgin evoked the theme of Good Government, as argued by Krautheimer and Hanson, who associated the program with Lorenzetti’s frescoes in the Sala della Pace. The Virgin, placed centrally on the fountain, was understood as the protector of the city, and her just rule was personified by the Virtues seated around her. The addition of the personification of Wisdom to the group was convincingly explained in relation to Lorenzetti’s fresco, where she is given an important place close to the theological virtues. Her presence reflects a long medieval tradition that wisdom is the guiding principle of good government. For St

297 The necessity to retain two statues even though their iconography referenced just one figure (Gaia) was likely determined by the unusual shape of Quercia’s fountain that did not lend itself well to the placement of just one statue. It is likely that Quercia decided to maintain the visual equilibrium of the fountain by maintaining two statues at either end of the fountain, especially since the changes were made after the second plan.

298 “The group of Virtues gathered around a central figure has, in Sienese art, a very specific meaning. It represents Good Government, using symbolically any particular medieval government’s outstanding qualities. The dominating figure is variable.” Krautheimer, 1958, 271. See also Hanson, 28. In Lorenzetti’s fresco it is not the Virgin, but rather Justice together with the Common Good that rules Siena.
Thomas, wisdom was the highest intellectual virtue and justice the highest moral virtue.\(^{299}\) Her inclusion in the program of the fountain was thus likely intended to strengthen the Good Government theme already depicted inside the Palazzo Pubblico by bringing it outdoors.\(^{300}\) Adam and Eve are sculpted at either end of the Fonte Gaia’s lateral wings. They demonstrate that spiritual salvation is possible by following a life guided by the virtues and the Madonna and Child. This concept is closely related to the purification of the soul symbolized by the fountain’s water.\(^{301}\) The figural groups refer to Gaia, or Mother Earth, who created all life and provides the vital source of water through the government’s agency. Thus the fountain as a whole refers to Siena’s good government and presents individual viewers with the tools needed to follow a virtuous life and to quench their spiritual and physical thirst.

There are other parallels between Bartolo’s works in the Palazzo Pubblico and Quercia’s Fonte Gaia that lend more weight to my hypothesis and further demonstrate that the artists mutually influenced each other. Several seated Virtues (three Theological, four Cardinal, with the addition of Wisdom) appear on the Fonte Gaia and their iconography is related to Bartolo’s frescoes in the Chapel and the Antechapel of the Palazzo Pubblico. Bartolo first painted the frescoes in the Chapel, the Cappella de’ Signori, whose principal entrance was via the antechapel. The Chapel is two bays long

\(^{299}\) *Summa Theologica*, Ia, IIae, q. 66, a. 5. See Rubinstein, 1958, 183.

\(^{300}\) Krautheimer, 1958, 271. Hanson, 1965, 28ff.

and frescoed with stories from the life of the Virgin which were painted in 1406/1407.\textsuperscript{302} Bartolo seems to have been under unusual pressure to finish the chapel frescoes quickly. In November of 1407 he was informed that the frescoes had to be finished by the following month or he would be fined 25 gold florins.\textsuperscript{303} The frescoes were probably finished by the end of December as there is no record that he paid the fine, and moreover on January 8, 1408, he was commissioned to paint the St. Christopher fresco for the Antechapel.\textsuperscript{304} Bartolo’s Chapel frescoes were painted before his later cycle in the Antechapel and the latter was painted after Quercia’s drawing fragments of the Fonte Gaia, but contemporaneous to Quercia’s first phase of sculpture on the Fonte Gaia. Comparisons of the Virtues from each of these commissions are illustrative not only in demonstrating Bartolo’s influence on Quercia but also Quercia’s influence on Bartolo.

Bartolo’s Chapel frescoes depict the theological virtues Faith, Charity, and Hope in the three lunettes of the altar bay. In the same bay, in four roundels located in the spandrels of the arches, are depicted the cardinal virtues: Temperance, Justice, Prudence, and Fortitude. The theological virtues are each shown full length, descending from above as if about to land in their respective lunettes. All three figures are crowned with hexagonal haloes and wear long dresses and capes that billow with their movement. Faith baptizes a small nude figure with water that pours from an amphora she holds in her right hand; in her left hand she holds a chalice and a paten with a host. Hope faces a portrait of

\textsuperscript{302} The scenes depicted are The Last days of the Virgin, The Farewell to the Apostles, The Death of the Virgin, The Funeral of the Virgin, The Ascension of the Virgin, The Annunciation, Virtues, Evangelists inspiring Doctors of the Church, Saints, Prophets.


\textsuperscript{304} Ibid.
Christ, and holds her hands in an orant position. Charity holds a spear and a heart. The cardinal virtues, in roundels with lobed internal frames, are shown in three-quarter length. They are each accompanied by their attributes, and below them inscriptions confirm their identities. Apart from Temperance, who is shown with a round halo, the other virtues have hexagonal haloes. Fortitude holds a shield and a column, Justice holds a sword and round map, Prudence has a third eye and holds a mirror and two books, and Temperance carries an hour-glass. [Fig. 27]

All of the same virtues are depicted on the Fonte Gaia, and each carries a similar attribute as those in Bartolo’s chapel frescos. While generally Virtues tend to carry common attributes, as I shall explain, there are some important particularities that distinguish Bartolo and Quercia’s portrayals from other representations of Virtues that I believe are not incidental. On the Fonte Gaia, Temperance seems to hold some type of measuring instrument, Justice carries a sword, Prudence a snake, and Fortitude a column. Faith carries a cross and Hope looks up at the Christ child. The figure of Charity is more problematic, due to the fact that the original relief is too badly weathered to recognize any attributes. The figure is nonetheless Charity as can be surmised from an

---

306 In 1865 Didron Ainé stated that both Temperance and Justice had round haloes. It should also be noted that the frescoes have undergone several restorations, the most recent in 1974. The Chapel decoration (murals, choir stalls, lamp, font, gate) is in any case considered among the best preserved early Quattrocento interior in Siena. See Southard, 1979, 320 and 337. Solberg, 1991, 979 and 981.
307 These are best seen in the nineteenth-century plaster casts made of Quercia’s reliefs by Tito Sarrocchi. These casts, discussed in full detail in chapter four, are one to one copies of Quercia’s reliefs. Unfortunately, Quercia’s original reliefs have incurred further damage since the nineteenth century and thus the plaster casts are more useful for my discussion of the Virtues’ attributes.
analysis of the other Virtues in the program.\textsuperscript{308} Further, as I shall discuss in chapter four, Sarrocchi’s nineteenth-century marble relief made after it also depicts Charity.

Thus it appears that Quercia chose the same attributes for his Virtues but placed them within their respective niches in a radically different format than Bartolo did with his Virtues. Each of Quercia’s Virtues solidly occupies all available space. In both the drawing and the final monument Quercia situated his Virtues frontally, seated on varying types of supports (either elaborate chairs or benches). Bartolo’s Virtues, especially the theological virtues, are situated in lunettes yet they do not occupy the pictorial space. Instead his Virtues, although shown full-length, leave abundant vacant areas on either side.

This is very different from the way Bartolo painted his second cycle of Virtues in the antechapel. Although they are in lunettes, like his first cycle, these Virtues are seated on wooden benches that fully occupy the pictorial space. Bartolo’s frescoes in the antechapel portray Justice, Magnanimity, Fortitude, Prudence and, above the entrance arch, the personification of Religion. Each woman is shown as a weighty, muscular figure draped in heavy garments. They are displayed frontally, seated on wooden benches just like Quercia’s sculpted Virtues on the Fonte Gaia.

Bartolo’s female figure of Religion indicates with both hands a sphere suspended in the air. The sphere is painted with landmasses and seated upon it is the small figure of

\textsuperscript{308} Hanson, 1965, 58. Charity is the only Theological Virtue missing from the program. From left to right: Hope gazes upward at the Christ child. Wisdom holds a book on her lap. Fortitude wears armor under her cloak and holds a shield at her left side. Prudence holds, in her left hand, the broken remains of a snake. Justice holds, in her right hand, the broken remains of the hilt of a sword. Temperance is attributed on the basis of Supino who recounts that she held a measuring instrument. Supino, 1926, 40. Faith is identified by a large cross which she holds upright with her left hand.
Christ in benediction. Her entreaty reads, “Whatsoever you do in word or deed, do it in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Prudence holds a baton and with her right hand indicates a vicious-looking snake that pops his head out of a dark cave located in the lower right of the picture plane. Fortitude is adorned with a helmet on her head and is accompanied by both a spear and a fortress. Justice is crowned, and has several books on her lap; in her right hand she carries a sword whose hilt indicates a map. Magnanimity carries a spear that is pointed in the direction of a little man carrying arms, while her right hand is open toward a kneeling man. Clearly, a significant change in design was effected from the Virtues that Bartolo had painted in the chapel previously. It is difficult to know whether Bartolo had seen Quercia’s 1408 drawing for the Fonte Gaia, or even the full-scale drawing at one time in the Palazzo Pubblico, but it is probable. Certainly the massive seated figures that are the hallmark of Quercia’s style seem to have been infused into Bartolo’s later pictorial idiom in the antechapel. Bartolo adopts a more productive use of the picture plane for his Antechapel frescoes, as the Virtues are seated on wooden chests and fully occupy the lunettes. Moreover, Quercia’s influence may also be seen in the iconography of Bartolo’s virtues. Prudence, for example, was first shown in Bartolo’s Chapel fresco as a woman crowned with a mirror and a book. Later, in his Antechapel fresco, he shows her accompanied by a snake just as in the depiction of Prudence on the Fonte Gaia. [Fig. 28] Fortitude also undergoes a change; she was shown with a shield and

a column in the chapel and then in the antechapel with solely the column, again just as Fortitude is shown on the Fonte Gaia.\textsuperscript{310} [Fig. 29]

Closely related to the program of frescoes in the antechapel and the sculptural program of the Fonte Gaia are the relief sculptures embellishing two stone benches that are located under the Loggia della Mercanzia, begun in 1417. The bench to the left was sculpted by Urbano da Cortona in 1462, while that on the right was sculpted by one of Quercia’s pupils, Antonio Federighi, in 1464. On the left, in low relief, are the figures of the four cardinal Virtues (Fortitude, Prudence, Justice and Temperance) while on the opposite side are five Roman heroes, one of which is Furius Camillus.\textsuperscript{311} The Roman heroes are examples of men who put amor patriae above their own interests and thus embody the Virtues seated across from them. On the outer sides of the bench are two medallions, on the left a centaur, symbol of deceit and tyranny, and on the right a seated woman with a shield enclosed within a wreath, probably representing Fortitude.\textsuperscript{312} On the arms of the bench are two reclining nude figures identified as Adam and Eve. The benches fuse two earlier Sienese programs in one, the symbols of man’s fall and potential salvation are shown in connection with the ideas of Good Government, as in the program of the Fonte Gaia, and the exemplars of Virtue in the lives of Roman heroes, as in Bartolo’s Antechapel frescoes. The depiction of Furius Camillus, among the Roman

\textsuperscript{310}Solberg, 1991, 945-6.
\textsuperscript{311}On the identification of the Roman heroes see Paul Schubring, Die plastik Sienas im Quattrocento (Berlin: Grote, 1907), 55-56. See also Sabine Hansen, La loggia della mercanzia in Siena (Siena: Arti Grafiche Viti-Riccucci, 1992) and Piergiacomo Petrioli, “Anomalie iconografiche: brevi considerazioni sulle sculture della Loggia della Mercanzia di Siena” in Riconoscere un patrimonio (Galatina : Congedo, 2007). On the attribution of Furius Camillus see Rubinstein, 1958, 207.
\textsuperscript{312}Hanson suggests the figure, badly worn, may represent Rome and thus good government. Hanson, 1965, 31.
heroes sculpted on the bench, provides further evidence of the successful diffusion of
Siena’s Roman foundation story in the same period as Bartolo’s frescoes were painted
and the ornament of Quercia’s fountain was determined.

Good Government, the use of Roman Republican heroes, and the dangers of
tyrrany are continual themes in the frescoes, sculpture, and monuments in Siena’s civic
center; from Simone Martini’s Maestà, Lorenzetti’s frescoes in the Sala dei Nove, and
Taddeo’s frescoes in the antechapel, to Quercia’s Fonte Gaia, the benches of Loggia della
Mercanzia, and the frescoes of the Sala del Conciostoro (1529) by Domenico Beccafumi;
the portrayal of Virtues and Roman heroes serve as consistent reminders of the city’s
values and beliefs. The Fonte Gaia was the most visible of these programs since any
passerby could admire its sculpture. Quercia’s virtues were notable models that were
naturally influential in Siena and beyond.

**Influence of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia in the fifteenth century**

The fountain’s iconography was so important that it was adopted by artists active
as far away as the court of Niccolò d’ Este in Ferrara. A poem written in Siena by
Giovanni Marrasio, a Sicilian who lived in Siena and subsequently Ferrara, seems to be
the source for the diffusion to that city of the Fonte Gaia’s iconography. Marrasio
celebrated the great Sienese civic monument in a poem in which he associates the *Fonte
Gaia* with the fountain of youth. After reading the poem, Carlo Marsuppini, the

---

314 “[…] Algentes ardent, et sunt in amore furentes Quam primum biberint pocula dulcis aquae. Huc, Leonarde, veni sacros haustare liquores, Sic iuvenis fies; sic in amore furens. Postquam marmoribus gelidoque in fonte resedi, Plena fuere mihi corda dolore gravi. Vellem divini raperent mea corda furores Ad quos me hortaris dive poeta tuis[…]” English translation: “Freezing they burn and raging with love are
chancellor of Florence, responded to Marrasio in a letter, writing, “That night in a dream I saw myself taken away to the bosom of the Muses, immersed in the Fonte Gaia.” The sculptural program of the fountain, which included nine female figures enthroned in niches (the Virgin Mary and the Virtues) was thus transformed into the pagan muses in Marrasio’s poem and the subsequent correspondence with Marsuppini. Stephen Campbell has identified a group of paintings by artists active in Ferrara, such as Angelo Maccagnino, Michele Pannonio, and Cosmè Tura, who had modeled their painted muses upon Quercia’s fountain reliefs. He notes the combination of features from the reliefs that provide the pose for each muse. The contrapposto pose of Maccagnino’s Urania is derivative of Faith [Fig. 30]; Pannonio’s Thalia is a reversed form of Prudence [Fig. 31]; and Tura’s original design for Calliope recalls a combination of both Prudence and Justice.

On the basis of the evidence that Marrasio’s poem was dedicated to the Florentine humanist Leonardo Bruni and the confirmation of the Florentine Marsuppini’s correspondence, a similar diffusion of the Fonte Gaia’s iconography in Florence should exist. Certainly the influence of Sienese models would hardly be surprising considering the cities’ competition with one another. Sandro Botticelli, an artist who frequently

they, as soon as they drink a cup of the sweet water. Come, O Leonardo, and draw the sacred liquor; so you will become young, so rage in love. After I first bathed in the marble-cooled fount my heart was full of bitter anguish; I wished that divine frenzy would seize my heart, a frenzy to which your own, O divine poet, invites me.” Cited from Campbell, 1995, 162, note 37. For the complete text of “Marasii Siculi ed Leonellum Aretinum: De laudibus Fontis Gai”, see Carmina illustrium poetarum italorum (Florence, 1720, VI), 251-252.


316 “It can now, however, be shown that over the following decade the Virtues of his (Marrasio) beloved Fonte Gaia began to appear in the paintings of Angelo Maccagnino of Siena and his collaborators, transformed into the Muses of Belfiore.” Campbell, 1995, 166.
worked in the circle of patrons that comprised the Neoplatonic court of Lorenzo de’ Medici, demonstrates the assimilation of Quercia’s style. His first documented work is a seated Virtue painted in 1470.\textsuperscript{317} The Virtue is one of a series that once decorated the Tribunale della Mercanzia, the court of appeal for the five major Florentine merchant guilds.\textsuperscript{318} Botticelli’s Virtue demonstrates his knowledge of both Ferrara’s Muses and Siena’s Fonte Gaia. Whether that knowledge may be linked to the dissemination in Florence of Marrasio’s poem is uncertain, although it seems plausible, given the visual evidence. Regardless of its precise origins, Botticelli’s Virtue had a profound impact on the remaining virtues in the Mercanzia cycle, which served as the link between the earlier commissions in Ferrara and Siena and the Virtues painted thereafter.

The Mercanzia was a central institution in Florence. The bankers, wool, cloth, silk and apothecaries guilds looked to it to settle disputes and ensure the free exercise of trade. The court was composed of six Florentine merchants (five from each of the major guilds and a sixth representing the minor guilds). These were referred to as the ‘Six’ of the Mercanzia while the seventh officer, the Ufficiale forestiere or foreign magistrate, resided in the palace. The court’s seven judges were referred to in the seven painted Virtues that were depicted on a spalliera above their seats. It is relatively certain that the paintings functioned as models of civic virtue within the court.\textsuperscript{319} Tommaso Soderini, a

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{317} Fortitude is the artist’s earliest documented work. Bettina Wadia, \textit{Botticelli} (Verona: Mondadori, 1968), 29.
  \item \textsuperscript{318} Gene Brucker, \textit{Renaissance Florence} (New York: Wiley and Sons Inc., 1969), 147.
  \item \textsuperscript{319} In this case the term \textit{spalliera} indicates a type of fixed paneling attached to the wall. The disposition of the paintings is noted in the commission document. Alison Wright, \textit{The Pollaiuolo Brothers, The arts of Florence and Rome} (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005), 228 and 240. On \textit{spalliera} paintings see Anne B. Barrault, \textit{Spalliera Paintings of Renaissance Tuscany: Fables of poets for patrician homes} (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994).
\end{itemize}
Medici supporter on the board of operai for the project, facilitated the employment of the young Botticelli despite an earlier agreement made with Piero del Pollaiuolo for the commission.\footnote{According to the Anonimo Magliabechiano even though Botticelli was still inexperienced at the time he had a powerful supporter in Soderini. \textit{Il Codice Magliabechiano}, Ed. Carl Frey (Berlin: Grote, 1892), 104. See also Wright, 2005, 230.} The Mercanzia’s accord with the interests of the Medici regime was not new. Just a few years earlier, in 1466, Verrocchio’s \textit{Christ and St Thomas} sculpture for Orsanmichele had involved the intervention of Lorenzo de’ Medici himself as supervisor.\footnote{See Andrew Butterfield “Verrocchio’s Christ and St. Thomas: chronology, iconography and political context” in \textit{The Burlington Magazine} (134, 1992), 225-233 especially pages 228-32.} Nonetheless the motives that led to Botticelli’s commission seem to have been more complex than Medici compliance. As Alison Wright has recently demonstrated, the choice of Soderini’s protégé was not just an act of loyalty to the Medici but was specifically arranged to please Soderini (who had facilitated the delicate transfer of power from Piero to Lorenzo de’ Medici in 1469). At the same time the commission probably also served to keep up the momentum of the project since Pollaiuolo had failed to finish the second and third virtues on schedule.\footnote{Wright, 2005, 231.} Thus, of the series of seven allegorical virtues, in the end six were painted by Pollaiuolo and one, \textit{Fortitude}, was painted by Botticelli.

The decorative scheme of the Sienese Mercanzia, in particular the pair of splendid marble benches discussed earlier in this chapter, has been identified as a likely model for the Florentine cycle.\footnote{Wright, 2005, 233.} Considering its iconography the Sienese cycle provided an exemplary precedent, whereas it is difficult to find the influence of any earlier Florentine Virtue cycle in this regard. The Arte della Lana boasted a series of Trecento Virtues...
painted in medallions in the vault of its audience hall, and the Florentine Proconsolo had three figures of Virtues perhaps painted by Andrea del Castagno on the spalliera of the main audience hall.\textsuperscript{324} With the loss of the Proconsolo Virtues, the Mercanzia Virtues become the earliest surviving spalliera paintings in Florence serving to adorn an audience hall.\textsuperscript{325} According to Vasari, Taddeo Gaddi had also painted a series of six personifications of Virtues, now destroyed, that were also for the Florentine Mercanzia, possibly for the very same room. Little is known of the decoration. Apparently one fresco showed Falsehood, dressed in black, having her tongue cut out by Truth, nude beneath a transparent veil accompanied by a verse underlining that Truth acted at the behest of Justice to silence Falsehood’s tongue.\textsuperscript{326} Within the realm of sculpture other local models include the seven reliefs on the south side of the Campanile and eight in the lower panels of the south door of the Baptistery by Andrea Pisano, Agnolo Gaddi’s designs for those on the Loggia dei Lanzi in Piazza Signoria, and the cycle by Orcagna on the tabernacle of Orsanmichele. Conversely, none of these examples provide plausible prototypes for the monumentality of form or swelling drapery that instead characterize the painted virtues of the Florentine Mercanzia.\textsuperscript{327}

Siena’s Mercanzia benches provide the closest chronological relationship. The two benches sculpted with virtues and Roman heroes, as we may recall, deliberately

\textsuperscript{324} Barriault notes the record in the libro di Antonio Billi of the painted wooden spalliera from the Palazzo di Parte Guelfa. Barriault, 20. Wright, 2005, 240, n. 75.
\textsuperscript{325} Wright, 2005, 204.
\textsuperscript{327} Wright notes however that Piero’s Charity wears a flaming crown that is similar to the type found in the equivalent figure on the Orsanmichele tabernacle. Wright, 2005, 233.
evoked the virtue and authority of the nine consuls of Siena’s Mercanzia. The same principle was adopted in Florence as the seven painted virtues mirrored the values of the court’s judges. The deliberate reference to the virtues on Quercia’s Fonte Gaia has already been discussed with relation to the Sienese Mercanzia benches. However, the impact of the Fonte Gaia on the Florentine Mercanzia cycle has yet to be studied despite the fact that a convincing formal relationship exists. In their sculptural monumentality and comparably long, swelling torsos and small heads, the Mercanzia virtues reflect the style of the reliefs from the Fonte Gaia.

There are numerous similarities between the Florentine Virtue cycle and Quercia’s fountain suggesting that the Sienese monument was studied carefully. The most important stylistic connection is established by Botticelli’s figure of Fortitude. Chronologically Botticelli’s commission was assigned when Pollaiuolo had yet to complete the second and third virtues (respectively Faith and Temperance) and all of the other virtues (Hope, Justice and Prudence). Most scholars agree that Pollaiuolo effectively had only finished the figure of Charity. Charity was probably positioned in the center of the cycle since she appears crowned as queen of heaven. Here Charity assumes the position that was commonly accorded the Virgin in public fourteenth-century pictorial cycles, as for example in Ambrogio Lorenzetti’s great fresco in the Palazzo Pubblico in Siena, where the Virgin is associated with Justice. A similar

---

330 Southard, 1979, 85.
association is at work in the depiction of Charity who adopts the usual portrayal of the Virgin in the form of the Madonna lactans evincing her maternal nature.\footnote{Freyhan, 1948, 84.}

Botticelli’s \emph{Fortitude} is shown in martial dress holding a baton. She sits frontally on her throne, her head tilted slightly to the right. In her attenuated proportions and the position of her legs she is essentially the reversed pose of Quercia’s \emph{Faith} [Fig. 32]. Furthermore, instead of conforming to the Florentine type of Fortitude (shown with a lion’s skin and club), her military garb and attributes are taken from the more common depiction of Fortitude as seen on Quercia’s fountain.\footnote{The Florentine type of Fortitude evokes the qualities of Hercules on the Florentine seal and on the south door of the Baptistery in Florence. Wright, 2005, 240.} The Mercanzia Virtues follow closely the organization of their respective sisters on the Fonte Gaia. While the exact disposition of the paintings is debatable, the most recently proposed order for the \emph{spalliera} figures reads Fortitude, Temperance, Faith, Charity, Hope, Justice and Prudence, running from left to right.\footnote{The order is put forth by Alison Wright who agrees with Cruttwell for the central position occupied by Charity. Wright suggests that the cycle was installed according to order of execution and for the case of Prudence and Justice on the study of the shape of the dais to establish their position. Wright, 2005, 241. Maud Cruttwell, \textit{Antonio Pollaiuolo} (London: Duckworth, 1907). Ettlinger instead placed Justice in the center of the cycle. Leopold David Ettlinger, \textit{Antonio and Piero Pollaiuolo} (Oxford: Phaidon, 1978).} By inverting the positions imagined for Temperance and Prudence the paintings follow the fountain’s organization precisely: Fortitude, Prudence, Faith, Charity, Hope, Justice, and Temperance (excluding the figure of Charity who replaces the Virgin in the Mercanzia cycle).

While it is clear that Botticelli was probably aware of Quercia’s Virtues, he also made some important changes which may well have been drawn after Ferrara’s Muses. Quercia’s Virtues were not seated perfectly straight against their thrones. Their busts
were erect while their legs were turned slightly to the right or left with their legs crossed at the ankle. Botticelli’s *Fortitude*, in comparison, sits erect with her legs facing directly in front, slightly apart so as to form a diamond shape with the monumental folds of her gown. Of particular interest is the fact that her right foot extends beyond the throne. This extension of the foot into the viewer’s space is a characteristic feature of the Muses of Ferrara. In particular Botticelli seems to have looked at *Erato* who also sits frontally on her throne, head tilted slightly to the right; a similar diamond pattern is formed by the drapery over her legs and her right foot projects substantially beyond the platform of her throne. [Fig. 33] Indeed none of Quercia’s Virtues present the same extension of the foot beyond the throne’s platform.

Additionally, the Mercanzia Virtues sit on elaborate thrones similar to those painted in the Ferrara cycle. Ferrara’s Muses sit on thrones placed in open settings. They create a fence-like enclosure around the figure whose head is framed by the open sky. In the Florence cycle some of the thrones are enclosed by a low parapet while others have higher enclosures that resemble the thrones of the Ferrara cycle. The Mercanzia thrones are of two basic types. The first is composed of a marble parapet that frames the throne surmounted by an elaborate barrel vault while the figure’s head is framed by a lunette. The second type, first employed by Botticelli, simplifies the throne by eliminating the marble enclosure; the figure’s head is no longer confined by the lunette but overlaps it.

The timeline for the execution of the paintings illustrates that Botticelli’s *Fortitude* was completed before the majority of other Virtues. It has been duly noted that Botticelli’s work determined several changes which Pollaiuolo adopted in his own
Pollaiuolo begins to move the figures forward so they dominate the picture field and their heads start to overlap the lunettes of their thrones. Pollaiuolo also picks up the softer draping of the mantles and a greater sense of three dimensionality that Botticelli had accentuated in his work, and both features derive from Jacopo della Quercia.

Apart from the figure of Justice the attributes of each of the Mercanzia virtues corresponds with those of the same figure on the Fonte Gaia. Justice is shown with both a sword and the orb of the world as opposed to the more familiar scales. These are the same attributes borne by the Virtues in the chapel of the Palazzo Pubblico and in the Cathedral of Siena. The last three paintings of Hope, Justice and Temperance also show the influence of Botticelli’s work in the thrones. Pollaiuolo experimented with the thrones after Botticelli’s work, first eliminating the marble enclosure (Hope and Justice) and then reverting back to a marble enclosure in his last work (present in the case of both Prudence and Temperance).

The influence of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia may thus be extended to a wider range of fifteenth-century art, including painting and sculpture, than was previously suspected. As a result, the well-known relationship between Michelangelo’s art and that of Quercia has a firmer historical foundation than scholars have assumed. In chapter three I shall discuss what happened to the Fonte Gaia over the course of history, and deal specifically

335 The influence of Quercia’s Porta Magna on sixteenth-century artists has been duly noted, especially in the case of Michelangelo. In particular Quercia’s work as capo maestro on San Petronio in Bologna. According to Beck the first phase of work in Bologna occupied the artist from 1426-1428 and a second phase datable from 1429/30 to the end of his life. Beck, 1991, 125. Seymour notes “The power of Jacopo’s Genesis designs, with their accent on restraint of action and clear monumental relationship between figures find few manifest echoes in the Quattrocento; rather, the great epic of the Sistine ceiling seems to have been the major work to gain from Jacopo’s discoveries”. Seymour, 1973, 72.
with the reasons the fountain fell into ruin and why it was finally removed from the Campo in the nineteenth century.
Chapter Three
A History of Disrepair: The Vicissitudes of
Jacopo della Quercia’s Fonte Gaia

Introduction

Over the course of the six centuries that it stood in the Piazza del Campo, Quercia’s Fonte Gaia fell victim to circumstances that caused and then aggravated its disrepair. In this chapter I shall analyze the intrinsic nature of the material used to carve the fountain, the configuration and function of the monument, as well as the conditions it was subjected to in its location on the Piazza del Campo. These issues are fundamental to understanding its condition when it was removed in the nineteenth century and gaining a better understanding of its history today. More recently, restorations and cleaning have helped to preserve Quercia’s marbles, and these operations will be discussed in this chapter, with full details provided in the appendix.

Reasons why the Fonte Gaia was damaged in situ: Quercia’s choice of materials

The contract between Jacopo della Quercia and the Sienese commune for the Fonte Gaia dated January 22, 1409 required that the artist produce a preliminary drawing (Item 1), determined the duration of the project (Item 2), and outlined how Quercia was to be paid (Items 6 and 7). However, it did not specify the material that was to be used to sculpt the fountain. [Doc 1] Item 10 reads, “That said master Jacopo is obliged to make or make sure that the work on the figures described above in Siena be, as they should, polished, according to the work of good masters, doing everything stated here [above] in
good faith and without fraud." It would seem then, since the type of marble was not specified, that the choice of local marble was assumed. Apparently no need was foreseen to provide any further instruction; local stone was inexpensive and easily transported. Unfortunately, this choice also contributed to the fountain’s eventual decay.

The most prized sculptural material during the Renaissance came from the Tuscan town of Carrara, located northwest of Florence. White marble, such as that from Carrara, was highly valued by sculptors during this period because of its intrinsic qualities and because most ancient examples of sculpture were made from it. The growing interest in Roman sculpture, and the qualities of the marble itself (color and durability), made Carrara marble ideal for architectural sculpture. Furthermore, employing marble from Carrara was for many sculptors and patrons a guarantee; it was the first step in assuring the quality of the final work, as an inscription on the façade of the Cathedral of Pisa (begun in 1063) attested.

Quercia, however, choose to sculpt his Fonte Gaia not from this durable and precious material but rather from a porous local marble quarried from an area of the Apennines known as the Montagnola Senese, west of Siena. As I shall

336 “Item, ch’el ditto maestro Iacomo sia tenuto e debba fare e curare che le figure de’ lavorio soprascitto siena et essere s’intendano lastranti, second el corso de’ buoni maestri, faciendo tutte le predette cose a buona fede e senza frodo.” January 22, 1409 (and June 1, 1412) ASS, Opera Metropolitana, Diplomatico. Cited in Beck, 1991, vol. II, 349. As Beck, I too have also chosen to place the document under the original date of January 22, 1409 as opposed to citing the date it was copied June 1, 1412.


339 The fountain was likely sculpted from the variety known as giallo avorio or giallo venato. Giallo avorio has a predominantly ivory background with both white and yellow undertones with some characteristic veining consistent with the marble used for the Fonte Gaia. Giallo venato could have also been used but its more dominant veining was less suited for figural carving.
illustrate, the choice of indigenous stone was natural, although not ideal, for the construction of a public monument in fifteenth-century Siena.

Tuscan sculptors had been using Carrara marble since antiquity. It was the preferred stone of the Pisani in the thirteenth century, and over the course of the sixteenth century white marble became the customary material for large-scale figure carving of the highest quality, first in Italy and then in France. But it was Michelangelo who paved the way for the use of Carrara marble when he completed his David in 1504. Michelangelo’s predilection for Carrara marble was notorious, and at times, he would travel directly to the quarry in order to oversee operations, such as when he spent eight months in Carrara quarrying marble for the tomb of Pope Julius II. This practice of personally supervising the extraction of materials was sometimes emulated by later sculptors.

Because the building materials had to be brought to their intended sites, the transportation of stone became a significant expense for most projects. The movement of materials was both arduous and expensive, and thus since antiquity most construction made use of local resources. When materials had to come from farther afield, the most cost-efficient method of transporting stone was by water, and even this could be cost-

---

341 This colossal sculpture was originally intended to crown one of the buttresses of the dome of the Cathedral of Florence, instead it was placed in the civic center of the city in front of the Palazzo Pubblico. The block of marble used for the David was allocated almost accidentally to Michelangelo. In 1466 the block had been extracted from the Polvaccio quarry (Carrara, Apuan Alps) and in order to reduce its weight prior to transport the figure had been blocked out. The mason, however, had miscalculated the figure and the block lay unused until it was finally given to Michelangelo in 1501. Penny, 1993, 54. On the location of Michelangelo’s David see Saul Levine “The Location of Michelangelo’s David: The Meeting of January 25, 1504” in *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 56, 1974, 31-49.
prohibitive.\textsuperscript{343} For example, even in cases during the Renaissance when building stone could travel entirely by water, as in the transport of stone from Istria to Venice, the cost was still more than double the quarrying fees.\textsuperscript{344} Additionally, when the stone had to travel overland as part of its journey the costs could be even higher. Such was the case when Carrara marble was needed in Florence. It had to travel a long and expensive three legged-journey: from Carrara’s coastal marina to Pisa, where the blocks would await the rainy season when the waters of the Arno were high, then from Pisa to Signa, and finally from Signa to Florence. The last leg of the journey was inevitably by land because the rapids at Signa made further transport by water impossible. Thus the blocks had to be unloaded at Signa and travel the last fifteen kilometers by oxcart.\textsuperscript{345} The total cost of the journey was often far more expensive than the stone itself.\textsuperscript{346}

Unlike Florence, Siena had no waterway for the transport of stone from Carrara. Logistics and expense, therefore, made the use of Carrara marble for the Fonte Gaia next to impossible. Although white marble had been used in Siena for the Cathedral sculpture (at a noteworthy cost to the Opera), a similar expense was not possible for the Fonte Gaia. One reason for this situation may have been the requirement to pay a fee to a rival, the commune of Lucca, since the quarries were at the time under that city’s control.\textsuperscript{347}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[343] Wallace, 1994, 45.
\item[345] Wallace, 1994, 57.
\item[346] For example sending Carrarese marble to Milan or Pavia entailed sailing the stone from Pisa around the peninsula to Venice and then loading the blocks onto barges and sending them up the canals of the Po valley into Lombardy. Evelyn Welch, Art and Society in Italy 1350-1500 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 54.
\item[347] Lucca had control of Carrara from 1322-8 and 1404-33. See Klapische-Zuber, 1969, 27-32 and 80-1. The second period just about coincides with the rule of Paolo Giunigi, lord of Lucca from 1400 to 1430. See Michael Bratchel “Lucca, 1430-94: The Politics of the Restored Republic” in The “Other
It is unusual that the contract for the Fonte Gaia did not specify the type of marble to be used. Normally, materials were listed in detail to safeguard the permanence and to insure the beauty of the work of art. As Welch noted, patrons were usually careful to specify the type of stone they wanted since this made a difference in the eventual appearance and longevity of the work. Hard-wearing stones were more difficult to carve but lasted well over the centuries just as softer limestones and marbles were easier to manipulate but did not resist adverse weather conditions as well. When Carrara marble was required in Siena it was specified in the relevant contract, as in the case of the agreement between Michelangelo and Piccolomini for their altar in Siena’s Cathedral.

Without marble from Carrara, three possible local stones were left to choose from: *Arenaria Pliocenica*, *Pietra da Torre* and *Montagnola Senese*. *Arenaria pliocenica*, also called *tufo impietritto*, was a type of sandstone and the oldest and most abundantly used in Siena. The nucleus of the city is primarily constructed of this stone which is also a component of the geological substrata of the city. *Arenaria* is also the least resilient of the three building materials used in Siena. The fifteenth-century Palazzo Spannocchi is a late example of the use of *arenaria*. Its poor resilience made the Renaissance façade, designed by Giuliano da Maiano, require restoration in the nineteenth century by the

---


348 Welch, 1997, 54.


Sienese architect Giuseppe Partini. The fragility of arenaria and its increasing scarcity over the centuries brought about a decline in its use. On the other hand Pietra da Torre, was still abundant in the medieval period. It was especially popular for the construction of the house towers (case-torri) of the thirteenth century, as its name implies. The Rocca Salimbeni, the Palazzo Pubblico and the Ospedale of Santa Maria della Scala are all examples of buildings constructed of this stone. For external decorative elements such as colonnettes, coats of arms, and cornices, marble from the Montagnola Senese was preferred because it was available in several different colors. This type of marble was very popular for interior revetments during the Baroque period. The Fonte Gaia was built from this type of marble because it was the best suited local stone for decorative carving. Because it is soft this type of marble was also undoubtedly easier to carve than Carrara marble, thus permitting sharper three-dimensional figures. The same qualities made forms subject to deterioration over time.

Several different colors of marble quarried near Siena are all generally referred to as marble from the Montagnola. They range in color from dark grey, grey and white, to various shades of yellow (including the renowned “Giallo di Siena” or Sienese yellow Fig. 34). All of the colors of marble from the Montagnola are also spanned with
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351 The restoration took place between 1887-1882, Partini also added a new façade to the building in imitation of Maiano’s. Two other operations were effected in the twentieth century respectively in the 60’s and 70’s. F. Fabiani, M. Giamello, G. Guasparri, G. Sabatini, and A. Scala, I materiali lapidei dell’architettura senese: l’arenaria pliocenica (“tufo impietritto”); il supporto scientifico all’intervento di restauro di Palazzo Spannocchi (Siena: Nuova Immagine, 2001), 39-40.

352 The main types are: broccatello, giallo ocra, giallo venato, rosato, giallo avorio, calacatta, bianco arabescato, grigio perla, and bardiglio. Marco Giamello et al., 2003, 25. Raniero Gnoli “Marmi Antichi” in Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo e la Documentazione, Ed. Gabriele Borghini (Roma: De Luca, 1997), 16.
irregular veining. A view of the section of the south-east side of the bell tower of Siena’s cathedral (Campanile del Duomo) reveals such variation, where ten shades of the marble were used in construction. Another notable example is the polychrome pavement of the cathedral which occupies a surface area of 2,500 square meters. The biblical stories and allegories represented on the floor are populated by some fifty-six figures achieved thanks to the combination of different colored marbles from the Montagnola. The loggia della Mercanzia, the loggia del Papa, the cappella in Piazza del Campo, and the façade of the church of San Raimondo were all constructed using the same local marble. Outside of Sienese territory marble from the Montagnola was employed starting in 1321 on the façade of Orvieto Cathedral and toward the middle of the fourteenth century on the construction of Santa Maria del Fiore in Florence. While this local marble had been used successfully in the construction of various buildings in Siena, its use for the construction of the Fonte Gaia was problematic because the monument functioned as a fountain.

The unusually porous marble from the Montagnola is particularly prone to weathering, because its softer composition results in an accelerated erosion of the stone’s surface. In 2003, a study conducted by the University of Siena revealed that the high level of degradation of the marble was directly linked to the presence of veins and
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353 Sonia Mugnaini, I marmi della montagnola senese; inquadramento geologico del territorio di provenienza, aspetti litologici e impiego nell’edilizia monumentale (Università di Siena, Dipartimento di Scienze Ambientali, Sezione di Geochimica Ambientale e Conservazione del Patrimonio Culturale Lapideo, 21 Giugno 2007), 4.
nODULES OF CARBONATE MINERAL CALCITE PRESENT IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE STONE. Such deep veining is more easily penetrated by water which provides access for weak acids (such as acid rain) to compromise the structure of the stone over time. Essentially water acts as a sort of catalyst that sets off a damaging mechanism that proved disastrous for the integrity of Quercia’s sculptures. The fountain water mixed with precipitation and various pollutants found in the atmosphere, causing significant deformations in the appearance and structure of the marble. Water compromised the structure of the stone, leading to more severe damage as the marble, ever more vulnerable and frail, was unable to withstand even normal conditions. While several other factors augmented the disintegration of the fountain, the most disastrous was certainly the poor choice of marble. A contrasting case is Perugia’s Fontana Maggiore, similarly located in a high-traffic square, which despite more years of wear, is better preserved. It was more judiciously built of white marble and red stone, as the good condition of the reliefs testify.

Apart from the type of stone employed, it appears that even the quality of the Montagnola was questionable. It was common practice in the Renaissance for artists to be responsible for procuring materials. In fact all artists who headed workshops furnished their tools; painters provided their pigments (including the valuable blue and gold for gilding) and sculptors, especially for major sculptural commissions, supplied their stone as Donatello did for his Prato pulpit. Quercia was expected to follow these norms and to

357 Giamello et al., 2003, 29.
358 For more on the Fontana Maggiore please see my discussion in chapter one.
select the stone for his Fonte Gaia. \(^\text{359}\) Indeed, we learn from an additional clause in the 1409 contract that Quercia could purchase marble, lime, and other materials without having to pay tax on them. This arrangement may have tempted Quercia to choose a less expensive marble deliberately in order to pocket differences in cost. I contend this was unlikely for two reasons: first, the cost of the marble was usually deducted from the total compensation to the sculptor, and second, we know that Quercia had allocated the task of procuring the stone to a stonemason. Thus it was he who supplied the faulty stone. \(^\text{360}\) It is probable that the preoccupation of dealing with furnishing materials directly was simply too much of a burden since Quercia was working on the Giunigi commission in Lucca at about the same time. \(^\text{361}\) The experience, however, did teach Quercia a valuable lesson. From this point on, he personally supervised the extraction of marble for his projects, as he did in the quarries near Verona where he sourced the marble for the main portal of the church of San Petronio in Bologna (1425-1434). \(^\text{362}\)

---

\(^\text{359}\) Glasser, 1977, 47.


\(^\text{361}\) Paolo Giunigi, the early Quattrocento merchant-prince of Lucca, had commissioned the famous monument for his wife Ilaria del Carretto. Ilaria died in childbirth in December of 1405. The carving and assemblage of her memorial monument is generally dated 1406-1408. See Seymour, 1973, 33. Quercia was, however, still working in Lucca in March of 1416 when Paolo Giunigi provided him with a safe-conduct to return to Lucca and work there unmolested (after the unfortunate accusations of 1413 when he and Giovanni da Imola were accused of rape, sodomy and theft by Giovanni Malpigli). See Hanson, 1965, 96-97.

Reasons why the Fonte Gaia was damaged in situ: Civic events and festivals [markets, Palio, buffalo hunts]

The deterioration of Quercia’s fountain was also precipitated by activities that took place in the Piazza del Campo, the center of which contained the Fonte Gaia. Soon after the fountain was installed in the fifteenth century, the square became the site of the outdoor market. Vendors of different wares (such as bread, groceries, and pottery) were assigned positions all around the fountain in Piazza del Campo.\(^{363}\) [Fig. 35] While the Piazza hosted a popular market, business of a more bureaucratic nature took place inside the Palazzo Pubblico that further contributed to the Piazza’s role as a lively center for exchange. The importance of the square grew progressively over time, and by the seventeenth century, important new offices of government were added to the already extant public salt warehouse located on the basement level of the building. The republican institutions established by the Medici (il Concistoro, la Balia, la Bicherna) were all located in the Palazzo Pubblico, and their business also drew men to the square. Their horses and carriages, parked in front of the Palazzo Pubblico, occupied part of the square. This concentration of activities enriched life in the piazza but also dirtied it, particularly the fountain.

The market, with its busy commerce, was responsible for most of the havoc created in the piazza. The fountain was used by day to wash vegetables, cloth, and animal carcasses, and by night for a series of squalid activities. When the sun set, vagabonds used the fountain as their private bathroom and apparently delighted in throwing both live

\(^{363}\) These positions had been fixed by a statute as early as the fourteenth century. Heywood, 1904, 2.
and dead animals into the fountain. Market-goers leaned, stepped, and sat on Quercia’s fountain as they gained access to its precious water. Shop owners, mobile stall owners, and peddlers threw waste on the ground in the piazza. Donkeys, used to transport merchandise sold in the market, left their excrement on the ground next to the fountain or in front of the Palazzo Pubblico, where they were tied to iron hooks and expected to wait until the end of the day when they would be used again to carry away any unsold goods.

The numerous proscriptions in the documents attest to the difficulty of enforcing rules for appropriate use of the fountain. It seems that most attempts to keep the fountain clean were a mere exercise in futility. In an ordinance from 1617, the town regulators stipulated that “no one piss, or mistreat, [or] throw dogs, cats, and dead animals in the fountain of the piazza.” A stone plaque placed on the fountain in 1660 warned users that a fine of two gold scudi would be applied to those who made “a mess of any kind within ten braccia of this fountain.” In 1695, the Bando dei Regolatori established an alternative punishment, possibly for those unable to pay the fine, of ten severe stick whips or staffilate. In 1742, the punishment for the owner of a donkey who had

---

364 “[…Ifanciulli et alter persone che s’annidano sul banchi attorno alla piazza.” ASS Regolatori 767, c.307v.
365 See Roberta Mucciarelli, Laura Vigni, and Donatella Fabbri, Vergognosa immundità; Igiene pubblica e private a Siena dal medioevo all’età contemporanea (Siena: Sienambiente, 2000).
366 “Nè possa alcuno pisciare, o far bruttare, buttare cani, gati e animali morti nella fonte e cavina di Piazza.” ASS Regolatori 767, c.217.
367 The plaque read: “negli angoli della medesima dalla parte superiore: pena scudi 2 d’oro catt.a e arb.o a chi farà immondizie di alcuna sorte, braccia X vicino a questa fonte e sua platea per il bando di Bicch.a del di XVIII ottobre MDCLX.” Giovanni Antonio Pecci, Raccolta universale di tutte l’iscrizioni, arme e altri monumenti, si antichi come moderni, esistenti in diversi luoghi pubblici della città di Siena fino a questo presente anno MDCCXXX. ASS, MS. D. 5, c. 146v. See also Balestracci et al., 2006, 116; and Gabbrigli, 1994, 314.
368 ASS Regolatori 770, c.109v.
allowed the animal to drink directly from the fountain resulted in seizure of the animal.\textsuperscript{369} In 1766, another proscription specified that water could be drawn from the fountain only in clean vases and pots.\textsuperscript{370} Despite these measures, in 1830, the basin was damaged by chaotic use. Again official notification warned that washing cloth or anything else in the fountain was prohibited, “as it was to throw stones, earth, rags, or soak wood or do anything else that can compromise or disturb the clarity of the waters.”\textsuperscript{371} The practice of using the fountain inappropriately—as a drinking trough for animals, to wash vegetables and the entrails of all types of livestock, as well as leaving oak barrels to soak—was recurrent throughout the eighteenth century and part of the nineteenth century.

In order to keep the fountain clean, maintenance men responsible for keeping the aqueducts and all of Siena’s fountains running properly, known as acquaroli, were paid by the Bicherna to sweep and clean the Fonte Gaia at least twice a week.\textsuperscript{372} The cleaning of the piazza itself was contracted out, via public auction, to a street sweeper (spazzino). The highest bidder received the exclusive rights to collect the leftovers from the market stalls. The fortunate spazzino gathered the best leftovers from the market and made an income reselling the waste as fertilizer.\textsuperscript{373} The responsibility of cleaning the piazza was taken over by the commune’s cleaning department only after the unification of Italy in 1861, Once Siena was included in Italy cleaning of the piazza was to take precedence.

\textsuperscript{369} ASC, Preunitario 99 aff. 334.
\textsuperscript{370} “[…] con vasti puliti, o di rame o di terra” Giovanni Antonio Pecci, Giornale sanese [1751-1768], BCS, ms. A.IX.6, cc.196-197.
\textsuperscript{371} “[…]come pure di gettarvi sassi, terra, cenci, tenervi in mollo legni e tutt’altro che possa impedire e turbare la limpidezza dell’acqua.” Notificazione Marzo 1830, ASC, Preunitario 1167.
\textsuperscript{372} Mucciarelli et al., 2000, 116.
\textsuperscript{373} This method of outsourcing is explicitly documented at the end of the eighteenth century. Mucciarelli et al., 2000, 117.
over the cleaning of any other piazza or road in Siena and it was to be swept more than once a day.\textsuperscript{374} This fact underlines once again the preeminent role of the piazza in the life of the city, and makes clear how dirty the piazza became over the course of one day even as late as the nineteenth century.

Throughout the history of their city the Sienese were continually concerned with protecting their fountains and waterways. They were especially worried that their adversaries could use their waterways as weapons against them, whether that meant blocking the city’s water supply, contaminating the water, or using the aqueducts as passageways into the city. From the thirteenth century on the commune imposed stern penalties to protect its most precious life source. For example, in 1262, a woman was arrested for attempting to poison the city’s fonts. As a result she was skinned alive and burned at the stake.\textsuperscript{375} Her unusually severe punishment was a successful deterrent against other such illicit acts. In order to prevent the Imperial army from using the aqueducts as an entryway into the city, in March of 1553, the Commune ordered that all of the city’s bottini be walled up, only leaving enough space for water to pass through.\textsuperscript{376} The punishment for attempting to enter the aqueducts was clearly visible on the signs posted outside their entryways: “No one shall enter the public bottini except authorized personnel. Those who do not abide by the ban risk their life. Those who do not wall up the bottini in the next two days will risk a fine of 200 gold scudi.”\textsuperscript{377}

\textsuperscript{374} Mucciarelli et al., 2000, 118.
\textsuperscript{375} Bargagli-Petrucci, 1906, vol. II, 122. See also Duccio Balestracci, Laura Vigni, and Armando Costantini, \textit{La Memoria dell’Aqua, I Bottini di Siena} (Siena: Protagon Editore, 2006), 40.
\textsuperscript{376} Florence, long time foe of the Sienese, was allied with the Holy Roman Empire and invaded Siena successfully in 1554. In 1557 Siena passed under the rule of Cosimo de’ Medici.
\textsuperscript{377} Bargagli-Petrucci, 1906, vol. II, 502-503. See also Balestracci et al., 2006, 48.
Piazza del Campo was also the site of a vast array of other activities, including numerous public manifestations, some of which were peaceful, while others transformed the city center into a place of carnage and tumult. In the Sienese museum of the Opera della Metropolitana, a painting records one of the forty-five sermons, known as Le prediche volgari, given in 1427 by the Franciscan Saint Bernardino (1388-1444; canonized in 1450) in the piazza del Campo. [Fig. 36] The Saint is shown preaching from a podium located directly in front of the Palazzo Pubblico. On the left side of the picture, in front of the Fonte Gaia, women are kneeling in orderly rows and, on the right, men are kneeling before the future saint.378 Other events in the fountain’s history were not so serene and peaceful. One such event dates to July 28, 1799, when the Tree of Liberty, set up in front of the Fonte Gaia, was used to set up a gigantic pyre. In the vast fire a howling mob burned nineteen Jews, both men and children.379 By the end of the century many years of wear and tear had definitively signed the fate of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia.

Yet another threat to the integrity of the fountain sculptures was the celebrated Palio. This twice annual manifestation of civic pride was unintentionally destroying its constantly-visible sculpted counterpart. The Palio is a sport that involves jockeys racing bareback horses around the city. The sport dates back to 1310 when the General Council established that the festival of Our Lady (Festa della Madonna) of mid-August should be

378 Their separation is a reminder of the common period practice of segregation. On the role of women in the Renaissance see Edward Muir “In some neighbours we trust; on the exclusion of women from the public in Renaissance Italy” in Florence and Beyond: Culture, Society and Politics in Renaissance Italy, Eds. David S. Peterson and Daniel E. Bornstein (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2008), 271-289.
379 Heywood, 1904, 32.
further honored by an annual horse race.\textsuperscript{380} In fact, an image of the Virgin still ornamens the banner which is given to the winning \textit{contrada} or district.\textsuperscript{381} The race is held on July 2 and August 16, although in times of particular need, the Palio could be run more frequently as it was also seen as a way to placate Divine Vengeance. This was the case in 1363 after the city was besieged by the plague. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the course for the Palio was probably run in the great Via Francigena, outside one of the gates of the city, towards the Porta Camollia. From the fifteenth century on the Palio’s course was moved within the city walls: from the convent of Santuccio, near the Porta Romana, to piazza del Duomo. It was called \textit{Palio alla lunga} to distinguish it from the \textit{Palio delle contrade} (also called \textit{Palio alla tonda}), which was run in the trapezoidal piazza del Campo.\textsuperscript{382}

The origins of the July race seem to date to a later period in the sport’s history. Girolamo Macchi recounts that the Palio held on the 2 July first originated in the year 1656.\textsuperscript{383} In any case, by the end of the eighteenth century, the Palio was run in both July and August. However, by this time the Palio alla lunga had been completely abandoned.

\textsuperscript{380} Heywood, 1904, 62.
\textsuperscript{381} The \textit{contrade}, formed in the fifteenth century, are usually presumed to represent the divisions of the city which were made for military purposes; others believe that the \textit{contrade} were from their inception associations formed to assist at the public festivals of the city. The seventeen \textit{contrade} are: Tartuca, Chiocciola, Selva, Aquila, Onda, Pantera, Val di Montone, Torre, Leocorno, Civetta, Nicchio, Drago, Oca, Giraffa, Bruco, Lupa and Istrice.
\textsuperscript{382} From the convent the course traversed Via di Pantaneto (now Via Ricasoli) and then followed Via di Città as far as the Piazza di Postierla where it continued to the right in Via del Capitano and finished in the Piazza del Duomo. Heywood, 1904, 85.
\textsuperscript{383} Girolamo Macchi held the office of Scrittor maggiore in the Spedale della Scala for the last twenty years of the seventeenth century. His zibaldoni are preserved in the Sienese Archives. ASS, Misc. Stor. Senese, vol. V, 1898, 93-95.
in favor of the Palio delle Contrade, the same race that is run around the piazza del Campo today.\footnote{Heywood, 1904, 222.}

For the duration of the Palio, Quercia’s sculptures were disfigured by viewers climbing, sitting and dangling from the fountain. Such activities, on already weathered and weakened marble, greatly aggravated the state of preservation of the reliefs and sculptures. Giovanni Antonio Pecci recounted that during the July Palio of 1743 the statue called Rhea Silvia “sullied by the passing of time and winter freezes fell into pieces” after a group of fans had climbed on to the fountain. According to the chronicler two people were injured and one person even died in the incident.\footnote{July 2, 1743: “In occasione della sopradetta corsa salendo alcuni plebei sopra una delle due statue, rappresentanti la publica Carità, e collocate nel prospetto della Fonte della Piazza, quella a sinistra, troncata dal peso, e maculata dal tempo e da ghieli, venne a cadere; uno di coloro ci morì e altri due restarono feriti, colla statua in pezzi.” Giovanni Antonio Pecci, Giornale sanese, [1732-1751], BCS, MS. A. IX. 5, c. 195. Gabbielli, 1994, 314. Pecci identified the statue located to the left of the relief of the Madonna and Child as Public Charity (publica Caritât). See also Bacci, 1936, 307. Bacci identified the same statue as Mother earth (Terra madre). For a discussion of the statue’s iconography please see chapter two. Romagnoli recounted that in 1745 the statue known as Carità fell into pieces and was put back up on the fountain in 1759. Romagnoli, 1835, 631.}

The statue apparently remained in pieces for more than a decade before it was finally restored by the sculptor Giuseppe Mazzuoli.\footnote{Mazzuoli (1644-1725) was particularly renowned for his work on Alexander VII funerary monument in Rome where he worked under the supervision of Gian Lorenzo Bernini. See Ulrich Thieme and Felix Becker, Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart (Leipzig: Veb E.A. Seemann Verlag, 1930), 318-319. Gaetano Milanesi, Sulla Storia dell’Arte Toscana; scritti varj (Siena: Sordo-Muti, 1873), 41. Arturo Viligiardi “Bozzetti in terra cotta di Gian Lorenzo Bernini rinvenuti a Siena” in Rassegna d’Arte Senese (Siena: Stab. Arti Grafiche S. Bernardino), XIII, 1920, 36-38.}

The restorations included the statue’s left arm up to the shoulder and much of the lower third of the statue: part of her vestments, her feet, the base and the lower half of the standing child. This restoration may well be the second effected over just a few years, as Ricci mentioned that, in 1740, the lower part of the statue had been restored once before by a certain Annibale Mazzanti who also worked on
some of the damaged reliefs decorated with vegetative motifs. Finally in 1759, sixteen years after the accident, the statue was returned to its place on the fountain.

**Reasons why the Fonte Gaia was damaged in situ: Natural causes**

The situation became particularly critical in the summer months when water levels became low. The month of June in the year 1851 marked a drastic situation for the inhabitants of the city center. At this time the Fonte Gaia’s waters reached a record low. The waters were overdrawn to the extent that what was left in the basin of the fountain was described as “putrid soot.” It is clear from such testimony that the situation was dreadful; the fountain structure was at risk and its function severely compromised. The fountain’s ruined state had already been noted by several important scholars. In 1823, in his fundamental work on the history of sculpture, Count Leopoldo Cicognara wrote that admirers of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia are “left saddened to see the fountain damaged to the extreme.” In addition, Ettore Romagnoli lamented the poor condition of the fountain, in 1822 and in 1835, in his biography on Jacopo della Quercia, and once again in 1840.

---

387 The statue is referred to as Charity (Carità). Ricci, 1904, 18.
388 May 1, 1759: “Nel dì primo di maggio 1759, si vedé da Giuseppe Mazzuoli scultore sanese resarcita, e ricollocata sopra la Fonte della pubblica Piazza, quella Statua già lavorata nel 1419 da Iacomo della Quercia, che poi fu detto della Fonte, fatta da alcuni plebei cadere nel dì 2 di luglio 1743 in occasione che, per la corsa in Piazza, vi erano sopra saliti.” Giovanni Antonio Pecci, Giornale sanese, [1751-1768], BCS, MS. A.IX.6, c. 80. Cfr. Pecci, Ristretto delle cose più notabili della città di Siena a uso de’ foresteri (Siena: Appresso il Bonetti nella Stamperia del Pub, per Francesco Rossi Stampatore, 1759), 71; Fantastici, 1789, 44-45. See also Bacci, 1936, 308; Romagnoli, 1835, 631. Regarding the restoration see Stefano Landi, Daniela Manna and Anne-Katrin Potthoff, “Intervento di restauro sulla Fonte Gaia di Jacopo della Quercia” presented at the July conference of APLAR (vol. 2, 2009), 17.
390 “Nella fonte di Siena scolpita dopo i lavori di Bologna s’incontrano molte ripetizioni dei medesmi oggetti, e quantunque quella debbasi riguardare come il principal monumento di questo autore, null’ostante in qualche parte cede al merito d’ altre sue produzioni, sempre però lasciando dolenti gli osservatori in vederla danneggiata all’estremo.” See Francesco Leone, Barbara Steindl, and Gianni Venturi eds., Storia della scultura dal suo risorgimento in Italia fino al secolo di Canova del Conte Leopoldo Cicognara per servire di continuazione all’opere di Winckelmann e di D’Agincourt (Bassano del Grappa: Istituto di Ricerca per gli Studi su Canova e il Neoclassicismo, 2007 [Prato: Giachetti, 1823], vol. IV, 79.
when he wrote that the Fonte Gaia sculptures are “deformed and broken by the hands of man more so than from the passing of time; scorn the Sienese for they should have safeguarded the fountain.” These remarks may have been the catalyst to restore the fountain. The first official request to remove the fountain from the Piazza del Campo was articulated soon afterwards.

**Reasons why the Fonte Gaia was damaged in situ: Vandalism**

Besides the damage unintentionally caused by civic functions and natural circumstances, deliberate acts of vandalism also ruined and disfigured some of Quercia’s marbles. Already in 1468, less than fifty years after the fountain had been completed, one of the central relief panels had been damaged. The head and one of the arms of an angel, located next to the central relief of the Virgin and Child, were broken. It is likely that the incident took place when onlookers, probably in order to get a better view of the bull hunt in the piazza, had climbed onto the fountain. A picture of the sport is provided by Agostino Provedi who described the bull hunt of August 15, 1546 in the following terms: “Near the fountain of the piazza was prepared a great enclosure, made of ilexes like wood, for a park for the wild beasts; and therein were put hares, foxes, porcupines,  


392 August 15, 1468. We are told the statue was restored by an unknown artist following a request made by the Concistoro. Bargagli-Petrucci, 1906, vol. I, 238, vol. II, 418-419.

badgers, stags, wild boars, bulls and a bear."[394] Thereafter, in 1501, the Sienese court passed an ordinance punishing any offenders who damaged the fountain. The punishment included a fine of 300 ducati and violators were even prohibited from entering the city for three years.\(^{395}\) Punishments aside, however, the bull hunt continued to be practiced for more than a century in Piazza del Campo. The perilous sport was finally suppressed, in 1590, by an edict of Grand Duke Ferdinand I, which followed an earlier ban imposed by the Council of Trent.\(^{396}\)

In the sixteenth century at least two other incidents also injured the fountain’s sculptures. The first episode, recorded by Sigismondo Tizio, involved the complete loss of one sculpture already discussed in chapter two: the seated boy from the parapet of the fountain.\(^{397}\) The second episode concerned the figure of Justice. At some point the figure’s head was broken off necessitating a restoration to re-attach the head to the body. The restoration, however, created a rather unsightly dissonance between the head, neck and body that was noted by many scholars.\(^{398}\) [Fig. 39] While the details of the incident are unknown, it is easy to imagine that the damage was caused by any of the risky

---

394 “Fra le caccie celebri, che in Siena fossero date in occasione della Solennità fuddetta di quella fì fa feciale ricordanza fegguita il di 15 d’Agosto 1546. In questa dunque preparato preffio alla fonte di Piazza un gran chiufo di lecci a guifa di bofco per parco delle fiere vi fipofero lepri, volpi, ifrici, taffi, cervi, cigniali, tori, ed un orfo. Cited from Agostino Provedi, Relazione delle Pubbliche Feste date in Siena, negli ultimi cinque secoli fino alla venuta dei reali sovrani Ferdinando III e Maria Luisa Amalia.” Agostino Provedi, Relazione delle Pubbliche Feste date in Siena negli ultimi cinque secoli (Siena: Bindi, 1791), 47.


396 Heywood, 1904, 203.

397 For this discussion see page 80.

activities that took place in the piazza. In fact, once the bull hunt was abolished in the square, another equally hazardous sport replaced it: races on buffalo back.

The buffalo race ran three times around the piazza within established barriers. The barriers were of little consolation, as one of the regulations stipulated that should the buffalo break through the fence then the animal should resume the race from the same spot from where it had left the course.\textsuperscript{399} We can only imagine the effects of a charging buffalo on onlookers who must have been quick to seek refuge on Quercia’s fountain in order to get out of the way. Even seemingly innocuous celebrations could become a potential source of danger for the fountain sculptures. For example, in 1717, during the festivities organized for the visit of princess Violante of Baviera, Governess of Siena, the fountain was adorned with a balustrade and statues holding torches, and wine was made to flow from the mouths of the wolves instead of water.\textsuperscript{400} [Fig. 40] Participants lounged on and around the fountain as if at a celebration for Bacchus rather than at a political rally.

The general disrepair of the fountain is recorded in a letter to the Commune in 1786. The fountain sculptures are described as missing arms, heads, and other decorative elements.\textsuperscript{401} A specific request was made to replace the statues of the wolves which must have been in an even worse state than the rest of the sculptures, since shortly thereafter

\textsuperscript{399} Heywood, 1904, 207
\textsuperscript{400} By Domenico Rossi, April 12, 1717. Violante served as Governess of Siena from 1717 to 1731; she was appointed by her father-in-law Cosimo III dei Medici. Girolamo Macchi, \textit{Palazzi di Siena e stemmi di famiglie nobili di Siena e dei luoghi dello Stato}, ASS, ms. D 106, c. 50r; Girolamo Macchi, \textit{Memorie}, ASS, ms. D 107, c. 830r. Cfr. engraving printed in Pellegrini, \textit{Palazzi e vie cit.}, 41. Also in Mucciarelli et al., 2000, 123f.; Gabbrielli, 1994, 315.
\textsuperscript{401} Letter dated May 13, 1786: “Al segretario del Regio Governo, Questi bassi rilievi adesso li vedo tutti rovinati; dove mancano le teste, dove i bracci, dove mezzi busti e dove i fregi ed i contorni [...]” BCS, Miscela di ricordi diversi, E.V.3, n.17. Gabbrielli, 1994, 315-316.
(June 4, 1789) new statues were sculpted for the fountain by Matteo Pini and Lorenzo Ricci.\footnote{Bandini recounts that the marble to sculpt the new wolves arrived from Carrara on May 25, 1788. Antonio Bandini, \textit{Diario sanese}, [1788], BCS, MS. D.III.4, c. 31. Ibid., [1789], BCS, MS. D.III.5, cc. 59v-60. \textit{“Nell'Anno corrente 1789 alle replicate istanze del Pubblico, mal sodisfatto di certi mostruosi muriccioli fabbricati dal soppresso Uffizio della Biccherna in surrogazione dell’antiche Lupe infrante, vi furono collocate le nuove Lupe di Marmo d'intiero rilievo eseguite dal Marmista Matteo Pini.”} Bernardino Fantastici, \textit{Campione di tutte le fabbriche, strade, piazze, fonti, acquedotti, canali e cloache pubbliche appartenenti alla comunità di Siena, MDCCCLXXXIX}, Ed. Carlo Cresti (Siena: Periccioli, 1992), 45. Cfr. P. Pecci, \textit{Giornale sanese}, [1787-1794], BCS, MS. A.IX.8, c. 13.} One of these wolves, that sculpted by Pini, may be identifiable with the one situated on the landing in the stairwell of the Palazzo Pubblico.\footnote{Gabbrielli, 1994, 316. It was, however, Seymour who first noted that the statue did not appear to be carved by Jacopo della Quercia. See Seymour, 1973, 46 and fig. 44. On Matteo Pini see Thieme-Becker, vol. XXVII, 60. \textit{“[…] per sino l’interiora d’ogni specie di bestiami.”} ASC, Postunitario, Carteggio X.A, ctg. XIV, b.19. Mucciarelli et al., 2000, 119.} Reports that the fountain continued to be used inappropriately recur in nineteenth-century documents. The \textit{bottiniere} Vincenzo Gani (who was responsible for the upkeep of the aqueduct) reported that the waters were used to rinse meats, vegetables and “even the entrails of every type of animal.”\footnote{\textit{“[…] per sino l’interiora d’ogni specie di bestiami.”} ASC, Postunitario, Carteggio X.A, ctg. XIV, b.19. Mucciarelli et al., 2000, 119.} He also wrote that “urine filters and drains into the basin of the fountain” from the base (\textit{platea}) where many use the fountain as a bathroom.\footnote{\textit{“ […] l’orine filtrano e sgrondano nell’interno della detta vasca.”} ASC, Postunitario Carteggio X.A, ctg. XIV b.19. See also Mucciarelli et al., 2000, 119.} By now the fountain’s waters were at risk of serious contamination as, we are told, fluids drained into the fountain from the public urinals located next to a nearby building, the \textit{Casino dei nobili}. The problem was not resolved until 1811 when the outflow of the urinals was finally channeled into the sewer.\footnote{The sewer head was located next to the fountain. ASC, Preunitario 241, 325, 423, css. Mucciarelli et al., 2000, 119.} In sum, as this section makes clear, the poor quality of materials, the monument’s location and neglect, and the uses of the square over the
course of history were responsible for the disastrous condition of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia in the nineteenth century.

**Section Two: Removal of the fountain**

**Motivation for the fountain’s removal**

By the middle of the nineteenth century the condition of the fountain was so dire as to warrant its removal from the Piazza. This decision was instigated by the desire to preserve Quercia’s sculptures from further ruin and to ameliorate the appearance of the square. On July 18, 1844, Gaetano Milanesi, at the time a young scholar of art history, together with Gaspero Pini, an engineer, asked that the ruined fountain be dismantled and suggested that a copy be made to replace it. In their letter to the commune they indicated what type of marble should be used for the copy and how to go about financing the project. [Doc 2] The frame of the fountain should be made of marble from Montarrenti, Vallerano or Gerfalco (Sienese territory) and the statues should be sculpted in the more prestigious and durable marble from Seravezza or Carrara (Apuan Alps). They calculated the cost of the copy (one hundred thousand lire) and explained that since the care of Siena’s civic patrimony should not be the duty of the government alone, every citizen should help finance the project via a public subscription of funds payable over the course of five years. Milanesi and Pini calculated that if half of the population (10,000 citizens) paid a fee of two lire the necessary amount would be collected. The fee, they

---

Milanesi was a member of the prestigious Accademia della Crusca. In 1889 he became Director of the Sienese Archives. See Petrioli, 2004. ASC, Preunitario. Atti magistrali 545 (1844), cc. 219 e 226. The letter is dated July 18, 1844. See also Gabrielli, 1994, 317-318.
reasoned, was more than affordable considering that wealthier citizens would surely subscribe to pay more than the estimated fee.

In hopes that the commune would approve the project, the men also attached a poster to their letter illustrating how they imagined the promotion of the public subscription. In the text of the poster, published by Porri (Siena, 1844), Milanesi stressed his high opinion of Jacopo della Quercia, describing him as the “splendor of the Sienese school”. They intended “to bring [Quercia’s] noble monument back to life.” Moreover the monument is defined as the artistic emblem of Siena’s native son. [Doc 3] While the city magistrates, Gonfaloniere Mario Nerucci together with the priors, approved the project immediately, stating that “the community shall feel no negative repercussions [from the decision], on the contrary not small benefit and profit,” the Sienese were not yet prepared to cooperate, at least financially. Thus, even though the commune had approved the project on August 19, 1844, public support waned and the removal of the Fonte Gaia was put off for another decade. 

---

409 “Il Gonfaloniere, e i Priori residenti del Civico Magistrato di Siena, veduto il Progetto presentato dai Signori Gaspero Pini ingegnere, e Dott. Gaetano Milanesi per rifare la Fonte della pubblica Piazza del Campo, e la lettera colla quale essi dichiarano il modo che sarà tenuta affinché il lavoro proceda con tale diligenza e giudizio, da essere di satisfaicione dell’universale: e conosciuto altresì che per ciò che le si appartiene sulla Fonte medesima la Comunità non può risentirne danno nessuno, ma anzi vantaggio e beneficio non piccolo; approvano in tutto il Progetto medesimo, e concedono licenza ai suddetti Pini e Milanesi di poter rendere pubblico per l’organo della stampa, previa l’annunzio del Podestà locale; riservandosi nella prossima adunanza di deliberare in proposito, secondo le forme consuete.” ASC, Preunitario, Atti magistrali 545 (1844), c. 220.
The fountain continued to deteriorate. Its poor condition was recorded in a letter in which the Administrative District’s Engineer (Ingegnere del Circondario) warned that “many stones are loose and shaky around the fountain, and they could at any time fall and break considering how worn they are today.” In view of the fact that no record of payment was made at this time, the commune may have purposely delayed conservation in hopes that the fountain’s dramatic state would demand public attention. Over the course of roughly a decade, from 1844 to 1857, the public perception of Quercia’s monument changed, enough to bring about its removal and replacement finally. This was largely due to the pivotal role that Gaetano Milanesi had in calling attention to the Fonte Gaia’s plight.

**Milanesi’s crusade to save the Fonte Gaia**

Milanesi’s writings reveal two goals. The first was the removal of the fountain and the second was to prompt the Sienese to provide the financial support necessary to commission a copy. Between 1854 and 1856, Milanesi had published three essential volumes of documents (Documenti dell’arte senese) on Sienese art history that led subsequently to the discovery of several new documents pertaining to the commission of the Fonte Gaia. Through the means of his pen Milanesi was able to call attention to the fountain’s plight. Between 1854 and 1856 he wrote, “It is not without our great shame that this beautiful monument [Fonte Gaia], the only that remains in the city by such an

---

411 The letter is dated August 1, 1844. “[…] si sono venute a scommuovere più e diverse pietre attorno alla fonte della Piazza del Campo, le quali possono ad ogni momento cadere, e spezzarsi del tutto oggo essendo alquanto consunte.” ASC, Informazioni e Atti magistrali 518. Gabbrielli, 1994, 317.
excellent artist [Jacopo della Quercia], is without repair and worn to the extent that today it is almost completely lost.”

His description is paralleled visually in a photograph of the fountain from 1857 preserved by the Alinari Archives in Florence. [Fig. 41] In his renowned edition of Giorgio Vasari’s *Lives of the Artists* from 1857, Milanesi warned that, “If the charity of the Sienese does not reawaken in time then just a few years remain before this beautiful work [Fonte Gaia] will no longer exist to the shame of the Sienese.” The essence of his argument, to rouse interest and financing, was that Siena’s artistic patrimony was in the hands of her citizens and it was their civic duty to protect that patrimony.

One of the motives behind Milanesi’s high esteem for Quercia’s fountain was undoubtedly Giorgio Vasari’s influential description of the artist. Vasari’s analysis not only swayed Milanesi’s opinion but also shaped the perception of Jacopo’s art until the nineteenth century. In all probability the attentive reading of Vasari’s *Vite* made by Milanesi for his eighteenth-century re-publication stimulated his request to remove Quercia’s ruined fountain. For Milanesi it must have been significant that Vasari had placed Quercia’s biography at the very beginning of his second age (seconda età). In both editions of his *Vite de’ più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architettori* (1550 and 1568) he wrote, “Having chosen the abovementioned Jacopo for the honor of beginning the

413 “E non è senza grande vergogna nostra, che questo bellissimo monumento, ed il solo che resti alla città dell’arte di così eccellente maestro, sta oggi con non riparabile danno ridotto a tale, da doversi stimare quasi in tutto perduto.” Milanesi, 1878-85, vol. II, 117, n. 1 from the Life of Jacopo della Quercia.

414 Florence, Alinari Archives, n. 9073, dated 1856. Also published in Hanson, 1965, figure 3.

415 “Che se la patria carità de’ Senesi non si ridesta in tempo, pochi anni ancora passeranno, che questa bellissima opera, con grandissima loro vergogno, non sarà più.” Vasari in Milanesi, 1878-85, 117, n. 1 from the Life of Jacopo della Quercia.

Second Part, I will follow the order of the various manners, and proceed to lay open, together with the Lives themselves, the difficulties of arts so beautiful, so difficult, and so highly honored.”417 This position was all the more significant because Quercia’s biography opened a new period in Vasari’s history of art that was symptomatic of intense renewal. His art was not an example of decline, which for Vasari meant the gothic era, or of the start of the first phase of a new era, but instead his art was the promise of the blossoming second phase:

[…] wherein there will be seen infinite improvement in everything; invention more abundant in figures, and richer in ornament; more depth and more lifelike reality in design; some finality, moreover, in the works, which are executed thoughtfully and with diligence, although with too little mastery of handling; with more grace in manner and more loveliness in coloring, so that little is wanting for the reduction of everything to perfection and for the exact imitation of the truth of nature.418

In particular regarding Quercia’s art Vasari specified:

They had a manner of their own, so much more graceful and more natural, and so much richer in order, in design, and in proportion, that their statues began to appear almost like living people and no longer figures of stones, like those of the first age; and to this those works bear witness that were wrought in that new manner, as it will be seen in this Second Part, among which the figures of the Sienese Jacopo della Quercia have more movement, more grace, more design, and more diligence […]419

---

418 “[…] la seconda età: dove si vedrà infinitamente migliorato ogni cosa; e la invenzione più copiosa di figure, più ricca d’ornamenti; ed il disegno più fondato e più naturale verso il vivo, ed inoltre una fine nell’opra condotte con manco pratica, ma pensatamente con diligenza; la maniera più leggiadra, i colori più vaghi: in modo che poco ci resterà a ridurre ogni cosa al perfetto, e che elle imitino appunto la verità della natura.” Vasari, Vite, Ed. Milanesi, 1878-85, 103. I have preserved original spelling of text.
419 “Ed ebbono una lor maniera tanto più graziosa, più naturale, più ordinate, di più disegno e proporzione, che le loro statue cominciarono a parere presso che persone vive, e non più statue come le prime; come ne fanno fede quelle opere che in quella rinnovazione della maniera si lavorarono: come si vedrà in questa seconda parte, dove le figure di Iacopo della Quercia sanese hanno più moto e più grazia e
For Milanesi it must have been particularly pleasing to see that his forefather had been described in such complementary terms. More important still was the realization that Vasari had put aside his penchant for Florentine artists in order to highlight the Sienese sculptor. In this sense one finds Jacopo’s biography followed by those of the notable Florentine sculptors Nanni di Banco, Luca della Robbia, Lorenzo Ghiberti, Filippo Brunelleschi, and Donatello even more poignant.\textsuperscript{420} Vasari had also called attention to Querica’s masterpiece, the Fonte Gaia. This sculpture, above all others, had sealed Jacopo’s fate, for he was known “forever thereafter no longer as Jacopo dalla Quercia, but as Jacopo dalla Fonte, or of the fountain.”\textsuperscript{421} In subsequent contracts and payments his name is given simply as “Jacopo della Fonte.”\textsuperscript{422} From this analysis it is possible to view Milanesi as heir to Vasari’s legacy in a different light, for not only did he continue Vasari’s work (by adding a commentary of corrections to his text and an appendix of new documents that he had discovered in the Sienese archives), but he also shared the same admiration and respect for Jacopo della Quercia and his art.

\textsuperscript{420} Indeed Alberti, who influenced Vasari, had singled out four Florentine sculptors and Masaccio as the founders of the art he praised. In the dedication of his De Pictura from 1435 he wrote “[…] I recognized in many, but above all in you Filippo, and in our great friend the sculptor Donatello and in the others, Nencio [Ghiberti], Luca [Della Robbia], and Masaccio, a genius for every laudable enterprise in no way inferior to any of the ancients who gained fame in these arts.” English translation cited from Anthony Grafton, \textit{Leon Battista Alberti, Master Builder of the Italian Renaissance} (London: Lane, 2001), 72.

\textsuperscript{421} “[…] che non più Iacopo dalla Quercia, ma Iacopo dalla Fonte fu poi sempre chiamato.” Vasari, \textit{Vite}, Ed. Milanesi, 1878-85, 116.

\textsuperscript{422} See the contract for San Petronio March 28, 1424 in Milanesi, 1854-56, vol II, doc. 86, 125-127. He is called again “Maestro Jacomo di Piero detto de la Fonte” in a payment of 1430 for the Siena Baptistery Font in Bacci, 1929, 262.
The Fonte Gaia project was, for better or worse, instigated by Milanesi’s great commitment to the protection of the arts. His admonitory counsel led to the resurrection, in 1857, of the 1844 project by a new committee established to oversee the removal of Quercia’s fountain and supervise the new commission of Sarrocchi’s fountain. Count Carlo Corradino Chigi (1802-1881) was elected chairman of the organizing committee. He was a military captain, a member of the senate of Tuscany from 1848-9, and later nominated Gonfaloniere of Siena. His affiliation set the tone for the project, as both his position and his name helped to acquire the financial backing of some of Siena’s leading families. Another particularly influential member was the Director of the Sienese Academy of Fine Arts (Accademia Senese di Belle Arti), Luigi Mussini (1813-1888), who I believe determined the choice of Tito Sarrocchi for the new monument’s commission (see chapter four). Other members included Gaspero Pini, the engineer who had elaborated the 1844 project along with Milanesi, and Augusto Ficalbi, who served as the director (provveditore) and judge of the Palio of July 2, 1852. The new organizing committee, after the successful acquisition of funds, hired Tito Sarrocchi to carve the new fountain. We are told that the new fountain was supposed to be “a copy in marble in everything the same and as similar [to Quercia’s Fonte Gaia as possible].” This notion, however, is a moot point, and accordingly, I shall discuss it in the following chapter.

---

424 He was nominated on April 28, 1859.
425 He became Director in 1851.
426 “Intenzione nostra è adunque che della Fonte di Piazza si debba fare una copia in marmo in tutto eguale e somigliantissima [...].” See Document Two.
Reasons for the revival of the restoration project in 1844

After a decade of inaction, the revival of the 1844 project was certainly influenced by the changing political climate. I would argue that the unification had a decisive impact on the renovation project. In order to understand how this political situation may have conditioned the project, it is necessary to review some of the salient events of the unification. The unification of the Italian peninsula was a long and arduous process that took the better part of the nineteenth century. In April of 1815 Alessandro Manzoni, the famous Italian poet and novelist, wrote *Il Proclama di Rimini*, a proclamation which praised Murat’s attempt to liberate Italy from Austrian rule. Although the liberation was unsuccessful Manzoni’s famous lines—“Free we will never be if not united, despite the less strong of our flock, until a man rises to gather us”—were subsequently adopted as the motto of Italy’s struggle for independence. The man who did finally manage this feat was Victor Emmanuel II (1820-1878) who became King of Italy on February 18, 1861.

The period prior to the unification of the country, referred to as the *Risorgimento*, was marked by a great deal of military activity. The intellectual and artistic communities inevitably were swept up in the fight for national independence. By the unification of

---

427 Joachim Murat (1767-1815) was king of the two Sicilies from 1808 to 1815. He was the brother-in-law of Napoleon Bonaparte having married Caroline Bonaparte.
429 He was King of Piedmont, Savoy, and Sardinia from 1849 to 1861.
430 I am referring to Garibaldi’s Expedition of the Thousand (1860-1861) which resulted in the fall of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and later the defeat of the Kingdom of Naples. Giuseppe Garibaldi (1807-1882) was a commander of the Italian military who is considered a hero for his role in the Italian war of Independence. See Rosario Romeo, *Cavour e il suo tempo* (Bari: Laterza, 1977).
1861 practically all of the Italian states were united under Victor Emmanuel II’s rule, apart from Rome, which continued to be ruled by the Holy See under French protection, and Venice, which was under Austrian rule. A new Parliament was formed and Turin became the capital of the newly unified peninsula. Although political uncertainty characterized the period both before and after the unification, precisely this factor was propitious for the arts in Siena. On June 17, 1859, Siena was the first Tuscan commune to join the forces of King Victor Emmanuel II, a noteworthy fact that demonstrates the dynamic contributions that Siena was making toward the union of Italian states.

Sarrocchi’s fountain was commissioned on July 29, 1858, just a year before Siena joined the Kingdom of Piedmont, and two years before its unification with the rest of the peninsula. I see this chronological progression as an important signal of a new sense of patriotism that led to the desire to groom the city and, as we shall see, also record recent historical events in the form of grand pictorial cycles.

While for Milanesi and Pini the removal of Quercia’s fountain was vital to protecting the fountain from further damage, the decisive argument that finally led to its removal was more of a question of public decorum. The 1844 poster had stressed a preoccupation with the condition of the monument and anticipated the call to protect Siena’s artistic heritage:

[…] sure of victory only a heightened charity for one’s country, a deep love for our things, and a feeling of disgrace for the fate of this noble decoration of our city that dissolves forever, without anyone who raises his voice or moves a hand to generously save her and repair so much damage.431

431 “[…] i quali può combattere con certezza della vittoria solo una accesa carità di patria, un amore sviscerato alle cose nostre, ed un sentimento di vergogna che questo nobile Ornamento della città cada e si disperda per sempre, senza che s’innalzi neppure una voce o si muova una mano per soccorrere generosamente a riparare a tanto danno.” BCS, MS. P III 52, cc. 409-410.
Yet the removal was actually motivated by the fact that the fountain in its present state was neither a welcoming site for visitors nor the appropriate impression that Siena wanted to give the rest of Italy in light of the impending unification.

The influence of foreigners on the matter is also relevant. Travelers, especially the English, came to admire Siena’s historical monument, and their impressions of the Fonte Gaia served as a powerful tool effectively awakening the Sienese to the value of their artistic patrimony. The perception of foreigners, together with Milanesi’s counsel, was significant for a city that was beginning to see economic growth thanks to increasing tourism. John Ruskin’s opinion was laudatory when he wrote of Siena, “This town is worth fifty Florences: larger and more massy [sic] buildings in general with numbers of the triple Venetian window. A noble square, with a delicately carved fountain in white marble [Fonte Gaia] […]”. Four years later, in 1844, the poor condition of the fountain was noted by Charles Dickens who wrote that the Piazza del Campo is “a large square, with a great broken-nosed fountain in it […].” Siena would soon be joining the ranks of a new Italy, and this prospect led to the impulse to prove that she was just as beautiful as her neighbors. The perception of foreigners, together with the imminent birth of the new nation, seem to have brought out a desire to replace the fountain in Piazza del Campo and afterward, to ensure the preservation of the original monument. Thus it appears that the nationalistic ideals that stimulated a quick union with the King of Savoy ultimately also motivated the Fonte Gaia project.

---

Yet another indication of the encouraging artistic milieu stimulated by the union of Italy was the commission of a new fresco cycle in the Palazzo Pubblico. After the unification the Sienese were proud to memorialize their patriotism and thus had one of the rooms of the Palazzo Pubblico dedicated to King Victor Emmanuel II, also known as the “Padre della Patria” (Father of the Fatherland). A week after the King’s passing, on January 9, 1878, the commune commissioned the fresco decoration of the room now duly titled Sala Vittorio Emanuele II. Luciano Banchi, at the time mayor (sindaco) of Siena, explained that with this commission the commune intended to follow the “traditional history of grand Italian municipalities that illustrated the heroic deeds of their countrymen in recording the most salient facts of their lives […].” The inauguration was stipulated in conjunction with the traditional celebration of the August Palio run in honor of the Virgin. The room was decorated entirely in fresco, between 1886 and 1888, by Cesare Maccari (1840-1919), Amos Cassioli (1831-1891), Piero Aldi (1852-1888), Alessandro Franchi (1838-1913) and notably Luigi Mussini (the man who also played an important role in the commission of the new Fonte Gaia).

---

435 Luciano Banchi (1837-1887) was the director of the Sienese State Archives (Archivio di Stato) from 1867 and published along with Scipione Borghesi, Nuovi documenti per la storia dell’arte senese (Siena: Torrini, 1897).
437 The Palio was run August 16, 1890.
438 See Pierini, 2009, 71-84.
Sarrocchi carves a replacement for Quercia’s Fonte Gaia

Tito Sarrocchi was officially hired to sculpt the new Fonte Gaia on July 29, 1858, by the fountain’s supervisory committee. He had studied sculpture carving under the renowned Purist sculptor Giovanni Duprè, who as I shall explain in detail in chapter four, had recommended Sarrocchi to Luigi Mussini on the supervisory committee. The new fountain was very important because it resolved the problematic water situation that plagued the Campo in the first half of the nineteenth century. As I mentioned earlier, Quercia’s fountain was almost dry in June of 1851. Siena’s problematic water situation finally improved in 1867 when Quercia’s fountain was removed and Sarrocchi’s new fountain was installed. At this time work was done on the underground bottini in order to repristinate the flow of water to the city center.

The fountain was moved 1.6 meters to the south and 9.6 meters to the west of Quercia’s fountain.\textsuperscript{439} While the new fountain continued to face the Palazzo Pubblico, it was now centered between the two narrow streets (vicoli of San Pietro and of San Paolo) behind it. Thus, the fountain’s position in the square became more symmetrical and, as Carlo Carpellini records, altogether more pleasing.\textsuperscript{440} [Fig. 42] The plan devised by the architect Giuseppe Partini, hired by the organizing committee for the fountain illustrates

\textsuperscript{439} A special committee, composed of Luigi Mussini, Pietro Giusti and Gaspero Pini, was formed to oversee the relocation. Partini was hired to oversee the project on December 6, 1865. ASC, Carteggio, Cat. XIV, Lavori Pubblici 18, Fonti Pubbliche. Also see Gianni Maramai, “Posa della copia della Fonte Gaia nella Piazza del Campo” in Giuseppe Partini: architetto del purismo senese, Ed. Maria Cristina Buscioni, (Firenze:Electa, 1981), 143.

\textsuperscript{440} Carlo Carpellini recorded that, “Onde ci sembra che sia stato plaudevole partito l’aver mossa la nuova fonte dal suo luogo, e pensato a correggere questo difetto di simetria, e togliere con questa mossa una certa gibbosità che faceva la curva della piazza.” Carpellini, 1869, 23.
both sites. [Fig. 43] The new plan was confirmed by the commune in the same year.\textsuperscript{441} I believe that the organizing committee, considering the importance of the Palio which continued to be held in the Piazza and the necessity to ameliorate the water supply, calculated these factors when they proposed the fountain’s move toward the center of the square.

A much needed improvement in the flow and clarity of the fountain’s waters was a direct result of the relocation. In order to bring water to the new location, an extension was added to the preexisting system of aqueducts. While workmen were busy building the additional \textit{bottino} for the new fountain, the commune also ordered a restoration of the old \textit{bottino} of the Fonte Gaia. Thus the aqueduct was cleaned out of the mineral deposits and other debris that obstructed the water’s course.\textsuperscript{442} The new location of the fountain made the square altogether more harmonious for the activities that continued to take place there, particularly the Palio.\textsuperscript{443}

The fountain’s relocation allowed for a far more comfortable opening between the buildings and the rear wall of the fountain (Quercia’s fountain had been situated somewhat awkwardly in front of the \textit{vicolo} of San Paolo). The enlargement of the passageway behind the fountain allowed more space for the customary horse race around the square. When Quercia’s fountain was built the course for the Palio had yet to be established in the piazza del Campo. Other changes brought about at this time included

\textsuperscript{441} ASC, Deliberazioni della Giunta municipale 3, n. 489; ASC, Deliberazioni del Consiglio Comunale 3, n.210; ASC, Carteggio, Cat. XVII, Onorificenze 6, anno 1867.
\textsuperscript{442} ASC, Deliberazioni del Consiglio comunale 3, n. 260. See in particular ASC, Carteggi, Cat. XIV, Lavori pubblici 18, year 1867. Gabrielli, 1994, 320.
\textsuperscript{443} In an article entitled: “Sulla nuova Fonte di Piazza del Campo di Siena” Il Libero Cittadino, December 20, 1868 cites that the relocation of the fountain served to place the fountain \textit{“sulla sommità dell’arco formato dal circo”}. 
the decision to enclose the fountain with a gate, an idea that Milanesi and Pini had already proposed in 1844.

The gate, designed by Giuseppe Partini and founded in iron by Pasquale Franci, served to limit unauthorized use of the fountain, which in the past had contributed to its deterioration. The fountain’s layout was also modified to avoid unnecessary loitering since that area had previously been the cause of numerous sanitary problems. The base (platea) of Quercia’s fountain that is clearly visible in the 1717 engraving by Domenico Rossi for the arrival of Violante de Baviera was omitted entirely from the new project.

[Fig. 44] The base was originally flanked by two low walls (murelli) that allowed visitors a place to sit and rest. These walls had been redone in 1709 and 1797 when their surface necessitated restoration and, in 1710, when the cornice and several stones were restored near the rear entrance to the aqueduct. Despite such modifications, the fountain’s future also depended on the relocation of the public market. In 1882, the councilor of public works decided that the “unbecoming” outdoor market should be moved. The new market (mercato nuovo) was positioned instead on the other side of the Palazzo Pubblico in a square renamed Piazza del Mercato. From the piazza del Campo a passageway through the Palazzo Pubblico to the new piazza del Mercato facilitated

445 ASC, Carteggio, Cat. XVI, Lavori pubblici 18, year 1868.
446 The fountain with platea and murelli is also painted in Vincenzo Rustici’s La caccia de’tori 1585 and Giuseppe Zocchi Fiaccolata in onore di Francesco I di Lorenaa e Maria Teresa d’Austria 1739-51 both preserved in the collection of the Monte dei Paschi, Siena.
448 Mucciarelli et al., 2000, 123.
access. The relocation of the market was crucial to the preservation of the quality of the waters as the already prohibited, but ignored, washing of market goods no longer took place.

**Fate of Quercia’s sculptures after their removal from the Piazza del Campo**

One would naturally assume that once Quercia’s fountain was replaced by Sarrocchi’s it was safe from further destruction, yet Quercia’s fountain continued to deteriorate. The commune authorized the dismantling of the fountain on June 11, 1868, and almost immediately after the commencement of the project additional cracks and breaks began to appear.\(^{449}\) During the process to create manageable, movable pieces, many secondary reliefs suffered, in particular border elements, some decorated with foliage, and parts of the base. Perhaps most astonishingly, many of the most damaged reliefs were not considered worth salvaging and, according to Ricci, were thrown away in the public dump near San Domenico,\(^ {450}\) while the “best” reliefs (those least damaged), as specified by the Commune, were sent to San Francesco for storage.\(^ {451}\)

In 1869, the surviving pieces of Quercia’s dismembered fountain (the larger reliefs, lateral parapet statues and some of the better preserved secondary reliefs) were

\(^{449}\) ASC, Cat. 1 n. 9; Fonte Gaia Lavori Complementari Anno 1868. Cinelli erroneously recorded that the fountain was dismantled in 1858. Cinelli, 1975, 106. The commune’s engineer estimated that 180,000 lire would be necessary to remove the reliefs, and statues and transport them to San Francesco, 60,000 lire would be needed to take down the side walls and remove the old pavement, and lastly to repave the area 200,000 lire would be required (roughly 200 sq meters at the rate of 1,000 lire for each sq meter). He noted however that many pieces of leftover travertine and other old stones could be reused and thus, in part, could make up for the aforementioned expenses. ASC, Carteggio, Cat. XIV, Lavori pubblici 18, inserto 16, 9 giugno 1868. Gabbrielli, 1994, 321.

\(^{450}\) Ricci, 1904, 19.

\(^{451}\) ASC, Cat. 1 n. 9 Fonte Gaia Lavori Complementari Anno 1868. Doc. 9 Giugno 1868 specifies “migliori bassi rilievi”.
transferred to the Museo dell’Opera del Duomo for storage.\textsuperscript{452} It was here in the gallery of antique sculpture that they are first recorded in 1872.\textsuperscript{453} Period photographs, the first visual evidence of their degradation, show that the remnants were displayed without regard to their original layout and that no attempt was made to clean or restore them.\textsuperscript{454} This fact was noted by the art connoisseur and sculptor Pietro Giusti in his request to purchase the fountain remnants for the collection of the growing Civic Museum in Turin; on October 4, 1868 he wrote, “because of history’s wrongdoing what is left of Quercia’s fountain is but broken remnants; remnants that the commune is unable to safeguard in an orderly fashion.”\textsuperscript{455} The commune did not know what to do with the fountain pieces and thus Turin’s request was debated at length. It was only after consulting the Advisory Commission for the Conservation of Fine Arts that the commune declined, on February 21, 1869, to cede Quercia’s fountain to the museum in Turin. The commission determined that, “in one’s own country these venerable memorabilia have greater value and importance than if they were preserved elsewhere and our young artists can derive benefit from their study.”\textsuperscript{456} It is clear from the Commune’s response that the event

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{452} Gabbrielli, 1994, 312.  \\
\textsuperscript{453} AOMS, Inventario 889, n. 2475. Gabbrielli, 1994, 324, n. 53.  \\
\textsuperscript{454} Cornelius, 1896, 83-95.  \\
\textsuperscript{455} Pietro Giusti was professore d’intaglio at the Sienese Academy before he moved to Torino. “Le ingiurie del tempo avendo distrutto gran parte di quelle sculture e non restando altro che avanzi interrotti da non permettere di conservarli ordinatamente. Mi sono fatto ardito di avanzare alla S.V. questa domanda la quale non ha altro scopo che quello di dotare il nascente Museo Civico di Torino di qualche esempio di scultura senese.” ASC, Carteggio, Cat. XVII n. 1/2 1868-9, Progetto di cessione al Museo civico di Torino, Doc. 4, October 1868. The episode is also cited in Carlo Sisi and Ettore Spalletti eds., La cultura artistica a Siena nell’Ottocento (Cinisello Balsamo: Pizzi, 1994), 346; and Dei, 2011, n. 36.  \\
\textsuperscript{456} “Considerando che nel proprio paese queste venerande reliquie di un’opera d’arte che levò di se tanto grido, hanno un pregio ed un importanza maggiore che se fossero altrove conservate e possono riuscire profittevoli allo studio ed alla osservazione dei nostri giovani artisti, ai quali farà così dato di confrontare l’antica e la moderna scultura della fonte predetta.” ASC, Carteggio, Cat. XVII n. 1/2 1868-9 Progetto di cessione al Museo civico di Torino, Doc. 21, Febbraio 1869, Richiesta Respinta dalla Commissione
\end{flushright}
instigated a burgeoning protection for Siena’s artistic patrimony, a sentiment that, as we shall see, would continue to develop over the following years.

Giusti’s request not only stimulated a critical debate over what should be done with the Fonte Gaia pieces but also led to the creation of their more mindful display. The local press suggested that a new civic museum could be formed in Siena using Quercia’s fountain remnants and the remains of the Cathedral sculpture (removed as a result of the renovation to the façade) to form the nucleus of the collection. Nothing came of the idea until 1904, thirty-six years after the removal of the fountain from Piazza del Campo, when Quercia’s remnants were finally accorded a new home in the Palazzo Pubblico and displayed closer to their original configuration. At this time the art historian and museographer Corrado Ricci (1858-1934) had the fountain pieces transferred to the loggia of Siena’s Palazzo Pubblico for the occasion of the Exhibition of Ancient Sienese Art (Mostra dell’antica arte senese). Quercia’s Fonte Gaia was one of the prime attractions as it was featured on the exhibition poster. [Fig. 45]


Il Volontario, March 27, 1869.


The poster was designed by Carmela Ceccherelli, a student of the painter Alessandro Franchi. She was paid 200 lire for the job. ASC, Postunitario, Carteggio X A, cat. XXII, b 24, letter dated November 18, 1904. Cited from Cantelli and Pacchierotti, 2005, 50. On Ceccherelli see Alessandro Leoncini, Carmela Ceccherelli, una miniaturista senese allieva di Alessandro Franchi e Giorgio Bandini (Siena: Il Leccio, 1996).
To display the fountain fragments an architectonic infrastructure of brick and cement was devised. The re-composition of the various fountain pieces, the reconstruction of the base, and of all the missing borders were made in cement by Giuseppe de Ricco and his son.\textsuperscript{460} To hold the fragments to the walls, the engineers Giuseppe Barsotti and Alibrando Peccianti devised a system of iron cables, as the loggia floor could not be used to support the marbles.\textsuperscript{461} The creation of the new display protected the fountain pieces considerably more securely than they had been \textit{in situ}, as they were no longer subject to the dangerous activities that took place in the piazza (such as the market activities, bull fights, and Palio).

The loggia of the Palazzo Pubblico opens toward the new market square (\textit{Piazza del Mercato Nuovo}) and is not well protected from climatic conditions. [Fig. 46] In the winter months the sculptures were not fully sheltered from the cold or rain. The fountain pieces were thus still subject to some of the forces that led to further disintegration of the stone. Humid conditions such as those in the open loggia have been shown to create the same effects as the exposure of the marbles to direct rain (the chemical process produces the damaging formation of lead sulfate resulting in the loss of sculpture).\textsuperscript{462} Other superficial damage not present in 1868 when the fountain was first dismantled, such as traces of pencil and pen markings as well as dark oily residues left by the hands of

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{460} Ricci, 1904, 19. \\
\textsuperscript{461} The floor was supported by a wooden frame work (visible from the Sala del Mappamondo) that could not be used for support because it could fall in, damaging the frescoes on the wall below. Ricci, 1904, 19. \\
\textsuperscript{462} Landi et al., 2009, 21. I would like to thank Daniela Manna (one of the restorers who worked on the Fonte Gaia project) for her time. The content of their paper has also been published in Toti and Dei eds., 2011, 170-189.
\end{footnotesize}
uncontrolled visitors, were a result of poor conservation conditions in the loggia. [Fig. 47]

Despite the harmful conditions, period sources still found the new display to be nothing short of miraculous. For example, Giovanni Poggi considered:

[…] every fragment is in its proper light and rightful place and the virtues, even if mutilated and ruined by water and age, are nonetheless testament of the elegance and beauty of the spirit of a potent artist who knew the force, the grace, the sweetness and violence, the masculine force and the feminine gentleness, that together with the suave figure of Ilaria created the Michelangelesque prophets of the Portal of San Petronio.463

However, the new display was far from ideal. There were two main problems with the organization of the exhibit. The first concerned the location (the loggia), which did not lend itself well to the display of a fountain, and the second pertained to errors made in the re-composition of the fountain pieces. A simulacrum of the original architectural scheme was devised to mimic the trapezoidal form of the fountain, and each of the three loggia walls was used to display a wall of the fountain. The architecture of the loggia three doorways and three sets of walled bifora windows interrupted a continuous presentation of the reliefs and divided them unnaturally into independent reliefs. Corresponding to the loggia’s left side wall were the lateral parapet statue (the so-called Acca Larentia), and the reliefs depicting the Creation of Adam and two virtue

463 “Ogni frammento è nel suo posto e nella sua luce: e le figure delle Virtù, se anche mutile e ròse dall’acqua e dall’età, ci attestano quanti tesori di eleganza e di bellezza accogliesse nel suo spirito quel possente artista, che conobbe la forza e la grazie, la dolcezza e la violenza, la virile energia e la muliebre gentilezza, e assieme alla soave figura di ilaria immaginiò i michelangeloleschi profeti della porta di S. Petronio.” Giovanni Poggi, “La mostra d’antica arte senese” in Emporium (n. 20, 1904), 44. Gabbirelli, 1994, 325, n. 55. Poggi (1880-1961) was Soprintendente alle gallerie fiorentine and is probably best known for his publication of archival documents relating to the decoration of Florence Cathedral. See Giovanni Poggi, Il Duomo di Firenze: documenti sulla decorazione della chiesa e del campanile tratti dall’archivio dell’opera [Berlin: Bruno Cassirer, 1909] republished in two volumes with an additional commentary by Margaret Haines (Firenze: Medicea, 1988).
reliefs, while on the back wall were displayed the Madonna and Child flanked by angels and four virtues, and on the right side wall the lateral parapet statue (the so-called Rhea Silvia), the *Expulsion of Adam and Eve* and the two remaining virtues. [Fig. 48] The serious damage to the reliefs and the large number of lost pieces made the original composition difficult to evoke. In fact, ten pieces were placed in incorrect positions, eleven pieces located in a questionable arrangement (due to their level of degradation), and at least one piece was installed upside down.\textsuperscript{464} From Gabbrielli’s chart it is clear that the tools that Ricci had at his disposal in 1904 to create an accurate reconstruction of the fountain were not sufficient.\textsuperscript{465}

Period photos of the fountain taken *in situ* in 1857 were only useful for the collocation of the reliefs visible in the photographs (those facing the piazza) such as the central reliefs. The side walls can not be seen well in the photographs because of heavily cast shadows.\textsuperscript{466} Due to the errors made in the re-composition of the fountain, it would seem then that Ricci had been left to fit the original pieces together like a puzzle. As Gabbrielli correctly points out, Ricci was probably not aware of the drawings that the artist Giovanni Bruni had made of the fountain in 1839.\textsuperscript{467}

\textsuperscript{464} Gabbrielli, 1994, 327.
\textsuperscript{465} Gabbrielli, 1994, 326.
\textsuperscript{466} Photo in the Alinari Archives, n. 9073 and a photo by Lombardi published for the inauguration of Sarrocchi’s new fountain in Banchi et al., 1869. Both photos are taken frontally and therefore are of little use for a re-composition of the side walls which are not clearly visible.
The relationship between Bruni’s drawings and Sarrocchi’s sculptures

Giovanni Bruni (1804-1864) was an able draftsman; at just eighteen he had already won a silver medal for his drawings. Bruni had studied drawing at the Sienese Academy of Fine Arts (Istituto di Belle Arti) under Francesco Nenci and at Pietro Benvenuti’s school in Florence. However, Francesco Nenci (1827-1850) had a formative effect on Bruni’s career and fueled his interest in the conservation of monuments. He was an active member of the committee for the conservation of monuments in Siena. In 1838, the state of preservation of Sodoma’s frescoes in the chapel of St Catherine (San Domenico) was of primary concern. Nenci suggested Domenico Monti, Giovanni Vanni and Giovanni Bruni for the restoration of the fresco cycle, stating that the latter was specifically suited for the restoration of small figures. Nenci recommended Bruni for the restoration of local monuments on several other occasions, such as for the preparation of the cartoon used for the mosaic of the Coronation of the Virgin for the façade of the Cathedral in Orvieto. The design, as noted by Carlo Sisi, is clearly derivative of Sano di Pietro’s fresco in Siena’s Palazzo Pubblico. It was not unusual for the artist to hark back to the work of earlier artists as, throughout the 1830’s and 1840’s, Bruni was heavily influenced by the ideals of the Nazarenes, a brotherhood of German painters who had settled in Rome around 1810.
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470 “per rifare diverse piccole figure mancanti negli ornamenti” AISAS, Filza 3 (1838-1842), n. I. See Sisi and Spalletti, 1994, 250.  
471 Luigi Fumi, Il Duomo di Orvieto e i suoi restauri (Roma: Società Laziale Tip., 1891), 114.  
472 Sisi and Spalletti, 1994, 259.  
473 Sisi and Spalletti, 1994, 319. See in particular Bruni’s Incoronazione della Vergine for Santa Maria in Provenzano painted in 1849 where the influence of Friedrick Overbeck (one of the founders of the
The Nazarenes set out to purify art by reviving the spirit and style of early religious painting following Medieval and Renaissance tradition. The archaism of their style was admired by many artists whose influence inspired other art movements such as the English Pre-Raphaelites and Sienese Purists, whom I shall discuss in chapter four. In 1850, at the death of Nenci, Bruni became the Professor of Drawing (*Maestro di Figura*) at the Academy where he had studied years before.  

Bruni’s drawings of the Fonte Gaia, especially those of secondary decorative elements (located on the outside walls of the fountain), would have been very useful for Ricci in his re-composition of the fountain in the loggia since none of these aspects were visible in the extant photographs of the monument. [Fig. 49] While Bruni’s drawings have been studied in relation to Ricci’s re-composition of the fountain, they have not been explored together with Sarrocchi’s fountain. Bruni’s drawings were commissioned by the commune upon request of the *Gonfaloniere* Giovanni Pieri, and although the exact purpose of the drawings is presently unknown, it is probable that ideas regarding a possible and even imminent removal of the fountain may have already been circulating in Siena. Indeed Bruni’s drawings were made in 1839, just a few years before Milanesi and Pini’s documented request of 1844.

---

Nazarene Brotherhood) is evident; or, for example, Bruni’s *Rifugium Peccatorum* for Sant’Agostino, Siena presented in 1852 inspired by Florentine Cinquecento painters.

474 Sisi and Spalletti, 1994, 379.
476 The drawings have been dated to the year 1839. Cornelius, 1896, 81, n.1 An undated document that references the commission has since been located in the archives in a folder dated 1838-40 which further confirms Cornelius’s attribution. ASC, Carteggio del Gonfaloniere, Affari diversi, 554. See Gabbrielli, 1994, 326, n. 61.
Bruni’s drawings of the Fonte Gaia form an album of ten folios, each sketched with a different view of the monument including plans, prospects, and a great number of carving details.\footnote{The album is located in the Biblioteca Comunale degli Intronati (MS. E.I. 7/2). On Giovanni Bruni see Sisi and Spalletti, 1994, 223-278.} It is clear from an analysis of his album that such attentive drawings were aimed to preserve a memory of the monument \textit{in situ} [Fig. 50], and may well represent an early attempt at a plan for the ruined monument’s copy. [Fig. 51] This is an important point, as we shall see, because Bruni and Sarrocchi were almost contemporaries who had worked together on at least one occasion. In fact, the floor of the Marsili Chapel in Siena’s Misericordia cemetery was made by Sarrocchi’s studio after one of Giovanni Bruni’s designs in 1858.\footnote{Sisi and Spalletti, 1994, 346.} What is relevant to my thesis is the relationship between Bruni’s drawings and Sarrocchi’s new Fonte Gaia.

Bruni’s drawings do not depict just the damaged fountain but many of them illustrate an idealized reconstruction of Quercia’s reliefs. In these folios Bruni has integrated areas of ruin with creations of his own imagination, just as Sarrocchi did when he carved the new Fonte Gaia. It is difficult to discern to what extent Sarrocchi may have used Bruni’s drawings, if at all. Certainly, this would not have been unprecedented, since Bruni’s drawings had been used by another sculptor, Pietro Giusti, for a small ivory copy of the fountain made in 1857.\footnote{See note 455. It was later displayed at the \textit{Esposizione Universale} of Paris in 1867. Giusti had also asked for plaster casts to be made of the fountain but his request was denied. AISAS, Filza 7, 1857, n. 13. Cited in Sisi and Spalletti, 1994, 346. See A. Pavan, “Dell’intaglio e della scultura in legno” in \textit{L’Italia alla Esposizione Universale di Parigi nel 1867. Rassegna critica descrittiva illustrata} (Firenze: Le Monnier, 1867), 319-325.}
The relationship between Bruni’s drawings and Sarrocchi’s monument is made explicit in a comparison of the two. There are interesting similarities, such as in the depiction of the Madonna and Child and in the cases of Charity and Prudence but there are also notable differences in style and form. For example, in both the drawing and the actual relief the Madonna and Child are shown in almost identical positions, but Sarrocchi varies the position of the child’s head, which is slightly tilted to the right (toward the Virgin). It is likely that the similarities between the two depictions can be explained by their mutual reliance on Quercia’s original Madonna and Child relief, which had survived. In this case the original relief was intact except for the missing head of the Christ child, the very feature that was different in Sarrocchi’s work compared to Bruni’s. [Fig. 52]

Another interesting correlation is revealed in the study of the Virtue Charity. Both artists show the Virtue with two small children in almost the same position (On the right one baby is shown nursing and on the left a sleeping toddler lies across the Virtue’s lap). [Fig. 53] Sarrocchi, however, places the child farther to the left of the composition. Sarrocchi may have adopted the general composition of Charity from Bruni’s drawing, since both Quercia’s relief and the nineteenth-century cast do not preserve the figure entirely. [Fig. 54] Stylistically, however Sarrocchi’s relief is markedly different from Bruni’s drawing. A comparison of Sarrocchi’s Virtue to a fresco in the Sala di Costantino in the Vatican Palace helps us to understand the differences.
In the Sala di Costantino, a figure of Charity, painted by the school of Raphael, is seated with three small children. She is shown nursing two babies, one in each arm, while a third child, a bit older, stands to her left side and reaches an arm up toward her chest. Her head is tilted down, slightly to the left, and her wavy hair is parted in the center and pulled behind her head. [Fig. 55] Despite notable differences from Sarrocchi’s representation, such as the medium (fresco vs. marble relief) and the number of children (three vs. two), the figures have a startling physical resemblance. Both figures of Charity are positioned with head tilted, hair parted in the center and tied behind the head. Both have narrow oval faces, straight bridged nose, equally small and delicately contoured lips, and deep set eyes that direct their gaze down toward one of the two children on their laps. [Fig. 56]

A similar correspondence also exists between Sarrocchi’s relief of the Virtue Justice and the same depiction in Bruni’s drawing. Both artists place a sword in Justice’s left hand and a set of scales which dangle from her right hand over her knee. [Fig. 57] There is no indication of the presence of scales in Quercia’s relief or Sarrocchi’s plaster cast which instead show a fractured hilt and sword in Justice’s left hand. Her right forearm, which must have been in very high relief, is entirely missing. [Fig. 58] The fifteenth-century drawing of the fountain, although following a different iconographic
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480 This room is the largest of the four rooms that comopose the Stanze di Raffaello. The larger fresco program depicts Sant’Urbano I between Justice and Charity. However, its paintings were not begun until Pope Julius and Raphael had died. The room’s frescoes are dedicated to the victory of Christianity over paganism with scenes from the life of the Roman Emperor Constantine. The frescoes designed by Raphael are by Giulio Romano, Giovanni Francesco Penni and Raffaellino del Colle. See Rolf Quednau, Aspects of Raphael’s Ultima Maniera in the Light of the Sala di Costantino (Rome: Edizioni dell’Elefante, 1986) and Joseph R. Giuffre, Design in Raphael’s Roman Workshop (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University 2008) in particular chapter five on the Sala di Costantino, pages 124-156.
program (chapter two), also shows Justice with just a sword. Thus it is possible that Sarrocchi integrated the scales in his rendition of the virtue after Bruni’s drawing. Yet unlike Bruni’s drawing, Sarrocchi’s Justice is proportionally analogous to Quercia’s figure (even though the original relief has incurred an almost complete loss of the background). Bruni instead portrays a massive, mannish figure that is very different from the leaner, more feminine versions sculpted by Sarrocchi or Quercia.

There are a number of other discrepancies between Bruni’s drawings and the monument as executed by Sarrocchi. A comparison of Sarrocchi’s Expulsion relief and the same depiction in Bruni’s drawing is particularly illustrative. The position of the figures (Angel, Adam and Eve) in Bruni’s drawing follows the composition illustrated in a prominent fifteenth-century copy of Quercia’s original relief, located above the door of the Piccolomini library in Siena’s Cathedral. Interestingly, Sarrocchi did not take this up. Sarrocchi changed the position of Adam’s head, so that it is no longer engaged with the angels but at about a three-quarter turn. He also reduced the space between Adam and Eve, so that Adam’s head overlaps Eve’s shoulder. The position of the Angel’s head is also changed, so that he appears to be looking at the ground and not at Adam and Eve. These changes alter how the drama unfolds. Sarrocchi makes the Angel appear almost apologetic and Adam more accepting of his fate.

The discrepancies between the way Bruni and Sarrocchi reproduce the Fonte Gaia demonstrate that the nineteenth-century perception of Quercia’s art could vary

---

481 Hanson, 1965, 57.
considerably. In this regard, while the iconography is almost the same, there is a noticeable difference in the two works’ style that is not entirely accounted for by their different mediums. Sarrocchi’s figures are fuller and rounder, and the anatomy of his figures (whether covered by drapery or not) is more naturalistic. Note, for example, the schematic drawing of Adam’s abdomen in the Creation scene in Bruni’s drawing compared with the attentive study of the real anatomy of the male form in Sarrocchi’s relief. [Fig. 60] Numerous other details also varies, as in Adam’s supporting arm and the position of the toddler in the relief of Charity, areas that were missing in Quercia’s original reliefs and that therefore had to be invented by the artists. These discrepancies seem to reinforce the notion that while Sarrocchi was probably aware of Bruni’s drawings, he nonetheless elaborated his subjects independently.

It is interesting to note that Bruni also integrated another statue in addition to the two extant parapet statues; a nude male figure stands in contrapposto over the parapet in the rear righthand corner of the fountain. [Fig. 61] This is an addition that an artist not familiar with the sources is unlikely to have made. The reference is most clearly to Tizio’s sixteenth-century history, where it is recounted that four statues once adorned the Fonte Gaia. It seems reasonable to assume that Bruni (who must have been aware of this history) was commissioned to do the drawing album with the aim of building a copy of the fountain. Thus not only do they provide a valid tool to study the organization and disposition of the monument before it was dismantled, but they may very well be considered the first plan for the new fountain given that they predate Milanesi and Pini’s idea for a new fountain by a few years. Certainly, the re-composition of about eighty fragments of Quercia’s fountain, which up until this point were derelict in San Francesco,
was a crucial step towards the conservation of the monument as well as a signal of a renewed appreciation for Quercia’s art.

Section Three

The cleaning of Quercia’s fountain pieces

From the creation of the simulacrum of the architectural framework in 1904 to the display of Quercia’s fountain in Santa Maria della Scala in 2011 Quercia scholars have been able to study the Fonte Gaia only as it was arranged in the loggia of Siena’s Palazzo Pubblico. As the previous sections have made clear, the fountain’s poor condition and inaccurate reconstruction have made it difficult for scholars to study Quercia’s original marbles accurately. Moreover, since as early as the fifteenth century surface encrustations (biological and organic elements, fungi and bacteria), graffiti, and dirt have plagued the remains of Quercia’s fountain and further complicated the reading of its reliefs and sculptures. Some of these problems have altered the appearance of Quercia’s sculptures, such as the relief of the Virgin and Child, which until only recently was covered with a thick layer of dirt and other encrustations that created the impression of very high relief and more defined modeling. [Fig. 62]

It was primarily because of its sad state that the Opificio delle Pietre Dure in Florence decided to restore the fountain in 1989. The project can be divided roughly
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483 Prior to the 2011 exhibit only a few of Quercia’s fountain pieces were on display (see my note 2).
484 The various phases of work involve the participation of the Scientific Laboratory of the Opificio delle Pietre Dure, the Soprintendenza ai Beni Storici Artistici ed Etnoantropologici di Siena, Dipartimento di Scienze Ambientali-Sezione di Geochimica ambientale e Conservazione del Patrimonio Culturale Lapideo of the University of Siena, l’Istituto di Elettronica Quantistica of the C.N.R of Florence. The restoration team was initially comprised of Carlo Biliotti, Roberto Nesti, and Roberto Manni who began the restoration
into two distinct phases, from 1989 to 2000 and from 2000 to 2010, based on the differentiation of restoration methods that characterize each period. The introduction of a new restoration method in the second phase resulted in an important discovery, as traces of polychromy were found on Quercia’s marbles. In this section I shall survey the principal methods employed to clean and restore Quercia’s fountain in order to understand better the results acquired through the restoration. This information is fundamental to a better understanding of the condition of the marbles before and after the intervention of the Opificio and to an evaluation of the benefits of such efforts for future interventions. I then shall use these results and extant archival documents, period photographs of the restoration process, and firsthand interviews to reevaluate the appearance of the monument in the Renaissance.

The primary concern for the restoration team was to clean the marbles and to preserve the integrity of the stones. Currently, the restoration project is complete and all of Quercia’s marbles have been stabilized and cleaned. In 1989 when, after close to a century in the loggia, Quercia’s fountain was dismembered again, the removal from the loggia was a new threat to its structure and stability. Recall that at the beginning of the century Quercia’s marbles were set in cement within the framework created for the 1904

under the Director of the Opificio, Annamaria Giusti. Biliotti physically directed the removal of the fountain’s right wing and both of the lateral parapet sculptures. He restored the figure known as Acca Larenzia and together with Manni the reliefs from the right wing of the fountain while Roberto Nesti restored the figure often called Rea Silvia. In 1995 Daniela Manna, Stefano Landi and Anna Katrin Potthoff (all former students of the Opificio) took over the restoration project. They continued to work on the project under the current Director of the Opificio, Alessandra Griffo, and the curator of Santa Maria della Scala in Siena, Enrico Toti.

485 The schede tecniche are located in the Archives of the Opificio delle Pietre Dure: Cartella 10484 I 567, 10484 I and II 568, 10484 III 569, 10484 IV-XIII 570, 10484 XIV-XXV 571. Part of this material has also been published see Landi, Manna and Potthoff, 2009 and 2011.

486 All of the reliefs and statues are, as of March 2011, on display in the museum of S. M. della Scala in Siena.
exhibition. So when the restoration of the fountain began, the original marbles had to be drilled free from the surrounding cement construction. [Fig. 63] This had to be done carefully in order to protect the already weak marbles from fracturing.

The fragility of Quercia’s marbles was a main concern for the restoration team. They wondered how to deal with the breakability of the marbles and test alternative cleaning techniques since the ammonium carbonate solution used to clean the marbles in the first phase was found unsatisfactory. In order to safeguard the sculptures all trials were first tested on secondary border reliefs. Another chemical process, known as resina a scambio ionico, was tried out for use on the Fonte Gaia but this too was found to be of little effectiveness and subsequently abandoned. As a result, the team began to explore the use of lasers, a new technology, in collaboration with the scientific center of the CNR (Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche) in Florence. The first trial results were promising as the laser provided a great deal more control over the removal of surface deposits and presented more homogenous results.

When in 2000, again under Biliotti’s direction, the rest of the fountain was dismantled from the loggia of the Palazzo Pubblico, the second phase of restoration privileged the use of laser cleaning. The laser chosen for the job was an EOS 1000 (model number), with the emission of radiation Neodimio YAG (YAG is a type of crystal, this conveys a wave length of 1064 nanometers) and impulses “short free running” of

487 Please see Appendix I and II where I discuss the restoration methods in further detail.
488 It should be noted that this process, although time consuming, is useful for cleaning marble with superficial deposits and is also used for the demineralization of water.
60/120 µs (that is lasting ten microseconds per impulse). In order to prepare the surface of the stone for laser treatment each marble was first dusted using soft brushes. Any bandages (fluorinated elastomer with Japanese paper) and/or plaster additions were removed using acetone or a scalpel and de-ionized water (acts as a neutral rinse). Oily residues were then removed using solvent applied with cotton swabs and, finally, the surface to be treated was dampened with de-mineralized water (which does not leave behind any residual salts). As is clear from the trial piece (one of the secondary reliefs of the Fonte Gaia) the strength of the laser was also varied in order to see the possible levels of cleaning on the marble. [Fig. 64] These experiments showed exactly what the laser was capable of and at the same time permitted the restoration team to evaluate the level of force that would best suit their needs.

The success of the laser technology allowed the technician a level of control in removing surface encrustations that was unprecedented using other methods. As a result, the remaining fountain pieces (phase two) were cleaned with the laser. The team found that the laser allowed them to remove the crosta nera (the layer of crystals of calcium carbonate, nitrate and calcium sulfate that forms on marble) and other encrustations without also stripping the natural patina from the marble surface. This was extremely important because the conservation of the patina concealed an unexpected finding. Traces of polychromy were found on several pieces, particularly on the central relief of the Madonna and Child. [Fig. 65] When the first step of cleaning was begun (brushing the relief to remove the first layer of dirt and dust), the team noticed what appeared to be
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490 Ibid.
491 Landi et al., 2009, 23
small areas of color on the marble. As a result work was stopped and Giancarlo Lanterna and Carlo Lalli of the Opificio’s Scientific Laboratory investigated the presence of polychromy with an XRF analysis (X-ray fluorescence). Their analysis confirmed the presence of both color and gilding.

The evaluation was followed by a careful and difficult laser cleaning in order to preserve the original color. According to Manna, the decision to wait and clean the relief of the Madonna and Child last was made both because of its importance in the decorative scheme but also because of the discovery of polychromy. The delay was fortuitous as the team was in a better position to use the experience gained from the restoration of the other pieces on this relief. The laser was able to leave the natural honey hue of the patina intact and reveal traces of both polychromy and gilding that are now visible to the naked eye. The circular niche which frames the figure of the Madonna presents a border decorated with a motif of ogival arches. The design was probably gilded and would have continued the ornamentation present in the sculptured niches of the lateral angels through to the relief of the Madonna and Child. The three consecutive relief panels would have appeared as a triptych where the continuation of the same treatment united the otherwise separate panels as in the punch marks of the gold background of Masaccio’s St Giovenale Triptych from 1422. On Quercia’s relief traces of red and gilding were found preserved under the patina. The fabric that hangs behind the seated Madonna was also decorated with what appears to be a curvilinear ornamental

492 The laser was used first on the bottom of the relief with an impulse of 290 mJ, frequency 2-3 Hz with a diameter of 2mm, and then on the areas presenting color and gilding the impulse was lowered to 100-200 mJ, frequency 1-2 Hz and diameter 4mm. Landi et al., 2009, 27.
493 I interviewed Daniela Manna in March of 2009.
494 Located in Cascia, near Reggello, in the Church of St Peter.
motif that commonly decorated the drapery behind the Madonna, as in Duccio’s *Maestà* or Sassetti’s *Madonna of the Snow*. Traces of a decorative pattern survive along the border of the Madonna’s robe, and along her neckline. There are more traces of red and a probable preparation for gilding. The figure of Christ was also adorned with traces of the color red found in areas along with a preparation for gilding. Part of this decoration survives on his robe where what appears to be a small sun is visible. The same reddish color was also found on the figures’ lips and a darker pigment colored their eyes. Traces of polychromy were also found on the other female Virtues in specific areas such as the borders of vestments and facial features such as lips and eyes.

Scholars have touched on the question of whether polychromy and gilding were an integral part of marble and stone carving in the Renaissance. The main problem is a general lack of evidence due to the fact that many early Italian sculptures have undergone invasive and radical cleanings that have eradicated or modified the original surface treatment. This makes the discovery of pigment on the Fonte Gaia very important; not only does it provide another indication that not all early Italian marble sculpture was white, and second, it may also shed some light on why the less desirable marble from the *Montagnola* was used in the first place. Did Jacopo della Quercia intend to paint the
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monument from the beginning, and if not, when was the fountain painted? Was this surface treatment devised to cover imperfections such as veining in the marble?

**New discoveries: What the restoration uncovered**

The contract for the fountain is the first place to look for the answers to these questions, yet polychromy and gilding are not mentioned in the contract. Nor, to my knowledge, do any period sources mention the polychromy of the fountain. If the fountain was painted in the fifteenth century as the restoration team believes (based on the fact that the traces of color were found under the patina) then how can this lacuna be accounted for in the sources? It would seem that the most convincing reason for such an omission could only have to do with the quick formation of organic encrustations on the monument that masked the presence of polychromy at an early date. It is true that areas of polychromy and gilding are known to attract more deposits than areas that are not treated. Another factor may have to do with the distance from which someone using the fountain would have been able to see the polychromy which was, as far as we know, confined to small areas such as the lips, eyes, and border decorations. The fact that evidence in this regard is lacking is not entirely surprising considering the level of wear of a monument exposed to the elements outdoors. Even similarly painted marble sculpture preserved indoors, as we shall soon discuss, did not necessarily show the evidence of polychromy before major recent restoration projects. Unfortunately, at this point in my study it is impossible to know with any certainty whether Quercia had
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497 However, Anna Maria Piccinini has speculated on the possibility that the fountain was intended to be painted from the beginning since the contract stated that precise directives were to be given to Jacopo "altrimenti i marmi resteranno lisci e bianchi". See *Il Giornale dell’Arte*, n. 81 Sett. 1990, 36.

498 Information obtained from my interview of Daniela Manna, Fonte Gaia restoration expert.
planned for the monument to be painted from its inception, or whether he or another artist painted and gilded the monument directly.

Certainly, within the sculptor’s oeuvre the polychromy of sculpture was not unusual. Quercia’s marble altarpiece in San Frediano in Lucca (1422) comprised of a Virgin and Child flanked by the standing figures of Saints Ursula, Jerome, Lawrence and Richard, was also likely gilded and painted. The altarpiece was built using several pieces of marble varying in dimension, hue, and surface texture, which led Geddes to suggest that it was painted from the beginning. The quality of the marble was not of prime importance, and it is possible that as for the Trenta altar, the Fonte Gaia may too have been intended to be painted from its inception, thus concealing, in part at least, the poor quality of the marble chosen for its construction. The original monument to honor Ilaria del Carretto was also in all likelihood polychromed. As Seymour notes, “There was undoubtedly a good deal of polychromy, and the whole would have gleamed with gilt and color from the shadows of the Giunigi family chapel.” Quercia’s wood statues were all most certainly polychromed as his firmly documented (signed and dated) Annunciation group shows. Throughout the fifteenth century sculptors practiced the tradition of carving wood statuary, something that had long been a specialty of Sienese sculptors. Two-figured Annunciation groups were a popular form of religious sculpture, and these

500 Seymour, 1973, 33.
501 Quercia’s Annunciation group is also known as the San Gimignano group and may be dated contemporaneously with Francesco da Valdambrino’s Annunciation Group located in San Francesco, Asciano. Del Bravo proposes a date of circa 1420 for Valdambrino’s group while Quercia’s was commissioned in 1421. See Carlo Del Bravo, Scultura senese del Quattrocento (Florence: Edam, 1970), note 25. Seymour, 1973, 35. Beck, 1991,104.
502 See Enzo Carli, Scultura lignea senese (Milano, Electa, 1951).
wooden groups were generally painted by professional painters who were engaged specifically for that purpose by the sculptor. An example of this phenomenon is the San Gimignano Annunciation carved by Jacopo della Quercia and polychromed in 1426 by Martino di Bartolomeo.\textsuperscript{503}

Over the course of the last two decades the publications of the Opificio delle Pietre Dure indicate that polychromy was an intrinsic feature of much early Italian sculpture. For example, the seated statue of Charles of Anjou by Arnolfo di Cambio was wholly polychromed,\textsuperscript{504} as were areas of Baldassare Cossa’s wall tomb in the Baptistery in Florence,\textsuperscript{505} the tomb of Guglielmo di Ciliano and Niccolò Aringhieri from the courtyard of the University of Siena,\textsuperscript{506} Fra Guglielmo’s pulpit in San Giovanni Fuorcivitas in Pistoia,\textsuperscript{507} and several monuments in Santa Croce in Florence including the Cavalcanti Annunciation,\textsuperscript{508} the Marsuppini Monument,\textsuperscript{509} and Benedetto da Maiano’s

\textsuperscript{503} On the base of the figure of Gabriel is Quercia’s signature “HOC OPUS FECIT MAGISTER GIACOPUS PIERI DE SENIS” and on the base of the Madonna is Bartolomeo’s signature and the date “MCCCCXXXVI MARTINUS BARTOLOMEI DE SENIS PINXIT”. Cited from Max Siedel ed., \textit{Da Jacopo della Quercia a Donatello, Le arti a Siena nel primo rinascimento} (Milano: Federico Motta Editore, 2010), 96.


\textsuperscript{505} Ernesto Tucciarelli and Anna Maria Giusti, “Il sepolcro di Baldassare Cossa: il restauro dei marmi” in \textit{OPD Restauro}, n. 2, 1987, 94-98, esp. page 98. The restoration revealed that the monument sculpted by Donatello had been gilded and polychromed. In particular traces of pigment were found in the area of the baldachin where a colored paste had been used to fill the patterned incisions (graffito). A similar pattern of foliage had been painted to imitate the graffito technique on the lateral drapery.

\textsuperscript{506} Ernesto Tucciarelli, “Sepolcro di Guglielmo di Ciliano e Niccolò Aringhieri” in \textit{OPD Restauro}, n. 2, 1990, 150-4, esp. page 151. The monument is attributed to Goro di Gregorio and dates to circa 1324. Traces of original pigment were found on the relief which depicts a scene of a university class room, and primarily on the hem of the Professor’s robe. The restoration also recovered the elegant gothic writing in the open books held by the professor and several of the students in the first row.

\textsuperscript{507} Annamaria Giusti, Cristina Samarelli, “Il ‘pulpito’ marmoreo di fra Guglielmo in San Giovanni Fuorcivitas a Pistoia” in \textit{OPD Restauro}, n. 9, 1997, 38-55. Colored glass pieces were used to create a colored mosaic background for the figures.

\textsuperscript{508} Roberto Manni, Andreina Andreoni, Francesca Kumar, “Annunciazione Cavalcanti” in \textit{OPD Restauro}, n. 7, 1995, 185-92, esp. page 188. The relief was painted white (bianco di piombo) and gilded probably in
pulpit, among others. In each case the pigment and/or gilding was brought to light during the course of restoration projects aimed at the routine cleaning or maintenance of the monument. It is thanks to the technology and expertise developed in the field of restoration practices that such discoveries have been made.

The Opificio’s restoration of Baldassare Cossa’s tomb monument revealed, for example, that Donatello’s bronze sculpture of Cossa was originally gilded. In the eighteenth century the gilded bronze surface had been hidden under a layer of pigmented oil specifically applied to give the monument an antique appearance according to the taste of the period. Despite the fact that the restoration team was able to remove the pigmented oil from the bronze sculpture, the treatment irreversibly altered the monument, particularly where the oil permeated the marble below the bier. In this particular case the restoration team was able to mitigate the damage caused by an earlier (eighteenth-century) treatment of the sculpture. It illustrates that restoration over the course of time employs various techniques according to period-specific canons.

It is not my intention to discuss the evolution of such period canons with regard to Italian restoration practices; however it is important to reiterate a number of points that are particularly pertinent to my study. First, in order to consider a restoration intervention order to give the air of antique marble sculpture and thus mask the “poor” material used (pietra arenaria from Fiesole for the relief and terracotta used for the putti that stand on the cornice above).

509 Cristina Danti, Annamaria Giusti, Maria Rosa Lanfranchi, Christopher Weeks, “Scultura e Affresco: Novità dal restauro del Monumento Marsuppini” in OPD Restauro, n. 10, 1998, 36-56. Originally the sculpted tomb was surrounded by extensive fresco decoration that mimicked both sculpture and architecture. The sarcophagus lid was gilded and the bier was decorated in blue and gold.

510 Annamaria Giusti, Cristina Samarelli, Carlo Lalli, “Pulpito” in OPD Restauro, n. 12, 2000, 211-21. The pulpito located in the church of Santa Croce was multicolored: partly gilded, red marble used in areas, while the background was filled with colored glass tessere and in areas painted with verderame (almost black in color) behind the figures.

511 See Tucciarelli and Giusti, 1987, 94-98.
beneficial, several factors must be considered. As discussed above, all of these factors must take into consideration the methods and techniques employed, and the taste of the period in which they were applied. The applications of oils to make a marble monument look antique or the removal of tinted varnish from oil paintings are just a few examples. As one author writes, “The restorer who proudly announces that he has cleaned a Rembrandt so successfully that its colours remind one now of Monet exposes himself courageously to the full wrath of historically-minded art lovers.”

The Fonte Gaia project is a case where the historically-minded art lover is at a loss. On the one hand, the restoration of the marbles has removed centuries of filth from the marbles, allowing a clearer picture of the sculptures. This provides us with important new elements for analysis. Thanks to the use of an innovative laser cleaning technique new evidence reveals that parts of the sculptures were polychromed and this helps to clarify our perception of Italian Renaissance sculpture. Yet on the other hand, we will never know whether the sculptures and reliefs restored during the first phase of cleaning were also polychromed and gilded. Their ammonium carbonate cleaning has eradicated any such traces and this evidence could have been critical, especially regarding the iconographical questions related to the lateral parapet statues. Questions will thus always remain; If they were painted, how were they painted? Could their polychromy account for the differentiations that made Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia identifiable in the two fragments of the Fonte Gaia drawing? The Fonte Gaia did provide the restoration experts of the Opificio an opportunity to explore marble cleaning techniques, and with laser

technology they are now able to clean marble and stone more effectively. However, as the Fonte Gaia project demonstrates, such interventions must be handled with extreme caution since not only is technology in constant evolution but undoubtedly the Fonte Gaia was also cleaned following period specific canons. In the following chapter I shall discuss Tito Sarrocchi’s life and work. Why he was chosen to sculpt the new fountain? And should we consider his fountain a copy of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia?
Chapter Four
The nineteenth-century Fonte Gaia

Introduction

The nineteenth century was a particularly fertile period in Italy for the restoration and renovation of Medieval and Renaissance sculpture as the country became aware of the need to protect and preserve its artistic patrimony. The flurry of activity concerned all of the arts, although architecture and outdoor sculpture were of particular interest due to their exposure to damaging elements. Throughout Europe important historic monuments, conceived as national emblems, were restored in the most appropriate style, usually Gothic or Renaissance, as an illustration of the nation’s achievements. The experiences of other European countries—namely England, France, and Germany—were fundamental to the circulation of ideas on the subject of restoration in Italy since these countries were avant-garde in the development of conservation practices. As a result, different ideas circulated in Italy contemporaneously before a strictly Italian approach to conservation practices emerged toward the end of the century. As discussed in chapter three, the emphasis on nationalistic feelings stimulated by Italy’s unification process played a critical role in the appreciation of the country’s heritage, the removal of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia, and the commission of Sarrocchi’s new fountain.

The following chapter is divided in two sections. In section one I shall discuss Tito Sarrocchi’s artistic formation and the early history of stylistic restoration practices in

---

513 Jokilehto, 1999, 137.
514 I am referring to the establishment in 1891 of the *Uffici regionali per la conservazione dei monumenti* which may be considered the first Italian attempt at national legislation for the protection of ancient monuments. Although several bills were presented earlier than 1891 none were approved as laws until the beginning of the twentieth century. Jokilehto, 1999, 198.
Siena, as both contributed to shaping Sarrocchi’s carving style and the appearance of the new Fonte Gaia. Sarrocchi’s teachers—Antonio Manetti in Siena, Lorenzo Bartolini and Giovanni Duprè in Florence—will be considered first as the lives of these men were critical for Sarrocchi’s artistic development. Duprè, as we shall see, was particularly important for Sarrocchi’s career and growth as a Purist sculptor. Section two is dedicated to Sarrocchi’s Fonte Gaia, specifically, to Sarrocchi’s relationship with the project’s architect Giuseppe Partini and the artistic influences that informed the appearance of the new fountain. This information helps us understand how Sarrocchi’s fountain was changed with respect to Quercia’s original. I shall illustrate how the nineteenth-century project was a Purist revision of Quercia’s monument and how, through the invention of Sarrocchi’s carving style, the fountain was transformed from a copy of a Renaissance sculpture to a Renaissance Revival work that is only partially dependent on the original monument’s design.

Before I examine the creation of Sarrocchi’s fountain, it is important to briefly outline certain key points regarding conservation theory, as it is pertinent to the nineteenth century and my discussion of the Fonte Gaia. As noted earlier, period documents refer to the project as a “restoration” and the monument as a “copy,” although the modern usage of these terms does not accurately describe the processes employed by the nineteenth-century practitioner.\textsuperscript{515} It is important to recall that Quercia’s fountain was not “restored” in the modern sense but \textit{replaced} by a new marble fountain sculpted by Tito Sarrocchi. In order to understand the different meanings of the terms copy and

\textsuperscript{515} For modern practitioners the word “copy” intends the reproduction of an original work, and “restoration” (which encompasses a category of different types of practices) is the repair of a work’s appearance as close as possible to the original as far as allowed by its state of preservation.
restoration in the nineteenth century the project is best understood within the context of the circulation of restoration and conservation theories in Italy. The nineteenth-century Fonte Gaia project, along with a number of other projects in Siena and Tuscany, reflect Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc’s theory of restoration as described in his renowned *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XI au XVI siècle* (Dictionary of French Architecture from the XI to the XVI Century) of 1854-68. The French architect and theorist had defined restoration as more than repair or conservation but a process that regularly entailed the creation of something entirely new.

Viollet-le-Duc had spent more than a year studying architecture when he traveled around Italy for sixteen months in 1836-1837; upon return to France he was appointed to restore the abbey church of La Madeleine at Vézelay (1839), and later appointed as chief inspector of the National Commission on Historical Monuments. Although his initial aim was restoration in the style of the original, he often added entirely new elements of his own design, as his interventions at the Cathedral of Notre Dame (1844), Amiens Cathedral (1849) and the fortifications of Carcassonne (1852) demonstrate.

---

516 For a detailed discussion of the topic see Jokilehto, 1999.
Tuscany a number of restoration projects conformed to his idea of restoration. Often such projects concerned façade sculptures which necessitated restoration, or at times, the addition of entirely new façades to monuments that had been left unfinished in the Renaissance, such as Santa Maria del Fiore and Santa Croce in Florence [Fig. 68]. The substitution of sculpture with copies loosely based on their original models was common practice, as was, for some, the alteration of a building and its decoration to fit a particular romantic vision. Thus, for a number of nineteenth-century practitioners “restoration” did not necessarily just intend the act of repair or conservation, but at times meant a more radical transformation. Today, the terms stylistic- or historical restoration (in Italian _restauro in stile_) are used to refer to this type of restoration, which consists of new additions made to fit the original style of the building or monument. This resulted, in some cases, in the birth of new trends such as Gothic or Renaissance Revival architecture and sculpture. Sarrocchi’s Fonte Gaia is an example of this phenomenon, as I shall explain in section two of this chapter.

Section I: Life of the Sculptor

Sarrocchi in Antonio Manetti’s studio

Tito Sarrocchi was born in Siena on January 5, 1824.\(^{521}\) He began to work with marble at the age of nine when he learned to finish sculpture in the studio of Antonio Manetti (1805-1887).\(^{522}\) Manetti’s workshop was, for the better part of the century, the

---

\(^{521}\) His father, Antonio was a blacksmith and his mother, Rosa was a dress maker. They had four children Elvira born in 1821, Tito born in 1824, Cesare born in 1826 (who however died at a very early age) and Adelina born in 1828. Guido Sarrocchi, _Cenni biografici dello scultore senese Tito Sarrocchi_ (Siena: Stabilimento Arti Grafiche Lazzeri, 1924), 6.

\(^{522}\) At the time Manetti’s workshop consisted of two departments: the first dealt with wood carving and the second with the carving of stone. Sarrocchi was trained in the latter. Guido Sarrocchi, “Cenni biografici
premier sculpture training ground in Siena; Enea Becheroni (1819-1885) and, for a short time, the celebrated purist sculptor Giovanni Duprè (1817-1882) also trained there.\textsuperscript{523}

Sarrocchi’s early schooling was important because in his formative years as an artist he was exposed to the concept of stylistic restoration. For two decades, from 1830 to 1850, Manetti’s workshop was dedicated almost exclusively to the restoration of Siena’s Cathedral sculpture, in particular the sculpture on its façade.\textsuperscript{524} The original thirteenth-century façade sculpture—statues of prophets, philosophers and apostles by the renowned Gothic sculptor Giovanni Pisano and assistants— was worn and damaged. Manetti’s workshop was hired to restore the façade sculptures. This job consisted of repairing

dello Scultore Senese Tito Sarrocchi” in Bullettino Senese di Storia Patria fasc. III, 31 (1924), 140-141. For bibliographical information of Antonio Manetti see Silvia Roncucci, “Antonio Manetti e la rinascita dell’intaglio a Siena nel XIX secolo” in Accademia dei Rozzi (11, 2004,21), 31-39. Wolfgang Loseries, “Restaurierungen und Denkmalpflege des Doms 1798-1998”, in Die Kirchen in Siena, Eds. Peter Anselm Riedl e Max Seidel, vol. 3.1/I.2 Der Dom S. Maria Assunta, Architektur (München: Bruckmann, 2006)\textsuperscript{523} For bibliographical information on Enea Becheroni see: Gaetano Milanesi, Memoria di Enea Becheroni scultore senese (Siena: Tipografia dell’Ancora, 1855); Bernardina Sani, “Enea Becheroni” in Siena tra Purismo e Liberty, Eds. Enrico Crispolti and Bernardina Sani (Milano: Mondadori, 1988), 76-80; Sisi and Spalletti, 1994, 253. Becheroni is also listed as one of the collaborators on the restoration project of Siena’s façade sculpture. See Wolfgang Loseries, 2006, 829, Doc. 238; on Giovanni Duprè see: Ettore Spalletti, Giovanni Duprè (Milano: Electa, 2002); Monica Maffioli, “Giovanni Duprè per la facciata di Santa Croce” in Santa Croce nell’800 (Florence: Alinari, 1986), 81-96; Giovanni Duprè, Lettere familiari di Giovanni Duprè a Tito Sarrocchi (Siena: Lazzeri, 1917); Orazio Bacci, I pensieri sull’arte e ricordi autobiografici di Giovanni Duprè (Siena: Lazzeri, 1896).\textsuperscript{524} Documents pertaining to Manetti’s employ at the Cathedral are found in the Archives of the Opera del Duomo and the State Archive of Siena. See Wolfgang Loseries chapter “Die Restaurierungen des 19. Und 20 Jahrhunderts” in Der Dom S. Maria Assunta from the series Die Kirchen von Siena. For a list of façade sculptures executed by Manetti’s workshop see Silvia Roncucci, “Antonio Manetti e i restauri del Duomo di Siena nella prima metà dell’Ottocento” in Quaderni dell’Opera 79; 2003/ 2005; Fascicolo II, (Siena, Opera della Metropolitana, 2006), 420-421. Manetti also restored the Cathedral’s interior pavement figures which were re-designed by the Director of the Institute of Fine Arts, Francesco Nenci. Among Manetti’s contributions to the pavement were the graffito figures of Justice and Temperance located near the main altar. Romagnoli, 1835, vol.12, XXXV-XXXVI. Roncucci points out, however, that in the archival documents Fortitude (Fortezza) is listed instead of Justice. ASS, Governo di Siena, 386, ins. 22, 1846. Cited in Roncucci, 2006, 410.
sculptures that were deemed to be in good enough condition to leave *in situ* and the carving of “copies” to replace others that were too badly weathered.\(^{525}\)

Siena Cathedral’s façade sculptures eroded over the course of six hundred years, but an earthquake in 1798 also contributed to their demise.\(^{526}\) According to Bandini, a nineteenth-century chronicler, the thirteenth-century façade sculptures were in dire condition. Apparently a horse had been killed in front of the Cathedral when, in 1821, one of the sculptures fell on its head.\(^{527}\) As a consequence of this event a Supervisory committee (Deputazione alla Conservazione dei Monumenti di Siena) decided that the restoration of the façade was inevitable. The Cathedral Supervisory committee stipulated that copies be made for the sculptures that were very badly damaged, with the originals being moved indoors to protect them from further deterioration.\(^{528}\) The evolution of the project is interesting both because it allows some insight into nineteenth-century Sienese restoration practices and because we know that Sarrocchi was working for Manetti at the time.

The head architect of the *Opera della Metropolitana*, responsible for the Cathedral project, was Alessandro Doveri (1771-1845). He was thus the overseer of Manetti’s work, which meant ensuring that the quality of the labor was high and that the

---

\(^{525}\) This dates from 1834. ASS, Governo di Siena 386, fasc.7 “Lavori nella metropolitana affidata a Manetti scultore”. Roncucci, 2006, 412, n.9.

\(^{526}\) The earthquake was on May 26, 1798. See Soprintendenza per i beni ambientali e architettonici di Siena e Grossetto, *Il Duomo di Siena: documenti, studi, restauri* (Siena: Centroofset, 1993).

\(^{527}\) In May of 1821 we are told, “cadde una statua dalla facciata del Duomo, e batté sopra una testa di cavallo, e lo massacrò.” Bandini, 1821, ins. 79v. Cited from Roncucci, 2006, 409.

\(^{528}\) Today the thirteenth-century façade sculptures are housed in the Museo dell’Opera del Duomo adjacent to Siena’s Cathedral.
job was done according to the committee’s stipulations. In 1837, Manetti explained that additional work on the façade sculpture was necessary, “in order to avoid monstrosity, which naturally occurs when new ornamentation is mixed with old, ruined, and mutilated stones weathered by time.” The following year, in 1838, the supervising committee approved an extension of labor on the façade, clearly agreeing with Manetti’s view. Manetti and his workshop continued to work on the project until the aged Doveri was replaced by a new head architect, Maurizio Zannetti. Unfortunately, the change in the project’s direction proved detrimental to Manetti’s career.

Zanetti suspended the restoration project, citing irregularities in the work supervised by his predecessor. According to Cathedral records, these irregularities had to do with both imprecise measurements and unnecessary restorations. Manetti was accused of removing sculptures that did not need to be restored in order to procure more work for his workshop and of sculpting statues in his own carving style as opposed to that of the thirteenth century. The charge is particularly revealing as it highlights one of the issues that later theorists would have with stylistic restoration: the lack of control in assuring a true copy of the work was made without the sculptor making any changes.

529 AOMS, 1625 (2645), f. 1, ins. 62, ins. 63. Roncucci, 413, n.15. On Alessandro Doveri see Die Kirchen von Siena (vol. 3.1.1.2, Der Dom S. Maria Assunta), 633, n. 136 and on his work at the Cathedral particularly pages 632-637. For bibliographic information see also Künstler Lexikon, vol. XXIX, 2001, 236.
530 “[...] quella mostruosità, che naturalmente nascerebbe dal vedere i nuovi ornamenti mescolati con I vecchi, malcondotti e mutilate dalle intemperie.” AOMS, 1625 (2645) f. 1. Cited in Roncucci, 2006, 419, n. 33.
531 The commission’s approval dates from January 27, 1838. AOMS, 1625 (2645), f. 1, ins. 84. Roncucci, 2006, 419, n. 34. On Manetti’s intervention see AOMS, 1625 (2645), f. 1, ins. 109. See Roncucci,2006, 432, n. 81.
532 On Maurizio Zannetti see Die Kirchen von Siena, vol. 3.1.1.2, 636-640.
533 In 1844 Manetti was suspended. Zanetti appointed two men, Saracini and Nerucci, to verify how the work had been carried forth and list any discrepancies between what should have been done and what was done. AOMS, 1625 (2645), f. 1, ins. 107. See Roncucci, 2006, 431, n. 80.
This was especially problematic when the original work to be copied was in a damaged and/or incomplete state, since this made it more difficult for the sculptor to suppress his own carving style.

As we shall see, this was a problem that Sarrocchi would also have to deal with for the “copy” of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia, which, like many of Siena Cathedral’s façade sculptures, was in a ruinous state. In Siena the position of architects, sculptors and theorists at mid-nineteenth-century was not entirely clear; some were in favor of such interventions and others less so, and an official position had not yet been taken. The stimulus in Italy for more conservative restoration practices on a general scale came about only following the English debates on the subject instigated by John Ruskin and William Morris, both of whom argued against stylistic restoration in favor of more conservative practices.\(^{535}\) It is interesting to note that Ruskin, in a lecture held in 1873, remembered having seen the original Fonte Gaia as a youth before he recounted how the Sienese demolished and replaced the fountain with a reproduction made by a modern sculptor.\(^{536}\)

---

\(^{535}\) Ruskin explained his position on restoration in *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* where he writes “It [restoration] means the most total destruction which a building can suffer: a destruction out of which no remnants can be gathered: a destruction accompanied with false description of the thing destroyed. Do not let us deceive ourselves in this important matter; it is impossible, as impossible as to raise the dead, to restore anything that has ever been great or beautiful in architecture.” John Ruskin. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (New York: Dover Publications ([1880] 1989), 194. Following Ruskin’s theories Morris founded, in 1877, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (S.P.A.B. and also known as Anti-Scrape) which was against restoration because this was seen as detrimental not only to the visual impression of the monument but because this canceled its history. Chris Miele ed., *William Morris on Architecture* (Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1996). Francesco La Regina, “Antiscrape: polemiche, denunzie, processi contro i restauri” in *Restauro* (6, 1977, 30), 123-130

Manetti, in his defense, explained that the modified statues were not original thirteenth-century sculptures but later additions. Furthermore, the change in carving style was necessary, in his view, to compensate for variations between the quality of the new copies and the older statues remaining in situ. The disparate views on how the Cathedral sculptures should be restored reflect the lack of a communal line of thinking regarding such practices, and thus even though the Cathedral supervisory committee had approved Manetti’s project under the supervision of head architect Doveri just a few years later, the perception of his work changed drastically. Ultimately the charges brought against Manetti led to the closure of his workshop in 1851. In a letter to the Cathedral’s rector, Manetti wrote that he was moving to Livorno because his “homeland had treated him like a step-mother instead of an affectionate mother.”

While Sarrocchi’s exact role in Manetti’s workshop is undocumented, it appears that he initially worked as a garzone, or helper. Sarrocchi’s son Guido wrote that by the time his father left Manetti’s workshop in 1841 he had become an able polisher. This leads us to propose that Sarrocchi was likely responsible for polishing many of the copies that adorn Siena Cathedral’s façade. There is no evidence that Sarrocchi was an independent sculptor yet, although he must have learned the basics of stone carving since

537 AOMS, 1625 (2645), f. 1, ins. 109. See Roncucci, 432.
538 “[…] inutilmente da tanto tempo ricerco, e mai trovato nella patria, a me non madre affettuosa ma piuttosto matrigna.” AOMS, 1625 (2645), f. 2, ins. 11. Cited from Roncucci, 2006, 438. In Livorno he was offered the post of Director of a carving workshop (bottega d’intaglio).
539 Sarrocchi worked during the day in the workshop and after work he attended classes at the Institute for Fine Arts (Istituto di Belle Arti) in Siena (also cited as Accademia di Belle Arti). He was registered at the school on November 18, 1833. According to his biographer his age was changed to eleven in order to bypass school regulations that imposed the minimum age of eleven to attend the school. Sarrocchi, 1924, 8.
540 This entails making ever-smaller scratches on the sculpture’s surface in order to bring the marble to a high sheen. Sarrocchi’s first biographer, his son Guido, recounts that by this time Sarrocchi had become an able polisher, “un abile finitore” See Sarrocchi, 1924, 142.
after his employ in Manetti’s workshop he was hired to work in Florence as a stone carver.

Sarrocchi’s decision to move to Florence was primarily motivated by the desire to ameliorate his financial situation after a series of misfortunes struck his family. In May of 1839 his mother Rosa died, and just a few months later, his father had an accident in which he lost his left eye and could no longer work as a blacksmith.\(^{541}\) As a result Sarrocchi was responsible economically for the family, which included his father Antonio and his sisters Elvira and Adelina.\(^{542}\) Manetti tried to persuade Sarrocchi to stay in Siena, but he was unable to offer him a higher salary.\(^{543}\) Thus he set out for nearby Florence. Once there Sarrocchi found employ in Leopoldo Pisani’s workshop. We are told that his first commission was to copy a marble sculpture of a crouching lion by Antonio Canova (1757-1822) for the tomb of Pope Clement XIII in St. Peter’s Basilica.\(^{544}\) In Florence Sarrocchi enrolled in the Academy of Fine Arts (Accademia). This marked an important period in Sarrocchi’s artistic formation because the Academy was then burgeoning with new ideas.

**Italian Purism**

Sarrocchi began his formal study of sculpture carving with Lorenzo Bartolini (1777-1850) and Giovanni Duprè (1817-1882), two of the most important figures in the development and dissemination of the sculptural branch of the Italian art movement

\(^{541}\) Antonio was a blacksmith; he lost his eye after an accident involving a piece of incandescent iron. Sarrocchi, 1924, 10.

\(^{542}\) His brother Cesare, born in 1826, died shortly after birth. Elvira was born in 1821 and Adelina was born in 1828. Sarrocchi, 1924, 6.

\(^{543}\) Sarrocchi, 1924, 11.

\(^{544}\) The type of marble was called *broccatello di montarrenti*. Pierini, 1999, 11. On the commission of the statue see Sarrocchi, 1924, 13.
Proponents of Purism were closely tied to other European groups of the Romantic Era such as the *Primitifs*, Nazarenes and Pre-Raphaelites respectively in France, Germany and England.\(^{545}\) The artists active in these groups were often associated with one another and artistic models spread across Europe as a result of these relations. Although the art produced by each group was distinct, a common denominator was their inspiration from the artists of the early Italian Renaissance, who were also referred to by scholars as the Italian primitives.\(^{546}\) The predilection for the Italian primitives in these artistic circles was primarily stimulated by European writers and other members of the literati.

In Germany Wilhelm Heinrich Wackenroder (1773-1798) and Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829) were largely responsible for a renewed interest in the art, literature and architecture of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.\(^{547}\) This preference was in contrast

---

545 The *Primitifs*, also known as Barbus, were a group of artists who had split from David’s studio around 1800 to form their own. Founding members include Pierre Maurice Quai, Charles Nodier, Joseph and Pierre Franque and Jean Broc. Their art was inspired by Greek vase painting and they were particularly attracted to the simple compositions of early Italian Renaissance subjects. See Etienne Jean Delécluze, *Louis David, son école et son temps* (Paris, Didier, 1855 [Paris: Macula, 1983]). The Nazarenes were a group of early nineteenth-century German Romantic Painters who aimed to revive honesty and spirituality in Christian art by recapturing the mood of Medieval and early Renaissance painters. Founding members Friedrich Overbeck and Franz Pforr, after secession from the Vienna Academy, formed the Brotherhood of Saint Luke in 1809. In the first quarter of the nineteenth century the group settled in Rome and made their headquarters the monastery of Saint Isidoro. The subject of their art was often drawn from religious subjects or events from Medieval history while their style revealed an emulation of Trecento and Quattrocento painting; they particularly admired Fra Angelico who they took as their model since he was both a painter and a monk. See Keith Andrews, *The Nazarenes: A Brotherhood of German Painters in Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964). The Pre-Raphaelites were a group of English painters who were inspired by the art produced before Raphael, whose compositions had, in their view, compromised the teaching of art. See Elizabeth Pettejohn, *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites* (London: Tate Publishing, 2000).


547 Wilhelm Heinrich Wackenroder (1773-1798) published his *Outpourings of an Art-loving Monk* in 1797 under the original title *Herzensergiessungen eines kunstliebenden klosterbruders*. He is considered, along with Ludwig Tieck, a key member of German Romanticism. Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829) co-founded with his brother August Wilhelm the *Athenaeum*, a literary journal dedicated to German Romanticism. See Paolo D’Angelo, *L’Estetica del romanticismo* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1997).
to those of earlier writer Johann Joachim Winckelman (1717-1768) and painter Anton Raphael Mengs (1728-1798), chief proponents of the earlier classical revival.\textsuperscript{548} Wackenroder and Schlegal’s writings (Herzensergiessungen eines Kunstliebenden Klosterbruds and Athenaeum)\textsuperscript{549} were avidly studied by the Nazarenes and later by the Italian artist Tommaso Minardi (1787-1871), whose theories formed the basis for the development of the Italian art movement Purism (Purismo). Nineteenth-century Purism was a rejection of neoclassicism in favor of an attempt to recapture the mood of Medieval and early Renaissance art in line with Romanticism.\textsuperscript{550} Minardi saw early Florentine and Sienese art as the “pure, primary impressions and concepts from nature alone.”\textsuperscript{551} These artistic models were considered better than following classical models which Minardi viewed as artificial and false. Minardi’s ideas were disseminated by his follower Antonio Bianchini (1803-1884), who wrote the Purist manifesto (Del Purismo nelle arti) in 1842.\textsuperscript{552}

\textsuperscript{548} Johann Joachim Winckelman (1717-1768) published his History of Ancient Art (Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums) in 1764. He had a decisive influence on the rise of the neoclassical movement during the late eighteenth century. Anton Raphael Mengs (1728-1798) was a German painter whose art heralded neoclassical painting. See Michael Hollowell Duffy, Style and Truth in the Neoclassical Art Theory and Criticism of Anton Raphael Mengs and Johann Winckelmann (Ph. D diss., University of Illinois, 1991)
\textsuperscript{549} See note 545.
\textsuperscript{550} This art movement is not related to twentieth-century Purism which is a revision of Cubism put forward by Amédée Ozenfant and Le Corbusier in 1918. See Deborah Gans, The Le Corbusier Guide (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006), 17.
\textsuperscript{551} Andrews, 1964, 72. Minardi was Professore di disegno at the Academy of San Luca in Rome. He saw the art of Italian painters before the age of Raphael as representative of the qualities he praised in art: immediacy and naturalness. On Minardi see Guglielmo De Sanctis, Tommaso Monardi e il suo tempo (Roma: Forzani, 1900) and Italo Faldi “Il Purismo e Tommaso Minardi” in Commentari, (I, 1950), 238-246. On Purism see Antonio Bianchini, Del Purismo nelle arti [1842] in Scritti d’arte del primo Ottocento, Ed. Fernando Mazzocca (Milano: Ricciardi, 1998), 182-190; Cesare Guasti Del Purismo (Florence: Stamperia sulle Logge del Grano, 1852); Vincenzo Marchese, Dei Puristi e degli accademici in scritti vari (Florence: Le Monnier, 1855).
\textsuperscript{552} Bianchini was an art critic and a painter. He first applied the term Purismo to painting following the use of the term by linguists who used the term for linguists who heralded a return to thirteenth-century linguistic style. See Joshua C. Taylor, Vedere prima di credere: saggi sull’arte del primo Ottocento (Parma: Tipografia La Nazionale, 1970), 48-57. Bianchini first published the Manifesto in the newspaper
of the Nazarene Brotherhood) and the Italian sculptor Pietro Tenerani (1789-1869) who was to become a leading Purist sculptor.\textsuperscript{553} The tendency toward the study of the Primitives and the artists of the Quattrocento was for Purists a step toward an art that was considered real, moral and appropriate for Christian art rather than the aesthetic perfection promoted by neoclassicism. In Florence these ideas were circulated by Lorenzo Bartolini, who was responsible for the shift away from neoclassical models (such as Canova) toward the recovery of naturalism at the Florentine academy.

**The artistic climate at the Academy: Lorenzo Bartolini and Giovanni Duprè**

Lorenzo Bartolini was named professor of sculpture at the Academy in Florence in 1839.\textsuperscript{554} This occasion marked a particularly important moment in the sculptor’s career and signaled an important stylistic shift in the artistic milieu of the Florentine Academy, as I shall explain further on. In the 1820’s Bartolini had been skipped over for the same position, which was instead given to the orthodox follower of Canova, Stefano Ricci.\textsuperscript{555}

---

553 Pietro Tenerani, native of Torano (Carrara), worked primarily in Rome where he taught the life class at the Academy of San Luca. He first studied sculpture carving there under Bertel Thorwaldson (1770-1844) and as a result his early work is neoclassical. His later work, from circa 1840 on, may instead be classified as purist. At this point in his career he began to introduce elements of realism into his work as his seated statue of Pellegrino Rossi (1854, Carrara) demonstrates. Tenerani was also a decisive influence on the sculptor Giovanni Duprè who he met in Rome during the winter of 1844-1845. Sandra Berresford, *Italian Memorial Sculpture 1820-1940* (London: Frances Lincoln, 2004), 39. Spalletti, 2002, 37. See also Elena di Majo and Stefano Susinno “Pietro Tenerani, da allievo di Thorvaldsen a protagonista del Purismo religioso romano. Una traccia biografica” in *Bertel Thorvaldsen 1770-1844, scultore danese a Roma*, Ed. Elena di Majo, Bjarne Jørgnaes, Stefano Susinno (Rome: De Luca, 1989), 313-326.

554 In 1808 Bartolini had been called by Napoleon’s sister Elisa Bonaparte Baciocchi (1777-1820) to run the Academy of Fine Arts in Carrara. Majo and Susinno, 1989, 313. At the time Elisa was Princess of Lucca and Piombino and is credited with the re-vitalization of Carrara’s quarries as she required that every commune in France purchase a bust of the Emperor to stimulate revenue. See Gérard Hubert, *La sculpture dans l’Italie napoléonienne* (Paris: De Boccard, 1964), 342.

555 In 1825. See Mario Bellandi and Gaetano Siciliano, *L’Opera di Lorenzo Bartolini (1777-1850); sculture, disegni, cimeli* (Firenze: Tipografia Giuntina, 1956), 41.
Following this disappointment in his career Bartolini left for Paris where he became an integral part of the artistic community whose focus of attention was the studio of painter Jacques Louis David (1748-1825). In Paris Bartolini received critical attention and consequently was commissioned by Vivant Denon, Napoleon’s Minister of Public Works and Director General of the Museums in Paris, and the Bonapartes. Among his circle of friends were both Jean Auguste Dominique Ingres (1780-1867) and François Joseph Fétis (1784-1871), the former even sojourning in Florence at his request from 1820 to 1824.

Bartolini’s friendship with Ingres was particularly important because of its influence on his art. Ingres’ first sojourn to Rome in 1806 marks the artist’s initial approach to the art of the Italian Renaissance. His first-hand study of Italian art not only influenced his own work but also had a profound influence on that of his friend Bartolini, as the two corresponded regularly. A clear example of Ingres’ influence is Bartolini’s portrait of the Russian Countess Gouriev (1820-21), which derives from...

---

556 The sculptor was twenty when he moved to Paris. Douglas K. S. Hyland, Lorenzo Bartolini and Italian Influences on American Sculptors in Florence (1825-50), (Ph.D. diss., University of Delaware, 1981), 17.
557 He modeled a large bust of Napoleon for the Louvre, worked on the Austerlitz Column for Place Vendome, and the bust of General Pierre Banel for Versailles. For Elisa Bonaparte Baciocchi he was asked to create a colossal statue of Napoleon and busts of her family portrayed in classical garb. Many of his works in Italy were destroyed or damaged after the fall of Napoleon in 1813. At that time Elisa was also driven from her throne and Bartolini, because of his close ties with the family, was forced to leave Carrara. Hyland, 1981, 30.
558 At the time Ingres was a student in David’s studio and Fétis, the Belgian musician and composer, was living in Paris.
560 He took up residence at the French academy. Between 1813 and 1820 he completed several major paintings that indicate an attraction to early Renaissance art. Probably his most important example from this period is Christ Giving the Keys to Saint Peter destined for the church of Trinità dei Monti which shows the artists dependence on Raphael. See L. Fröhlich-Bume, Ingres: His Life and Art (London, 1926), 14.
Ingres’ painting of Mme. De Senonnes painted ca. 1815. The sculpted portrait recalls the style and pose of the earlier painted portrait: the two ladies are seated in the same position with their right hands placed on their laps and are dressed similarly with low cut Empire dresses following the latest women’s fashion. As further testimony to the sculptor’s devotion to the French painter, he also dedicated the plaster model of the Countess Gouriev to “his friend Ingres”. Stylistically, Bartolini’s sculpted portrait reveals another influence; as Carlo Del Bravo correctly noted “the sculpture is part Ingres and part Italian Quattrocento as seen in the art of Antonio Rossellino”. The association with the Quattrocento is not surprising considering that a group of artists that Bartolini had come in contact with in France, the Primitifs, were a formative influence in the revival of Italian Renaissance art in Paris in the nineteenth century. On at least one occasion Bartolini and Ingres also collaborated on a project: Ingres painted a copy of Titian’s *Venus of Urbino* (Uffizi) in 1822 so that Bartolini could use the painting for his reclining nude statue entitled *The Venus of Titian* which he was commissioned to sculpt by the Marquis of Londonderry in 1822.

These formative experiences, especially his relationship with Ingres and the Parisian school of artists, greatly influenced Bartolini’s teaching methods at the

562 Del Bravo, 1977, 11.
563 Originally cited as: “*Uno squisito ritratto in vesti e pettinatura moderne, in uno stile scultoreo fra ingressiano e quattrocentesco: soprattutto il marmo, limpido come un Antonio Rossellino*”. Del Bravo, 1977, 11.
564 The initial group of Primitifs was composed of Maurice Quai, Charles Nodier, Joseph and Pierre Franque and Jean Broc. See also Hyland, 1981, 18.
Florentine academy. These concerned specifically the introduction of real models as a teaching aid. This practice was already common in France. Drawing the live nude was one of the cornerstones of David’s studio practice. Bartolini introduced the same practice for the students of sculpture at the Florentine Academy instead of using the common teaching aid of classical statuary (according to then dominant neoclassical tendencies). In 1840 Bartolini caused quite a scandal, bringing about a veritable didactic revolution, when he brought in to his lesson at the Academy a highly unusual model for the students to work from, a hunchback. Critics condemned the use of a real model (as opposed to classical statuary), for the subject of the exercise, *Aesop Meditating on a Fable*. Bartolini defended his choice by explaining that although the model was not beautiful it was appropriate for the subject. Ettore Spalletti explained,

His [Bartolini’s] teaching methods provoked immediate difficulties in the Florentine academic circle because of his continuous use of nude models, obviously remarkable compared with previous teaching methods […] the sculptor even paid for his students’ models from his own pocket, and proposed that the administration commission a number of plaster casts of anatomical parts, from Phidian sculptures and artists of the Florentine Quattrocento.

---

566 Drawing the live nude was one of the principle cornerstones of David’s studio practice. See Étienne Jean Delécluze, 1855.


568 This was to be a bas-relief, the subject was deemed acceptable because it had already been depicted in the arts by both the Greeks and Romans.

569 “I suoi sistemi d’insegnamento provocarono immediatamente difficoltà all’economia grama dell’accademia fiorentina a motivo del continuo uso de’modelli nudi, evidentemente eccezionale rispetto a quanto avveniva in precedenza. Nell’aprile dell’anno seguente (1840) lo scultore, che fratattanto pagava anche di tasca propria i modelli da destinare ai propri allievi, avanzava alla direzione dell’accademia varie richieste, fra cui l’esecuzione di un certo numero di calchi in gesso da parti anatomiche, da sculture fidiache e del Quattrocento fiorentino; e infine domandava lo stanziamento ordinario di nuovi fondi per consentire ai suoi allievi un più intenso esercizio dal modello vivente.” Ettore Spalletti, “Lorenzo Bartolini
Although the introduction of Bartolini’s methods was initially disturbing, it was soon embraced by other artists affiliated with the Florentine Academy.

In 1843, Bartolini awarded Giovanni Duprè a post teaching sculpture carving at the Florentine Academy. This recognition followed the unveiling, in 1842, of the sculptor’s plaster statue *Dying Abel* at the exhibition of the Academy in Florence.\(^{570}\) For Bartolini, Duprè’s statue was the practical demonstration of the principles he advocated at the Academy.\(^ {571}\) In his memoirs Duprè explains,

> I don’t recall who mentioned my name first or my work, but Bartolini said that convincing evidence of his good teaching method was the statue of Abel, since the statue was made by a youth who knew nothing of Phidias or Alcmene, or of others, and who had not breathed the stuffy air of the academy, but trusting nature had copied it faithfully and with love.\(^{572}\)

When the statue was unveiled, a heated controversy broke out between the supporters of “*il bello di natura*” and “*il bello ideale,*” respectively, those at the Academy who advocated the close imitation of nature and those who instead believed that art should reflect ideal beauty. Purist sculptors preferred “the natural beauty” of the Renaissance over the “ideal beauty” of the Greeks. The debate was similar to that

---

\(^{570}\) The original title is *Abele Morente*, it was displayed at the Esposizione dell’Accademia di Firenze.

\(^{571}\) “[…] fatto sta che il Bartolini disse, che la prova più convincente della bontà del suo metodo era appunto l’Abele, la quale statua era fatta da un giovane che non sapeva nulla né di Fidia, né di Alcmena, né di altri, che non aveva respirato l’aria afosa dell’Accademia, e che affidatosi alla bella natura l’aveva copiata con fedeltà e con amore.” Giovanni Duprè, *Pensieri sull’arte e Ricordi Autobiografici* (Firenze: Le Monnier, 1893), chapter VII. See also Sarrocchi, 1924, 15; Capitelli, 2007, 82; Spalletti, 2002, 11.

\(^{572}\) “Non mi sovviene da qual parte prima fu pronunciato il mio nome e l’opera mia; fatto sta che il Bartolini disse, che la prova più convincente della bontà del suo metodo era appunto l’Abele, la quale statua era fatta da un giovane che non sapeva nulla né di Fidia, né di Alcmena, né di altri, che non aveva respirato l’aria afosa dell’Accademia, e che affidatosi alla bella natura l’aveva copiata con fedeltà e con amore.” Duprè, 1893, 118. Spalletti, 2002, 11. See also Capitelli, 2007, 82.
provoked, two years earlier, by Bartolini when he introduced his hunchback model for the sculpture exercise regarding Aesop.

As the title of the statue makes clear, Duprè’s statue depicts Abel, the second son of Adam and Eve, who is shown lying in anguish after his brother Cain’s brutal attack. [Fig. 69] His distraught facial expression makes the spectator understand that his despair is a result of both his realization of imminent death caused by his brother’s betrayal. At the time critics argued that the statue was so realistic that Duprè could not have sculpted it freely and accused him of having made the statue after a life cast. The debate was only squashed after the sculptor allowed critics to compare the measurements of his statue with the model he had used, and this confirmed that he had not made a life cast. 573 The model was highly admired by the public, and shortly after the exhibition the Grand Duchess Maria Nikolaievna, Daughter of the Russian Zar Nicola I, commissioned a statue (1843) after the plaster model now in the collection of the Hermitage. 574

Sarrocchi’s early career

In 1844, Sarrocchi joined Duprè’s workshop and within a year had already become one of Duprè’s most valuable assistants. 575 Sarrocchi worked on a number of Duprè’s commissions over the decade that followed, including statues of Cain and Pius II, as well as his own work, such as The Adulteress (La donna adultera) and Bacchus (Baccante), presented at public exhibitions in 1846 and 1851, respectively. 576 In 1853,

574 There is also a bronze copy of the statue in the Galleria d’Arte Moderna, Palazzo Pitti, Florence.
575 Duprè, 1917, 7-8.
576 The Adulteress is a bas relief which won third place in the sculpture competition at the Florentine Academy. Bacchus is a marble statue which was also exhibited at the Florentine Academy. Pierini, 1999, 136.
Duprè left Sarrocchi in charge of his workshop when, following his doctor’s advice, he left Florence in order to take care of pressing health concerns in Naples. Surviving correspondence between the two men gives us an idea of their relationship at this time. Duprè’s letters are filled with advice on how to facilitate the daily operations of the studio and directions on how Sarrocchi should handle commissions in his absence.

Sarrocchi’s experience running Duprè’s workshop was fundamental for his development not just as a sculptor but as a master learning to run a workshop. This undoubtedly helped him make the transition to an independent career. In 1855, at thirty-six years of age, the Sienese sculptor Enea Becheroni died suddenly, leaving the commission of the Pianigiani monument in Siena unfinished. This tragic event, as I shall explain, launched Sarrocchi’s independent practice.

The committee responsible for the Pianigiani monument, located in the left transept of the church of S. Domenico in Siena, included Gaetano Milanesi, who composed the funerary epigraph in 1853, and Giovanni Duprè, who was responsible for supervising the project. The monument was commissioned to celebrate the engineer Giuseppe Pianigiani, who was responsible for the creation of the train line that connected Siena to the preexisting Firenze-Livorno line. At the death of Becheroni it was Duprè who designated his pupil Sarrocchi for the commission and facilitated his move back to Siena. In a letter to Luigi Mussini, Duprè described Sarrocchi as “an honest, modest, and

---

579 Becheroni died in Livorno on June 9, 1855.
580 Originally positioned near the door, the monument was moved into the transept in 1941. Pierini, 1999, 12.
careful youth who will honor, and not fail those who advise him as he starts his independent career.”

According to surviving documents Sarrocchi was responsible for the design and execution of the lower half of the monument, principally the three allegorical figures of the arts: Mechanics, Architecture and Physics (La Meccanica, l’Architettura, La Fisica). [Fig. 70] The three female figures are positioned in round niches on the base of the monument; each is dressed all’antica and carries an identifying attribute. The influence of Duprè’s art is still strong on Sarrocchi. This is especially noticeable in the figures’ drapery, which is similar to that sculpted by Dupré for his Abandoned Sappho. [Fig. 71] The statue depicts Sappho seated with her right leg crossed over her left. From the waist down she is covered with an ample robe. Her crossed legs are covered by drapery that twists to dramatically reveal her body. The fabric falls down along her right knee in an ornate v-shaped pattern. The drapery is similar to the wet drapery characteristic of fifth-century BCE classical Greek sculpture. Indeed, within Dupré’s oeuvre the statue is considered an example of Greek revival art. Despite the fact that Sarrocchi’s figures are fully clothed; the drapery on his figures on the Pianiginai monument, especially Meccanica and Architettura is similarly treated. The similarity is

---

581 He described him as “onesto, modesto e attento giovane, che potrà fare onore, e non farà pentire quegli che vorrà essergli largo di consigli nella carriera, ora del tutto indipendente, che va ad intraprendere.” Letter from Dupré to Luigi Mussini dated July 7, 1855. Cited from Narciso Mengozzi, Lettere intime di artisti senesi (Siena: Sordomuti, 1908), 20.

582 Becheroni had completed the portrait of Pianigiani before his death. Pierini, 1999, 12.

583 Their attributes are for Mechanics a bellows and a lever; for Architecture a scroll and a square; for Physics the wheel of a grinstone

584 The original title is Saffo abandonata, 1857, Galleria d’Arte Moderna, Rome.
especially pronounced in the pattern of closely chiseled pleats in the drapery that falls from the figures’ knees and over their busts revealing the forms beneath. [Fig. 72]

After nearly twelve years in Duprè’s studio, the commission of the Pianigiani monument had brought Sarrocchi back to his native Siena. This is where Sarrocchi established his workshop and worked as an independent sculptor for the next thirty years. The successful completion of the Pianigiani monument determined Sarrocchi’s commission for a number of other Sienese works, for both public and private patrons, including the new Fonte Gaia.\(^{585}\) Despite his distance from Duprè’s workshop Sarrocchi conversed regularly with Duprè, who continued to act as his mentor as surviving letters attest.\(^{586}\) In 1860, for example, Duprè wrote Sarrocchi with regard to the latter’s commission of a statue of the famous artist Michelangelo: “I would like a photograph and I will give you my opinion as usual.”\(^{587}\) Duprè also acted as a sort of manager for Sarrocchi, intervening with supervisory councils in order to direct commissions his way. He did this on a number of occasions, including the cases of the façade relief for the Church of Santa Croce in Florence and for the new Fonte Gaia in Siena.

---

\(^{585}\) The Pianigiani monument was inaugurated June 5, 1858 and on July 29 Sarrocchi received the Fonte Gaia commission. That same year Sarrocchi was commissioned a statue for the Venturi-Gallerani Chapel (Siena). In 1859 he was commissioned the funerary monument to Francesco Bonci Casuccini (Madonna della Rosa Church, Chianciano), and in 1860 a relief for the funerary monument to Girolamo Ballati Nerli (Quinciano), a statue for the garden of Allessandro Saracini (Castelnuovo Berardenga), and a tympanum relief for the façade of Santa Croce (Florence).

\(^{586}\) Here he worked for the next thirty years occupying the same studio previously occupied by Enea Becheroni. Sarrocchi, 1924, 21. Pierini tells us that Sarrocchi’s studio occupied the chiostro of S. Domenico. Pierini, 1999, 136.

\(^{587}\) The original citation reads: “Gradirò la fotografìa e glie ne dirò il mio parere come al solito.” Letter from Duprè to Sarrocchi dated March 14, 1860. Cited in Sarrocchi, 1917, 13. The statue was commissioned by Alessandro Saracini for the garden of his villa at Castelnuovo Berardenga where it is still today. Sarrocchi, 1924, 25.
Originally, it was Duprè who had been commissioned to sculpt three tympanum reliefs for the façade of the church of Santa Croce. In 1860 he asked the supervisory committee to allow him to contract out to Sarrocchi the left portal tympanum (*Discovery of the Cross*) and the right portal tympanum (*Vision of Constantine*) to another former student, Emilio Zocchi. He further advised Sarrocchi on his composition of the relief,

> I have your photograph right here. The corrections I think you should make are the following: The figure of a man on the left, holding the cross, should bend over more. This will help interrupt the severe line of the large cross but also help to make the group of men behind him more visible […]

In addition to Duprè’s guidance, Sarrocchi also benefitted from Gaetano Milanesi’s counsel. Sarrocchi asked for Milanesi’s advice with regard to a number of his later sculptures, such as *Ezekiel’s Vision* (1879, Placidi Chapel, Cemetery of the Misericordia, Siena), the Independence War Memorial (1879, Piazza dell’Indipendenza, Siena), and the funerary monument to marquis Giuseppe Campori (1886, Cemetery of San Cataldo, Modena). In addition, although Sarrocchi’s selection for the Fonte Gaia project was largely determined by Duprè’s intercession, the fact that Milanesi was already familiar with his work made Sarrocchi an especially favored candidate. In chapter three, I outlined how Milanesi played a pivotal role in launching the Fonte Gaia project.

---

588 The new façade was designed, between 1857-1863, by the architect Niccolò Matas (1798-1872).
589 The original citation reads: “Ho sottocchio la fotografia del suo bassorilievo. Ecco le correzioni che mi pare necessario di portarci. La figura dell’uomo a sinistra, che tiene la croce, starebbe bene più piegata perché così interromperebbe quella gran linea della croce e lascierebbe più visibile il gruppo di dietro.” Letter from Duprè to Sarrocchi dated March 11, 1861. Cited in Sarrocchi, 1917, 14. Duprè executed the tympanum over the central door which represents the Triumph of the Cross. The new façade reliefs were inaugurated in 1865. Sarrocchi, 1924, 26.
590 A photograph of the plaster model of Ezekiel’s vision was also sent to Milanesi in 1877. Letter from Tito Sarrocchi to Gaetano Milanesi April 30 and May 13, 1877, BCS, Lettere di diversi a Gaetano Milanesi, MS. P II 46. Pierini, 1999, 116. Petrioli, 2004, 123. The Independence memorial has since been moved. It is now located in the public garden along viale Arturo Pannilunghi, at San Prospero, Siena.
Just a few months before the fountain was commissioned to Sarrocchi, Milanesi had served on the supervisory committee for the Pianigiani monument. Sarrocchi’s work must have appealed to Milanesi since he also commissioned from the sculptor a portrait bust of his late brother Carlo for his tomb in the cemetery of the Misericordia in Siena.  

As mentioned earlier, the vast majority of Sarrocchi’s work was commissioned for private patrons and these works fall into three primary categories: freestanding sculptures for funerary chapels, funerary monuments or cenotaphs with relief sculpture, and/or sculpture in the round. The first such commission after the execution of the Pianigiani monument was for a life-size statue for a funerary chapel in the cemetery of the Misericordia in Siena. The statue, _Genius of Death_, commissioned in May of 1858, depicts a nude youth who stands in _contrapposto_ with his left arm folded across his chest. [Fig. 73] There is a long cloth wrapped once around his forearm which covers his genitals and falls down along his right leg to the floor where a sickle rests upside down. His right elbow rests perpendicularly on top of a sickle and his right hand rests under his chin in a gesture of contemplation. A cypress wreath crowns his head and long wavy hair frame his rather feminine features. When the statue was installed in the Venturi-Gallerani chapel in 1860, it was praised by critics as a sentimental mix of Christian ideals and Greek beauty. Stylistically, the statue was inspired by the Greek revival but, as is typical in the nineteenth century, there are various influences at work.

---

592 The original title is _Genio della morte._
Indeed there are several features of the statue that pay homage to the Italian Renaissance. The combination of a *contrapposto* stance with a feminine nude male youth is a reminder of Donatello’s bronze *David*. The statue guards the entrance of the tomb, designed as the remaining architecture of the chapel, in a style that is characterized as Egyptian Revival, according to the patron’s wishes.594 This eclectic mixture of styles is typical of the decoration of the chapels in the Misericordia cemetery.

The Misericordia cemetery is located outside the southern city gate, Porta Tufi. [Fig. 74] The cemetery preserves some of Siena’s finest nineteenth- and early twentieth-century art, including the work of sculptors Giovanni Duprè, Enea Becheroni and Tito Sarrocchi, and the painters Giovanni Bruni, Luigi Mussini, Alessandro Franchi and Cesare Maccari. In Tuscany the practice of burying the dead within churches (and the cloisters of convents) was banned in 1784 following a law issued by Grand Duke Pietro Leopoldo.595 This led to the creation of public outdoor cemeteries like Siena’s Misericordia cemetery. The nucleus of the structure dates to 1835-43. It consisted of a roughly square plan with galleries on three sides of an open courtyard. The cemetery was first enlarged, in 1862, by Lorenzo Doveri and, after his death in 1867, more substantially by Giuseppe Partini who added some thirty private chapels under the porticos in 1872. The chapels are designed in a mixture of Greek and ancient Roman styles.596 Each chapel

---

is decorated with painted frescoes, sculpted tombs or portraits of the deceased according to the patron’s specifications. Gothic, Renaissance, Greek, and Egyptian Revival styles coexist in the architecture, sculpture and frescoes of the chapels. This stylistic freedom was typical of nineteenth-century Italian cemetery art, visible not just in Siena’s Misericordia cemetery but Genoa’s Staglieno cemetery or Milan’s Monumentale cemetery. A number of Sarrocchi’s sculptures in Siena’s Misericordia cemetery demonstrate that he was an able practitioner of various revival styles. It was not unusual for Sarrocchi to work in different styles contemporaneously while juggling different commissions. He did this, for example, while working on the new Fonte Gaia, which required a Renaissance idiom instead of, for example, the Greek revival style that he had used for the Genius of Death discussed above.

---

597 Examples include the marble statue Genio della Morte (Venturi-Gallerani Chapel), the marble relief Angelo del Giudizio Universale (Monument to Ernesta Gani. She was Sarrocchi’s first wife. She died in childbirth in 1863.), the marble group Virtù Teologali (Buonsignori Chapel), the marble group Tobia che seppellisce un morto (Pozzesi Chapel), the Monument to Clementina Cresti, the marble group La visione di Ezechiele (Placidi Chapel), the marble statue La Riconoscenza (Bandini Piccolomini Chapel), the Monument to Alessandra Pierini Pallini and the marble Statue Angelo della Resurrezione (Ciseri De Metz Chapel).

598 Between July 29, 1858, when Sarrocchi was commissioned the new Fonte Gaia, and the inauguration of the monument, on January 24, 1869, the sculptor worked on a number of different commissions: in 1858 the marble statue Genio della morte (Venturi-Gallerani Chapel, Misericordia cemetery, Siena); in 1859 the funerary monument of Francesco Bonci Casuccini in the Madonna della Rosa Church, Chianciano; in 1860 the relief Fede consolatrice del Dolore for the Monument to Girolamo Ballati Nerli (Ballati Nerli chapel, Quinciano), the same year he was also commissioned the statue of Michelangelo for the garden of Alessandro Saracini in Castelnuovo Berardenga and the tympanum relief of the Discovery of the Cross for the facade of Santa Croce in Florence; in 1863 the statues Prima preghiera and Prima lettura; in 1865 he was hired by Partini, architect of the Opera del Duomo, to sculpt copies of the portrait busts around the rose window of Siena’s Cathedral façade.
Section II

Giuseppe Partini

Over the course of his career Sarrocchi worked repeatedly with the Sienese architect Giuseppe Partini (1842-1895), as Marco Pierini’s study underscored.\(^{599}\) Their relationship started out as a professional association but soon developed into a lifelong friendship and later a family tie when their children married in 1893.\(^{600}\) Partini was Professor of Architecture at Siena’s Academy of Fine Art, and head architect of the Opera del Duomo.\(^{601}\) Thus he was responsible for a number of projects in Siena including the design of the seat of the Monte dei Paschi Bank,\(^{602}\) the Misericordia Cemetery, the restoration of Siena’s Cathedral, and the new Fonte Gaia project. He also designed a number of private funeral chapels and monuments such as the Monument to Giulio Rossi (Misericordia Cemetery, Siena) and the Monument to Girolamo Ballati Nerli in the Pieri Nerli Chapel of Quinciano (Monteroni d’Arbia), both sculpted by Sarrocchi.\(^{603}\) Later in his career he was appointed, together with Gaetano Milanesi, to the regional council


\(^{600}\) Adele Sarrocchi married Luigi Partini on October 15, 1893. Pierini, 1999, 142.

\(^{601}\) He became professor at the Academy in 1866 after the post was left vacant by the death of his mentor Lorenzo Doveri. Maria Cristina Buscioni ed., *Giuseppe Partini (1842-1895): Architetto del Purismo senese* (Firenze: Electa, 1981), 20.

\(^{602}\) This included the restoration and re-design of three separate building: the medieval Palazzo Salimbeni, the fifteenth-century Palazzo Spannocchi, and the sixteenth-century Palazzo Tantucci.

\(^{603}\) The monument to Rossi (1862) was designed by Partini while the portrait bust was sculpted by Sarrocchi. Pierini, 1995, 497. The Ballati Nerli monument (1863), designed by Partini and sculpted by Sarrocchi, is a wall tomb with Gothic style pinnacles with the figures of Faith consoling Grief in high relief in the center of the monument (*Fede consolatrice del Dolore*). Mazzoni, 1990, 133-134. Sisi and Spalleti, 1994, 349-354.
supervising the arts and, in 1892, he was nominated, as was Sarrocchi, to the national commission on the Veneto’s monument restoration committee.\textsuperscript{604}

In the scholarly literature Partini is considered Siena’s chief purist architect. This is understandable considering his prolific career and the number of his interventions, following Viollet-le-Duc’s theories, which are stylistic restorations.\textsuperscript{605} With regard to the Fonte Gaia, I have outlined in chapter three, how Partini, as supervising architect, was largely responsible for the structural modifications made to the new fountain. These changes entailed repositioning the fountain in the square and enclosing the new fountain with a gate of his design.\textsuperscript{606} These alterations helped ameliorate the flow and clarity of the fountain’s waters, protect the fountain from unauthorized use, and allow for an improved arrangement of the square for the activities that continued to take place there. In addition, Partini, together with Sarrocchi, recommended that the original travertine base of the Fonte Gaia be replaced by a base in \textit{pietra serena} in order to better show off the marble of the new fountain.\textsuperscript{607} These were not the only modernizations made to the square in the nineteenth century. The commune had new gas lights, designed by Partini and the commune’s civic architect Cantucci, positioned around the perimeter of the square in the nineteenth century. The commune had new gas lights, designed by Partini and the commune’s civic architect Cantucci, positioned around the perimeter of the square.


\textsuperscript{605} See Buscioni, 1981. Sisi and Spalletti, 1994, 349-568. This is especially true after the death, in 1861, of the architect Giulio Rossi who was an able practitioner of stylistic restoration. Of particular note are Rossi’s interventions on the Palazzo dei Diavoli in 1859 and the Rocca Salimbeni in 1861. Sisi and Spalletti, 1994, 349. On Rossi see Romagnoli, 1835, vol. XII, 277.


\textsuperscript{607} The supervisory committee approved their suggestion and a new base (\textit{platea}) was made. ASC, Carteggio, Cat. XIV, Lavori Pubblici 18, Fonti pubbliche.
square, and even changed the square’s name from Piazza del Campo to the more patriotic alternative Piazza Vittorio Emmanuele II. 608 [Fig. 75]

Just a few years before the commission of the new Fonte Gaia, the square had also been the site of Enea Becheroni’s “restoration” of the Cappella di Piazza, or the ex-voto Chapel located adjacent to the Palazzo Pubblico and opposite the Fonte Gaia. 609

Becheroni, like Sarrocchi, was trained in Duprè’s studio and in 1848 was awarded the post of Maestro d’Ornato teaching sculpture carving at the Academy in Siena. 610 Between 1842 and 1846 he sculpted new reliefs and sculptures for the chapel, which was originally built and decorated during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. [Fig. 76] The structure of the marble chapel was begun by Domenico d’Agostino in the fourteenth century and the sculptural ornamentation was carved by Mariano d’Angelo Romanelli and Bartolommeo di Tommè. In 1470 Guidoccio Cozzarelli added the reliefs depicting the figures of Aritmetica and Geometria to the Gothic style balustrade. Originally, the chapel was covered with a simple roof, as the fifteenth-century paintings by Sano di Pietro and Neroccio di Bartolomeo illustrate. 611 This was replaced, in 1468, with a marble vault and exterior decorations of garlands, niches for statues, and a frieze of griffins by Antonio Federighi.
The chapel’s marbles were in poor condition. Like the Fonte Gaia the chapel was also built of marble from the Montagnola. It suffered, also from weathering and damage caused by the various activities that took place in the piazza.\textsuperscript{612} Apparently the chapel was in such profound disrepair that some architects suggested that the structure be completely demolished.\textsuperscript{613} Fortunately, it was not, and instead Enea Becheroni was commissioned to restore it. Recently, it has been demonstrated that the restoration project concerned, not just the lower balustrade (with the reliefs of \textit{Aritmetica} and \textit{Geometria} facing the piazza),\textsuperscript{614} but Federighi’s Renaissance frieze, and the remaining sculptures.\textsuperscript{615} In particular, Petrioli has demonstrated how Becheroni’s work on the chapel was, like Sarrocchi’s Fonte Gaia, a stylistic restoration that created something new as he interpreted the chapel’s original sculptures.\textsuperscript{616} Becheroni’s chapel is yet another

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{612} These are similar to those of the Fonte Gaia. People climbed on to the balustrade during the palio and bull hunt. See for example Vincenzo Rustici, \textit{Caccia dei tori}, 1585 ca., Siena, Collezione Monte dei Paschi, the engraving by Bernardino Capitelli, \textit{Feste per il Granduca XX ottobre 1632} (illustrated in R. Barzanti, A. Cornice, E. Pellegrini, \textit{Iconografia di Siena. Rappresentazione della città dal XIII al XIX secolo}, Siena, Monte dei Paschi, 2006, 240, fig. 174 and 247, fig. 179). Petrioli, 2007, 2. There was also a \textit{bottega di salumairo} located next to the chapel in Via Pescheria. See the engravings: Bernardino Oppi, \textit{Piazza del Campo}, 1650, Gaspero Pecchioni, \textit{Piazza del Campo}, 1761, Domenico de’ Rossi, \textit{Palio}, 1718, or the view of the square by Giuseppe Zocchi, \textit{Palio}, 1739 – 1751, Siena, Collezione Monte dei Paschi (illustrated in: R. Barzanti, A. Cornice, E. Pellegrini, \textit{Iconografia di Siena}…, cit., 252, fig. 182; 222, fig. 166; 264, fig. 189; 268, fig. 190).

\textsuperscript{613} The architect Lorenzo Doveri together with the gonfaloniere Antonio Palmieri suggested the demolition of the chapel in 1833 and the same request was made again in 1841 by the engineer Zanetti. ASS, \textit{Governo di Siena}, 386, II, “Deputazione dei Conservatori dei Monumenti di Belle Arti di Siena. Libro delle Deliberazioni dal 1 dicembre 1829 al 20 luglio 1857”, Adunanza del 22 gennaio 1833. Cited in Petrioli, 2007, 2.


\textsuperscript{615} For a list see Petrioli, 2007, 3 and Francesca Fabiani, \textit{La cappella di Piazza a Siena: storia, materiali, conservazione}, in “Quaderni di storia dell’architettura e restauro”, XX, 1998 (1999), 152.

\textsuperscript{616} Petrioli, 2007, 2. He explains, “la magistrale versatilità tecnica del Becheroni nel riprodurre stili fra loro differenti, spaziando dal gotico di metà Trecento al classicismo rinascimentale del quindicesimo secolo, applicando una idea di restauro-rifacimento uguale a quella che seguirà, in maniera ancor più radicale, il suo collega Sarrocchi per la Fonte Gaia, ove i pezzi in grave stato di conservazione vengono rimossi e sostituiti da nuovi “in stile”.”
\end{flushleft}
example of the type of romantic restoration that was employed by Manetti on the façade sculptures of Siena’s Cathedral and, as I shall explain, by Sarrocchi on the Fonte Gaia.

Sarrocchi’s Fonte Gaia

Commission and Reception

The supervisory committee hired Tito Sarrocchi to sculpt the new fountain for the square on July 29, 1858. The total amount collected by the commune via public subscription was just over 60,515 lire for the construction of the new fountain. The collection of funds proved to be more difficult than anticipated and thus, in order to speed the project along, the commune stipulated separate contracts for the fountain based on money collected. In 1858 the central rear wall was commissioned for 27,285 lire. The lateral wings were commissioned next in 1861 for 7728 lire and the same contract allocated 9844 lire for the marble to sculpt the central wall. The 1858 contract concerned the central and back wall of the fountain while the lateral walls and later structural modifications were stipulated with successive acts on August 28, 1861 and February 24, 1865. In order to withstand the elements the new fountain was sculpted

617 ASC, Carteggio, Cat. XIV, Lavori Pubblici 18. The committee was presided over by Carlo Corradino Chigi. The other members listed include Gaspero Pini, Luigi Mussini, Alessandro Saracini, Tiberio Sergardi, Scipione Bichi-Borghesi, and Bernardo Tolomei. Sarrocchi, 1924, 22.
618 The original estimate for the project was 100,000 lire. The total amount collected was 60,514.20 lire. Banchi et al, 1869, 27.
619 ASC, Carteggio, Cat. XIV, Lavori Pubblici 18, July 29, 1858. The contract stipulated that Sarrocchi was to complete the job within three years from August 1, 1858.
620 ASC, Carteggio, Cat. XIV, Lavori Pubblici 18, September 28, 1861. This contract stipulated that Sarrocchi had fourteen months to make the plaster casts of Quercia’s fountain and the plaster models for the new reliefs.
621 The 1858 contract stipulated “il parapetto centrale, la cimasa e le controbasi.” This was to take three years and cost 27,285 lire. The 1861 contract stipulated “due parapetti laterali, escludendo la cimasa, le controbasi e i due pilastri di testate.” This was to take sixteen months and cost 9,844.80 lire. The 1865 contract stipulated “due grandi pilastri che servono per la base, tutta la cimasa, le basi interne e le sei lupe.” The price for this job was set at 10,034 lire. Banchi et al, 1869, 26-27. Pierini, 1999, 100.
from marble from Seravezza, a more durable type of marble than that used by Querzia four hundred years earlier. [Fig. 77]

Sarrocchi was commissioned for the new fountain not only because Milanesi was already familiar with Sarrocchi’s work from the Pianigiani monument but also because Duprè had recommended him highly to his friend Luigi Mussini, one of the members of the fountain’s supervisory committee, and at the time, Director of the Academy of Fine Art in Siena. Sarrocchi was a natural choice for the Fonte Gaia project because the committee wanted to hire a local sculptor, and both Manetti and Becheroni were unavailable (the first had moved to Livorno, the second had passed away). It is possible that Mussini owed Duprè a favor since back in 1850 it was Duprè who recommended him for the position of Director of the Academy. Apparently Mussini’s friends (Giovanni Duprè, Gaetano and Carlo Milanesi, Carlo Pini, Cesare Guasti, and Luigi Venturi) had made a bet as to which one of them would persuade him to take over the position of Director left vacant by the death of Francesco Nencì. It is even possible that the Fonte

622 The name of the marble comes from its location Seravezza (Lucca). The contract stipulated the use of “marmo ravaccione di Carrara.” ASC Carteggio, Cat. XIV, Lavori Pubblici, July 29, 1858.


624 “Fu una gara fra i miei amici-ricorda Mussini-Gaetano e Carlo Milanesi, Carlo Pini, Cesare Guasti, Giovanni Duprè, Luigi Venturi, un vero assedio per indurmi ad attendere alla successione del Nenci che, dicevano, mi era assicurata per poco che ne facessi domanda. Ben s’intende che la mia famiglia non ristava dall’insistere nello stesso senso. Da Siena poi, e la Sig. Maria Nerli, e quegli che allora non conoscevo e che fu poi si ottimo e caro amico mio, mi diressero lettere premuroissime.” Duprè, 1893, 198-201.
Gaia project was first offered to Duprè who, as can be inferred from a letter, was not interested in this type of project.  

On June 4, 1858, Sarrocchi was commissioned to make the plaster casts of the central and back wall “as soon as possible,” although a clause indicated that the sculptor should not assume that this meant that he would be hired to sculpt the new fountain. Conversely, it appears that the committee’s warning was routine since informal discussion of the commission to Sarrocchi had begun at least a year before the official contract date. In December of 1857 Duprè wrote Sarrocchi,

this [the Fonte Gaia] shall be for you a time-consuming project and maybe of some earning, I hope, but unfortunately rather dull, because where you are able you must faithfully copy the original sculptures and where these are lost you will have to bend your ingenuity and model your carving after another’s even when you are not inclined to.

Duprè’s letter certainly does not make the job sound enticing. Yet Sarrocchi accepted the commission despite such an unfavorable description. There are probably two reasons for this. First, Sarrocchi was at the beginning of his career and thus certainly a dull job was better than no job. And second, a commission such as the new Fonte Gaia, which was located in such an important location and paid for by Siena’s citizens, was precious

626 June 4, 1858. ASC, Carteggio, Cat. XIV, Lavori Pubblici 18, Fonti Pubbliche. The original citation reads, “Il Sig. Tito Sarrocchi di fare eseguire i calchi dei bassorilievi del parapetto centrale al più presto possibile, senza che per questo debbasi intendere affidata al medesimo definitivamente la commissione della esecuzione del lavoro in marmo.”
627 “[...] questo sarà per Lei un lavoro lungo a forse di qualche guadagno, voglio sperare, ma alquanto uggioso a mio parere, perché dove si può bisogna fedelmente copiare e dove l’originale ha perduto qualunque traccia bisogna piegare il proprio ingegno e modellarsi a quello, cui per avventura non siamo inclinati sempre.” Letter from Giovanni Duprè to Tito Sarrocchi dated December 27, 1857. Cited from Sarrocchi, 1917, 11.
628 Sarrocchi also complained about the commission to Duprè. He writes that the work was of “nesunissima soddisfazione”. AD, Letter from Tito Sarrocchi to Giovanni Duprè June 7, 1858. See Pierini, 1999, 17.
publicity that could potentially bring more commissions to the sculptor, assuming it was received well.

We know that the new fountain was greatly admired by the majority of Sarrocchi’s contemporaries. For the inauguration of the fountain on January 24, 1869, the celebratory pamphlet published for the occasion proclaimed, “Today the Fonte Gaia is restored to her primitive splendor, thanks to the talent and merit of our dear sculptor and citizen Tito Sarrocchi.” Mussini was even more laudatory in his evaluation, “This marvelous restoration, rather reproduction, of the famous Fonte Gaia, is a work that the distinguished Sienese sculptor, who with force and wondrous talent, identified with the genius of Jacopo della Quercia, and made his maniera and emotion his own.” Not everyone agreed with Mussini’s view. Indeed, Guido Sarrocchi recounts, in 1924, that one journalist thought that his father’s fountain was in and of itself an act of vandalism. From the local press it appears that there were other dissenting voices but these did not concern the fountain sculpture, but rather, the decision to move the fountain and enclose it with a gate.

---


630 “…ed oggi la Fonte Gaia vedesi restituita al primitivo splendore, mercè l’ingegno e la valenza dell’egregio scultore nostro cittadino Tito Sarrocchi.” Banchi et al., 1869, proemio. See also Sarrocchi, 1924, 23.


632 The original citation reads, “...vent’anni fa, una giornalista, che si atteggiava anche a critico d’arte, inviò da Siena al suo giornale una corrispondenza nella quale, parlando della Fonte Gaia, taccò quasi di vandalica l’opera di mio padre.” Sarrocchi, 1924, 159.

633 With regard to the first concern some critics argued that changing the fountain’s location was disrespectful to the history of the square and Quercia’s memory. La Vita Nuova, October 4, 1868, 4. Instead in the article “Sulla nuova Fonte di Piazza del Campo di Siena” in Il Libero Cittadino, December 20, 1868
Faithful copy or Purist revision?
The differences between Sarrocchi’s Fonte Gaia and Quercia’s original monument

Although Sarrocchi generally followed Quercia’s iconographic program (minus several border elements and the two full-scale statues\textsuperscript{634}), he imposed a style and finish on the monument that significantly altered what was supposed to be a faithful recreation of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia. And even though Sarrocchi’s contemporaries saw his fountain to be a faithful copy of Quercia’s monument, in this section I shall demonstrate that it was in fact heavily influenced by purism. The new Fonte Gaia is a projection of the artistic creation of a Sienese artist working during the mid-Ottocento which, for Sarrocchi, meant a carving style influenced by the art of Lorenzo Bartolini and Giovanni Duprè. This is not surprising considering Sarrocchi’s artistic formation under the guidance of these men. I do not wish to imply that Sarrocchi’s nineteenth-century creation was in any way a critical rejection of Quercia’s style. Instead, I believe Sarrocchi’s interpretation of Quercia’s fountain is to be ascribed to a “period eye” that failed to perceive Quercia’s robust plasticity and antique style entirely.\textsuperscript{635}

\textsuperscript{634} Gabrielli has shown that two border elements were not made and eight pieces were situated in incorrect positions compared with Quercia’s fountain. Gabrielli, 2011, 129. The two lateral parapet statues were never executed. The project for the statues was discussed by the supervisory committee after the fountain’s inauguration in January of 1869 and over the course of the following year. The committee felt that if the fountain was to be returned to it’s primitive state then not only should the lateral parapet statues be made but so should the statue of a putto adoring the Virgin which according to Tizio’s history was located below her on the rim of the basin. In October of 1870 mention of a public subscription to pay for the statues is made but soon abandoned and the entire discussion is put to rest in September of 1871. ASC, Carteggio, Cat. XVII, Lavori Pubblici 6. \textit{Il Libero Cittadino}, January 23, 1870. \textit{La Vita Nuova}, October 2, 1870.

\textsuperscript{635} Michael Baxandall writes about the Period Eye in the second section of his book \textit{Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988). As Baxandall explains, different ways of seeing objects are a direct result of how one’s brain applies knowledge to what one sees. Consequently, the interpretation of visual data may differ greatly according to experience.
It is quite likely that Sarrocchi believed that he had respected his contractual stipulation that the new fountain be “a copy in marble in everything the same and as similar [to Quercia’s Fonte Gaia]”. He even describes his fountain in 1866 as a “reproduction of the Fonte Gaia”.\(^{636}\) In June of 1858, before the official commission of the new fountain, he was hired to create plaster casts of Quercia’s sculptures. Casts, such as those made by Sarrocchi, generally served as an artisan’s tool to aid the sculptor in his task of copying an original work. [Fig. 78] In this case Sarrocchi’s plaster casts are a particularly valuable tool because they record the state of the fountain before it was removed from the square. By contrast Sarrocchi’s plaster casts preserve many figural elements that have since been lost due to subsequent damage to Quercia’s fountain remnants. For this reason they can also help to reconstruct some of the qualities of Quercia’s carving style which would have been more apparent in their original state.\(^{637}\)

Sarrocchi’s plaster cast of Fortitude was particularly useful to decipher Quercia’s relief, discussed further on, and to reposition the figure’s head which had not been properly restored in the nineteenth century, as mentioned in chapter three. The plaster cast of

\(^{636}\) The citation is from a letter written to the Civic Magistrate of Siena from Gaspero Pini and Gaetano Milanesi from July 18, 1844. ASC, Preunitario. Atti magistrati 545 (1844), cc. 219 and 226. The sculptor described his fountain in 1866 (three years before the inauguration of the new fountain) as a “[…] riproduzione della Fonte Gaia rintracciata su le mutilate sculture di Jacopo della Quercia.” ASS, Istituto d’Arte Duccio di Boninsegna, Affari generali, 10 (1866-1867), 1866, 65. Also recall that the July 29, 1858 contract for the new fountain stipulated that Sarrocchi carve the new fountain “second’l’antico disegno di Giacomo della Quercia, e delle stesse misure e proporzioni.” ASC, Carteggio, Cat. XIV, Lavori Pubblici.

\(^{637}\) It should be noted that previous studies of Quercia’s monument had to come to terms not only with breakage but also with layers of dirt which darkened the depths of the folds and thus deceived the spectator as to the real nature of the forms. This is no longer an issue after the recent cleaning of Quercia’s marbles. However, another problem has emerged as a result. Today, almost none of the play of chiaroscuro is visible on Quercia’s reliefs and statues as a result of the radical cleaning of his marbles. This disturbing phenomenon was also noted by James Beck with regard to what he described as the “Spic & Span” cleaning of Quercia’s Ilaria monument in Lucca. See James Beck, L’Arte violate, una valutazione sulla cultura del restauro (Fucecchio: European Press Academic Publishing, 2002), 40-46.
Wisdom was similarly useful. The restorers, Landi, Manna and Potthoff, used Sarrocchi’s casts in order to integrate Quercia’s original relief accurately. [Fig. 79]

Apart from the plaster casts of Quercia’s fountain Sarrocchi also made his own plaster models which he then used to create permanent copies in marble. [Fig. 80] The regularly spaced point marks on his models are indicative of his use of the indirect carving method. This method employs the use of calipers or a pointing machine in order to transfer measurements accurately from the plaster to the stone. According to Sarrocchi’s son, Guido, after creating the plaster casts of Quercia’s fountain the sculptor covered the casts with clay to build up the missing forms and from these clay-casts made his new plaster models.⁶³⁸

A comparison of Quercia’s dismembered fountain remnants, Sarrocchi’s plaster casts, Sarrocchi’s new plaster models and Sarrocchi’s new fountain demonstrate that the nineteenth-century sculptor was not as faithful to the famous Renaissance original as we would expect.⁶³⁹ As I shall demonstrate here, liberties were taken in designing and carving the fountain’s replacement sculptures. I shall start my discussion from the first relief on the left-hand wing of the fountain, The Creation of Adam, before discussing the relief located in the same position on the opposite wing, The Expulsion of Adam and Eve. I shall then turn to the Virtues and the relief of the Virgin and Child, highlighting the

---

⁶³⁸ Sarrocchi, 1924, 158. According to the inauguration pamphlet there were three sets of moulds: two sets of casts of Quercia’s remnants (one left in their original state and the other set used with clay) and the new plaster models. Banchi et al., 1869, 40.

⁶³⁹ In March of 2011 Quercia’s restored fountain remnants were finally displayed in Siena’s Santa Maria della Scala museum next to Sarrocchi’s plaster casts and Sarrocchi’s plaster models, allowing visitors to compare the works directly. Prior to this installation, for the last two decades, visitors could only view four of Quercia’s original marbles (the two full-scale female statues labeled Acca Larentia and Rhea Silvia and two reliefs which depict the Expulsion of Adam and Eve and the virtue Wisdom).
differences between the carving styles of Sarrocchi and Quercia. I have selected the Virtues Charity and Justice to discuss in further detail because they warrant supplementary scrutiny as I shall explain.

The relief illustrating the *Creation of Adam* from the left wing of the fountain is a particularly good example of how, despite the evidence at Sarrocchi’s disposal, the sculptor relied on his own invention and artistic formation to carve the new Fonte Gaia. A comparison of Quercia’s original relief and Sarrocchi’s plaster cast shows that his plaster cast preserves substantially more of the relief than Quercia’s original today. [Fig. 81] This is because, as we may recall from chapter three, Quercia’s fountain incurred damage in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries subsequent to Sarrocchi’s intervention. In Quercia’s damaged relief, both Adam and the figure of God have been decapitated. The modeling is broken in several places and many forms are roughly worn away. Adam’s legs have been shattered, as has the figure of God’s upper torso. The nineteenth-century cast is in better condition. It records the state of preservation before the fountain was removed from the Campo. Sarrocchi’s cast shows the position of God’s head, lost in the original relief, and preserves more of the figural carving, especially the area of Adam’s chest and God’s right shoulder. Nonetheless, the exact position of the figures is hardly discernable. It is possible to deduce the position and poses of the two figures from one of Quercia’s later works, the Portal of San Petronio in Bologna, commissioned some six years after the Fonte Gaia.⁶⁴⁰

---

⁶⁴⁰ Hanson first noted this particularity in her monograph on Quercia. Hanson, 1965, 61. The commission dates to 1425. On the portal see Beck, 1991, 108.
The relief on the left-hand side of the portal in Bologna shows the same arrangement of the scene, in reverse, as that on the Fonte Gaia. [Fig. 82] The relief in Bologna shows, on the lower right, Adam who appears to be pushing himself up to a sitting position with one arm. He has one leg extended and the other bent. God, leaning toward Adam, raises his left hand in blessing, while his right hand lifts his cloak at the waist. It is clear from a comparison of the two sculptures that there are a number of similarities, including the drapery of God’s cloak, composed in comparable patterns in both. In comparison, Sarrocchi’s relief from the new Fonte Gaia differs in several respects. [Fig. 83] For example, Adam is modeled in very high relief, much more so than could be inferred from either the nineteenth-century cast or the original relief. The folds of God’s cloak swoop down form his right shoulder across his chest and then from his waist down diagonally to the right, each round fold creating a lightly cast shadow. Furthermore, God firmly grasps Adam’s forearm and appears to be lifting him from the ground after having given him life. Sarrocchi must have invented the composition because neither the original, nor the plaster copy, nor the relief from the Portal of San Petronio shows the scene. This type of creative integration is explained by Guido Sarrocchi, in his biography on his father, in the following terms,

“If the erosion was marked, he had to recreate, guessing from the fragments, the progression of the folds and the position of missing limbs. For those figures, for

---

641 It should be noted that Hanson dealt specifically with a comparison of Quercia’s fifteenth-century Creation scenes. In her discussion she distinguishes a major difference in style from the Fonte Gaia creation of Adam and the one at Bologna. This difference she notes in the bulky draperies and lack of formalized curvilinear rhythms in the first compared to the latter. This is in contrast to Jacopo’s later style and must have been a result of a new influence that effected Quercia’s style between the carving of the two works. Hanson, 1965, 62-63.
which unfortunately only masses remained, the artist had to create anew, according to the *maniera* of Jacopo.  

Sarrocchi’s Creation relief demonstrates that the sculptor was not preoccupied with copying Quercia’s relief exactly. In fact, he follows Quercia’s composition only loosely. Clearly, for Sarrocchi a cursory approach to the original was enough of a facsimile when the original did not meet his aesthetic taste. However, within these terms the final relief can not be considered a copy but rather, using Viollet-Le-Duc’s words, “something entirely new.” It is notable how Quercia’s characteristic loop-ended folds on the figure of God the Father (where the cloak falls between the knees), and the soft, heavy folds creating sharp contrasts of light and dark around the figure are gone in Sarrocchi’s relief. Whereas Quercia’s figures inhabit a shallow stage Sarrocchi creates a much deeper illusion, placing the figure of God behind Adam and giving a greater sense of space.

Quercia’s Adam is a young man, with an oval face and a mass of voluminous hair and instead Sarrocchi’s Adam is far more sharply carved; his face is harder, with a jaw line and the bridge of the nose defined by hard forms. In addition, each curl of his hair is carved individually creating a far more rigorous treatment. This is Sarrocchi’s carving style as we can see, for example, from the same treatment of the hair on the figure of the corpse that Tobias lays to rest from the funerary monument in the Pannocchieschi d’Elci chapel (1873, Misericordia cemetery, Siena). [Fig. 84] This rigorous, almost stylized
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642 “*Se la erosion era più accentuata, occorreva ricreare, intuendo da qualche frammento, l’andamento delle pieghe e le posizioni di qualche arto mancante. Per quelle figure, delle quali rimanevano, purtroppo, solo informi masse, l’artista dové creare, pure attenendosi alla maniera di Jacopo.*” Sarrocchi, 1924, 158-159.

643 See page 176.
treatment of the hair derives from Duprè’s art as can be seen on his personification of Astronomy from the Tomb of Ottaviano Mossotti (1863, Camposanto, Pisa). [Fig. 85]

The Expulsion relief, from the right wing of the fountain, also demonstrates the clear influence of purist models on Sarrocchi’s fountain. [Fig. 86] The original relief is in better condition than its counterpart on the opposite wing discussed above. However, the upper left corner of the relief is fractured and on the far left the angel’s head and both arms are lost. To the right of the angel is the figure of Adam, in higher relief, and consequentially in worse condition. He is missing his head, one arm and both legs. Sculpted in low relief, Eve, to his right, is better preserved although she too is missing part of one leg and a deep fissure runs through her other leg and continues diagonally across the rest of the relief. Sarrocchi’s plaster cast shows Adam and the Angel in roughly the same condition. Eve, however, is preserved entirely and there is no trace of any fissure. [Fig. 87] Another copy of the scene dates from the end of the fifteenth-century. This copy, despite subtle differences in the creation of space, provides a rendering of the figures and their positions that is more faithful to Quercia’s original. The relief, located above the door of the Piccolomini library in Siena’s Duomo, shows the figures in their entirety. [Fig. 88] Adam is shown with his head craning behind, in the direction of the Angel pushing him beyond the gate. His legs overlap those of the Angel and his hunched shoulders direct the movement of the relief toward Eve, on the right. Here too, Quercia used the same subject on one of the reliefs of the Portal of San Petronio, though, unlike with the Creation scene, he does not use the same

---

644 There is more space at the top of the relief between the figures and the frame.
645 It has probably been there from the construction of the library in 1495 since the wall beneath it was not frescoed in 1502 with the rest of the room by Pinturicchio. Hanson, 1965, 63. Gielly, 1930, 33, n. 2.
composition.\textsuperscript{646} [Fig. 89] Thus, the Piccolomini relief is the only example that preserves the position of the heads, lacking in both the original and the nineteenth-century cast. Interestingly, as I discussed in chapter three with regard to Bruni’s drawing of the scene, Sarrocchi did not use the Piccolomini relief to enable the composition of his final relief closely to reflect the forms of Quercia’s original. Sarrocchi positions Adam’s head at less of an angle, no longer engaged with the angels but at about a three-quarter turn, and he reduces the space between Adam and Eve so that now Adam’s head overlaps Eve’s shoulder. The position of the Angel’s head is also changed so that he appears to be looking at the ground and not at Adam and Eve. These changes alter our reading of the unfolding drama. Sarrocchi makes the Angel appear almost apologetic and Adam more accepting of his fate.[Fig. 90] The relationship between the figures and the recession of space is also different. Quercia’s figures are aligned while Sarrocchi positions the Angel and Eve behind Adam as their footing makes clear. This more plausible spatial arrangement is a sign, as is the altered drama, of Sarrocchi’s attention to naturalism, a major concern for purist sculptors.

The difference in composition and finish that I have outlined in the reliefs of the \textit{Creation} and \textit{Expulsion} may be extended to a discussion of Sarrocchi’s other reliefs as well. Quercia’s female Virtues and the Virgin have a distinct facial type. [Fig. 91] Their...
faces are all composed of a long oval, a high forehead, a straight bridged nose and a small mouth. The eye is created by a straight line below, while above the lid arches at the center and slims to points at either side of the eye, only partially covering the pupil. The eye itself is not deeply set. The eye seems to squint, and at the same time the pupil, being only half covered by the upper lid, seems to look up at something undefined. Sarrocchi instead creates a deeply set eye by modeling the forms both above and below the pupil. [Fig. 92] His attention to the anatomy of the eye is more naturalistic than Quercia’s more abstract delineation and derives from contemporary purist models. Compare Sarrocchi’s Faith, for example, with the similar configuration of this facial feature on Bartolini’s Faith or the left-hand figure of Charity from Duprè’s Monument to Berta Moltke Ferrari Corbelli. [Fig. 93] In each case the deep set open pupil gives substantially more expression to the face than Quercia’s style is able to impart and consequently reveals inner sentiment more readily.

Sarrocchi was even more inventive and creative in cases where Quercia’s original reliefs were less decipherable. The relief of the Virtue Charity is an illustrative example. Quercia’s relief is broken, shattered and badly worn away. [Fig. 94] From the fragment it is possible to discern a figure from the waist down, with only a general impression of the figure’s legs positioned diagonally toward the right side of the composition. Sarrocchi’s nineteenth-century cast does represent the upper half of the relief, but this only preserves the empty niche since the head and torso were already lost by then. [Fig. 95] It is not possible to identify attributes and thus, from the remnants alone, one can not securely identify the Virtue. This fact has led scholars like James Beck to suggest that the figure
represents Humility, rather than Charity, as is more commonly found in the literature.\textsuperscript{647} As discussed in chapter two, Beck’s proposal is doubtful. Following Hanson’s conclusion on the subject, the identification of the figure as Charity makes the most sense in relation to the other Virtues (whose attributes are legible).\textsuperscript{648} In the nineteenth century the iconography of the relief was apparently not an issue since the relief is referred to as Charity in period documents.\textsuperscript{649}

Sarrocchi depicts Charity as a mother nursing one baby in her right arm and holding a sleeping toddler in her left. [Fig. 96] The toddler is seated on her left knee with his legs dangling between her legs which are similarly positioned diagonally toward the right side of the composition as in the original relief. Since there is no indication of the rest of the composition from Quercia’s relief one wonders how Sarrocchi came up with this composition. Carpellini explained that for the virtue Charity Sarrocchi was free to create anew since there was “nothing left” of the original relief; the result was that he invented “the modern” replacement, which he even signed.\textsuperscript{650}

Sarrocchi’s figure suggests a Renaissance model while the carving style is obviously nineteenth-century in appearance. The drapery of the Virtue’s robe, for

\textsuperscript{647} Beck, 1991, 83. See my discussion in Chapter two. On the various depiction of Charity in art see Wind, 1937-38, 322-330.

\textsuperscript{648} From left to right: Hope gazes upward at the Christ child. Wisdom holds a book on her lap. Fortitude wears armor under her cloak and holds a shield at her left side. Prudence holds, in her left hand, the broken remains of a snake. Justice holds, in her right hand, the broken remains of the hilt of a sword. Charity is attributed on the basis of elimination. She is the only theological Virtue missing from the program. Temperance is attributed on the basis of Supino who recounts that she held a measuring instrument. Supino, 1926, 40. Faith is identified by a large cross which she holds upright with her left hand. Hanson, 1965, 58.

\textsuperscript{649} The commemorative volume identifies the figure as Charity (Banchi et al., 1869, pt. II, ‘La Carità’) as does the 1904 catalogue for the \textit{Mostra dell’Antica Arte Senese}. See Ricci, 1904, 244.

\textsuperscript{650} “Nella figura della Carità, però della quale non rimaneva più traccia, Tito Sarrocchi era libero d’immaginare, e qui dopo avere manifestato l’antico autore, nel rifare la Carità scopri il moderno, e pose all’opera la sua firma.” Banchi et al., 1869, 27.
example, is sharply delineated and has no resemblance to Quercia’s much rounder forms. Sarrocchi creates the folds of drapery in a distinctive way, hard and relatively flat, like those that delineate his figures’ drapery in the relief of the *Discovery of the Cross* (1860, Santa Croce, Florence). [Fig. 97] Shortly after completing the Fonte Gaia Sarrocchi reused some of his models. It is interesting to note that Charity was copied for the depiction of another statue, this time in the round, of the same Virtue for the Buoninsegni monument (1870, Misericordia cemetery, Siena) which was elaborated just after his Fonte Gaia.  

Notwithstanding notable differences in carving style, Sarrocchi’s Virtues respect the proportions of Quercia’s Virtues. Sarrocchi’s Justice is proportionally analogous to Quercia’s figure even though the original relief has incurred an almost complete loss of the background. Both the original relief and Sarrocchi’s plaster cast show a fractured hilt and sword in Justice’s left hand and both are missing her right forearm entirely; it must have been in very high relief. For his new model Sarrocchi placed a sword in Justice’s left hand and a set of scales which dangle from her right hand over her knee. There is no indication of the presence of scales in Quercia’s relief, and the fifteenth-century drawing of the fountain although a depiction of an earlier, modified program, as discussed in chapter two, also shows Justice with just a sword.  

From this discussion it is clear that Sarrocchi’s Fonte Gaia transformed Quercia’s Renaissance work, via purist revisions, into a Renaissance Revival work that is only partially dependent on the original monument’s design. His fountain is a reflection of
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651 The monument was commissioned in 1864 and installed in 1870.
652 Hanson, 1965, 57.
nineteenth-century values. Like Manetti’s façade sculptures for Siena’s Cathedral and Becheroni’s Cappella di Piazza, it demonstrates that romantic restoration consistent with the precepts of Viollet-le-Duc was common in Siena around the middle of the nineteenth century.

**Conclusion**

This dissertation recounts the history of Siena’s Fonte Gaia, this concerns the history, construction and restoration of the monument in its entirety, not just Quercia’s famous Renaissance monument. One of the goals of this study has been to integrate our knowledge of the monument with the early (Trecento) and late (Ottocento) history of the fountain as the study of these periods provides us with a better understanding of both Quercia’s Fonte Gaia and the monument today. This dissertation makes important contributions to the history of Jacopo della Quercia and Tito Sarrocchi as well as to the history of others artists such as Giovanni Bruni, Antonio Manetti, Lorenzo Bartolini, and Giovanni Duprè. Further, this dissertation adds to the growing knowledge of marble restoration and talks about the history of preservation. Thus, it shall be useful to scholars of early Italian art and Nineteenth-century Revival art as well as to scholars of other disciplines such as water engineering, material culture and Risorgimento studies.

My research reveals that the Trecento fountain designated the site and probably the form of the fifteenth-century fountain and my survey of early Italian fountain design demonstrates the singularity of Quercia’s monument. My discussion of the logistics of water transportation in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, and the construction of Siena’s bottini contribute to a more thorough understanding of the spectacular importance of the Fonte Gaia’s fresh, running water in the Renaissance.
Next, I outlined the history of Quercia’s fountain. This entailed a discussion of the fountain’s commission, the meaning of its iconographical program and its influence in the art of the fifteenth century. I also put forth a new interpretation of the lateral parapet statues, which I argue are references to Gaia. I then traced the sad story of the fountain’s later history plagued, as the archival documents indicate, by acts of vandalism and disrepair. Finally, I recounted how Quercia’s damaged marbles were finally restored. In this section and related appendix, I explain how the modern restoration project was carried forth and shed light on how the discovery of polychromy and gilding on Quercia’s Fonte Gaia may affect our perception of Renaissance sculpture.

I then turned to the Ottocento to explain why Quercia’s fountain was dismantled and, following Petrioli’s lead in other contexts, elucidated the role Gaetano Milanesi played in the commission of the new fountain. I demonstrated how the commission was tied to the impending unification of Italy and explained how the burgeoning sense of historic preservation led to the creation of a new monument. Sarrocchi’s life and artistic formation were discussed next as they provide us with a new understanding of stylistic restoration practices in the mid-nineteenth century. I then explored, through visual analysis, the relationship between the carving styles of Sarrocchi as opposed to Quercia. The information gleaned from my comparison demonstrates that the new fountain was heavily influenced by the art movement purism, and as a result, it is neither correct nor just to consider Sarrocchi’s fountain a mere copy of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia. Sarrocchi’s fountain is a reflection of nineteenth-century thinking about Renaissance art, and the project, stimulated by the Risorgimento, is a reflection of the social and political history of Siena and of modern Italy.
Appendix I

Fons papalis, Viterbo.

In 1268, under the direction of the viscontes papalis Raniero Gatti, the fountain known as the fons papalis was built on the loggia of the Palazzo Papale. The loggia probably served as both a courtyard for quiet contemplation and as an antechamber for persons awaiting admittance to the halls. The fons papalis celebrated the completion of a newly constructed aqueduct in Viterbo that stretched from the opposite southeast end of the city to the papal palace. The fountain was restored following damage incurred in the fifteenth century when the posterior façade of the Palazzo Papale collapsed on it; the only original elements to survive are the central shaft and raised cup. The salvaged cup is circular in shape and is decorated in relief with a strigilated motif. Along the cup’s exterior twelve leonine masks serve as water spouts. Water pours from the leonine spouts into the restored basin below. Gary Radke has suggested that the iconography of the fons papalis served to further the association of the city to the papacy. He is probably correct as it is likely that the fountain served as a reference to the sovereign authority of the pope, just as the fountains regularly set up in front of communal palaces often emphasized civic authority.

San Tommaso or Fontana della Morte, Viterbo.

The fountain of San Tommaso has a central spindle that rises from the circular basin into a shape approximating a liturgical ciborium and then culminates in a pinecone. The upper half of the ciborium is decorated with stylized acanthus leaves while the lower half is articulated with four lion spouts that pour water into the basin below. The name of the fountain derives from that of the church located in the same piazza. In the sixteenth century the fountain became known as the Fontana della Morte (or fountain of death) when the Confraternity dell’Orazione e della Morte was transferred to the church of S. Tommaso.

San Faustino, Viterbo.

Following the same fountain type is also San Faustino, built of peperino stone. Here instead of a circular basin the fountain has a polygonal basin elevated on a base composed of five steps. The fountain’s decoration is concentrated on the spindle that rises from the center of the simple geometric basin. The lower part of the ciborium is articulated with lion spouts while the upper portion is decorated with coats of arms and the usual pine cone terminates the whole. An inscription in Gothic letters, located between the lion spouts, records the names of the sculptors Iacopo di Andrea and Gemino

653 Radke, 1996, 73.
654 Radke, 1996, 73. See also Cesare Pinzi, Il palazzo papale di Viterbo nell’arte e nella storia (Viterbo: Agnesotti, 1910).
655 Agostinetti, 1985, 102.
656 Radke, 1996, 73.
657 Agostinetti, 1985, 38. See also Bonelli, 2001, 35.
di Mastro Francesco. It was financed, according to a statute from 1251, entirely by the citizens of the neighborhood in order to have access to potable water.

Pianoscarano, Viterbo.

The fountain of Pianoscarano, built in 1376, follows the same basic structure as the earlier Viterbese fountains; its central spindle, however, is more complex. The lower half of the pyramidal ciborium is articulated by six trilobed arches that open to reveal lions (the city’s emblem) standing on guard. In context the lions seem to serve an apotropaic function protecting the fountain’s waters: they are at once the guards and the purveyors. Directly above the lions, six figures of saints carved in low relief ornament the upper half of the ciborium. The fountain, like the earlier examples at San Tommaso and San Faustino, demonstrates the same general characteristics prevalent in Viterbese fountain design: a centrally planned, spindle-shaped fountain whose ornamentation reflects allegiance to the city (lion) and to Rome (pine cone).

Appendix II

Preliminary research in the Opificio delle Pietre Dure, Florence, on the condition of the Fonte Gaia.

A preliminary study was conducted in the laboratories of the Opificio delle Pietre Dure to determine the condition and composition of the patina on the marbles. The results acquired from this study were fundamental to evaluating the course of action to clean Quercia’s marbles and determine the tools that would be necessary. The Opificio’s study, published in 1990, consisted of the analysis of more than thirty samples that were taken from various parts of the monument: sample #31 came, for example, from Eve’s right forearm while sample #24 from Adam’s foot. Each specimen was analyzed using several testing methods: X-ray diffractometry, Infrared Spectroscopy, an optical microscope with reflected light, and specific spot tests to reveal the presence of any organic material. The exams identified the principle components of the patina and encrustations as gypsum, calcium oxalate, silicates and carbon particles. The patina was composed primarily of hydrated oxalates of calcium: Weddellite (CaC$_2$O$_4$2H$_2$O; not
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659 Ibid.
664 My thanks to Prof. Maria Giovanna Vezzalini of the Mineralogy department of the University of Modena for her help translating these technical terms.
In the case of the Fonte Gaia marbles it is probable that the formation of the patina was due to the deposit of organic material, which over time was transformed via a gradual process of mineralization to oxalates. Such findings are not unusual, especially, for marble sculpture that has been located for any extended period of time outdoors. The external patina on such monuments is generally characterized by a yellowish hue that is caused by the presence of calcium oxalate. This film may then be partially covered by other darker hues, even black, made up of deposits of gypsum and carbon particles. The thickness of the patina may vary from 30 to 100 µm on the same monument. Occasionally small round black holes appear in areas on the surface of the patina. This type of damage is known as pitting and can create small black cavities in the underlying stone evident under a microscope and, at times, even to the naked eye as attested on the Fonte Gaia. Generally, the patina is not soluble by rain, even acid rain, and hence is sometimes considered beneficial since it protects the marble from the assault of acids from the atmosphere. At the same time, however, the patina does not allow water and salts to exit the stone (these inevitably permeate the stone from the ground) and this leads to serious structural damage. Lastly, as in the case of the Fonte Gaia, the patina can chip or flake off particularly where the marble is broken, thus revealing the white marble underneath (effecting a sort of mutilation of the figures) and making such areas susceptible to acid rain. A further agent of decay is biological colonization which is associated with the presence of water and the pigeon dung that roosted on the fountain.

The removal of Quercia’s Fonte Gaia from the Palazzo Pubblico for restoration and treatments used in its cleaning.

In 1989 the right wing and lateral parapet statues were the first to be dismembered and removed from the loggia, followed in 1995 by the left wing and in 2000 the remaining central section (rear wall) of the fountain. Once free from the surrounding structure each piece was wrapped in white packing foam and crated for transport. [Fig. 99a, b, c] Some of these pieces were wrapped in “bandages” and where necessary plaster was applied to fractured areas on site before transport. In order to lower the crates down to street level (some fifty meters below) a large crane was parked in the Piazza del

665 The formation and quantity of these components is influenced by several factors including humidity, ph levels, temperature and other climatic conditions. See Piero Tiano and Carla Pardini eds., Le Patine, Genesi, Significato, Conservazione (Firenze: Nardini Editore per la Conservazione e Valorizzazione dei Beni Culturali del CNR, 2005), 21.
666 Tiano and Pardini, 19.
667 Tiano and Pardini, 21.
668 Bralia et al., 98.
669 These are referred to as safety bandages (bendaggi di sicurezza) and were made up of Japanese paper fixed to the marble with the application of (elastomero fluorizzato) Akeogard CO. See Landi, Manna and Pothoff, 2009, 23.
Mercato, the square located behind the Palazzo Pubblico directly under the loggia. [Fig. 100] The crates were then transported at first to the Opificio’s laboratory in Florence, and in the year 2000 directly to the laboratory of S.M. della Scala in Siena.

The lateral parapet statues (identified in the documents pertaining to the restoration as Acca Larenzia and Rhea Silvia) and the right wing composed of the panels representing Temperance, Faith, and the Expulsion of Adam and Eve were cleaned first (my phase one). A chemical process was used to clean these sculptures. In order to remove the black and dark grey layers, known as the crosta nera, a solution made with ammonium carbonate was used to clean the marble surface. The percentage of ammonium carbonate used in the solution varied considerably (anywhere from five to twenty percent) depending on the area treated. A larger percentage of ammonium carbonate was used where the thickness of the encrustations was higher and since this varied each area had to be evaluated separately. The process entailed covering the marble surface with wet packs impregnated with the ammonium carbonate solution thus allowing the chemical to act on the surface. The period of time that the wet packs were allowed to rest on the marbles was another variable determined case by case by the restorer.

In the early nineties, to clean stone, ammonium carbonate was employed more often and while it continues to be used today on specific projects it was not a particularly good choice for the Fonte Gaia sculptures. The problems evinced with this treatment concerned troubles in controlling the level of cleaning. For example, the restorers found that the wet packs tended to leave halos on the marble surface resulting in an uneven cleaning. In order to eliminate the halos successive treatments had to be done which led, overall, to a drastic and unnatural whitening of the marble surface which is evident when comparing any of the sculptures cleaned in phase one to those cleaned in phase two. In sum the team found that ammonium carbonate did not suit their needs as variables (such as the percentage of the product needed and the duration of time the product interacted with the marble surface) were hard to control and, in any case, did not provide satisfactory results.

In the final stages of cleaning a mechanical technique, known as Air Brasive, was also used to remove surface encrustations. This technique employs micro particles of sand and pressurized air to essentially sand blast deposits off the surface of the marble. Finally, where a more controlled cleaning was necessary, deposits could also be scraped off by hand using a scalpel. These last two methods were used consistently, when and where necessary, through both phase one and phase two.

In 1996 due to the inadequate results attained using ammonium carbonate the team began to experiment with different options that could effectively replace its use. Further testing was executed by the Section of Environmental Geochemistry and Conservation Studies of the University of Siena. Their study revealed that, a part from the crosta nera, an eighteenth century application (scialbatura) and an okra colored patina had been applied to the monument. This patina had probably been applied intentionally and relatively late in the history of the monument since it was found on areas that had already been damaged and thus conceivably applied shortly before the fountain was
dismantled. This patina was also composed of two layers of calcium oxalate, the upper layer weddellite, and the lower whewellite.\textsuperscript{670}

\textsuperscript{670} Landi, Manna and Potthoff, 2009, 21. Whewellite is a mineral deposited from low temperature hydrothermal solutions which have come in contact with carboniferous lithologies, releasing methane.
Documents


The terms of the contract for the Fonte Gaia between Jacopo della Quercia and the Sienese Comune.

In nomine Domini amen. Hic liber continet in se deliberationes et decreta que fiunt per infrascriptos magnificos et potentes dominos dominos priores gubernatores et capitaneum populi comunis Senarum nec non deliberationes reformationes et consilia sua per ipsos fient [=facta?] tam in consiliis…[paper ruined] quam etiam in consiliis populi tempore eorum officii videlicet de mense Ianuarii et Februarii MCCCCVIII [=MCCCCVIII, modern] indictione secunda, tempore pontificatus sanctissimi in Christo patris et domini domini Gregorii divina providentia pape duodecimi, quibis duobus mensibus presederunt dicto magnifico et laudabili officio dominorum priorum et capitanei populi dicte civitatis scriptas et notatas per me Nicolaum Laurentii de Belforte, civem Senensem, notarium publicum, pro dicto tempore notarium prefectorum dominorum et eorum consistorii, quorum quidem dominorum hec sunt nomina videlicet:

Domininum Iohannes Bandini legum doctor
Andreas Iohannes Bardi de terzerio civitatis
Pietrus Vive aurifex

Paulus Iohannis Landi
Angelus Tofani de terzerio Kamullie
Ser Antonius Iohannis Gennarii

Andreas Augustini bacherius capitaneus populi

Andreas Ambrosii Bonelli
Franciscus Bucci pizicaiolus de terzerio Sancti Mantini
Antonio domini Guiglemi

Vexilliferi:
Magister Franciscus Albertini vexillifer terzerii civitatis
Iacobus Tommasii Chechi bancherius magister terzerii Camollie ser Christoforus Andree notarius cancellarius et ser Pietrus Nerii Martini notarius domini capitanei, ser Nicolau Laurentii de Belforte notarius consistorii dictorum dominorum die prima ianuarii domino Iohanne priore, magnifici et potentes domini priores gubernatores comunis et capitaneus populi civitatis Senarum simul more solito convocati, et cetera.

Nomina officialium balie sunt infrascripta videlicet.
Dominus Iohannes domini Francisci de Belantibus legum doctor, Renaldus Andreocii de Petacciis, Paulus Minucii Bergagle, ser Iohannes Pieri Ture notarius, Antonius Bartholomei Saragniola, Aringherius domini Nicolai, dominus Carolus Angelini decreturum doctor, Iacobus Massaini legrit terius, Iacobus Iacobi lanifex, pro sex mensibus electi die vii novembris et finendi...[blank]. Prefati magnifici domini vexilliferi magistri et officiales balie concorditer et cetera...[paper ruined].

Die xxii Ianuari deliberaverunt magnifici Domini et Offitiales Balye quod fons Campi fiat per magistrum...[blank] eo modo et forma et prout designatus est. Et quod habeat duo mila florenos auri senenses non obstantibus quibuscumque, et quod promictat et se obliget etc. Et quod eidem magistro detur locus ubi possit laborare, etc. Item quod eidem explanentur vie sumptibus Comunis, ita quod conducat laborerium, etc.

Conventioni infra il magnifico Comune di Siena etc. e maestro Iacomo del maestro...[blank].

1. In prima, che maestro Iacomo predetto sia tenuto o debba fare o far fare uno disegno d’una fonte nella sala del Consiglio con intagliamenti, figure, fogliami, e cornici, gradi, pilastri, beccatelli, lupe e altri lavorii ragionati.

2. Item, ch’el detto maestro Iacobo sia tenuto o debba infra il termine di 20 mesi, cominciando in calende aprile proximo seguirà nel 1409, edificare, e avere edificata una fonte di marmo in sul Campo di Siena nel proprio luogo là du è la fonte al presente, di longhezza di braccia xvi e di larghezza di braccia otto, cho’ le figure, foglame, e marmi che nel disegno sopracritto chiaramente si dimostrano, non diminuendo alcuno lavorio, ma piùtosto migliorare e accrescere.

3. Item, che esso maestro Iacomo sia tenuto e debba fare e far fare la fonte predetta, così da l’acqua in giù come da l’acqua in su, e le sue proprie spese d’ogni lavorio; intendendosi che per infino a l’acqua e da inde in giù uno guazzo sia di marmo, e da inde in su di mattoni con certe pietre necessarie e oportune al diffitio de la detta fonte, con iscialbi e muro ragionevolì per lo lavorio predetto.

4. Item, che a maestro Iacomo predetto sia lecito mettere e far mettate in Siena tutti marmi, calcina, calcestruzzo e mattoni e qualunque altre sode fussero necessarie per lo detto lavorio senza pagare alcuna cabella; e anco s’intenda essere franco e libero, se per lo soprascritto contratto uscisse alcuna cabella al comuno di Siena.

5. Anco, che del presente contratto, el detto maestro Iacomo, volendolo publico, el notaio ne sarà rogato non ne possa ne debba avere più che fiorini...[blank]

6. Item, ch’el detto magnifico Comuno di Siena sia tenuto e debba dare e pagare al detto maestro Iacomo, per lo lavorio predetto, quel prezo e quantità de pecunia sarà dichiarata da Francescho di Cristofano, al presente Capitano di Popolo e Gonfaloniere di Giustitia; non passando però la somma di fior. mille[1]cento senesi, ne da 1500 senesi in giù.

7. Item, ch’el prefato Comuno di Siena sia tenuto e debba dare e fare el detto pagamento di due mesi in due mesi, come tocca per rata della somma predetta, cominciando in kalendeaprilie proximo seguirà, ricevendo dall’operaio dell’acqua, con que’ modi si pagano maestri e lavoranti, [che] lavorano ne’ lavorii delle fonti.

8. Item, che al detto maestro Iacomo sia lecito e possa cavare e far cavare a ogni marmiera e petriera per lo lavorio predetto, senza alcuna contraditione, pagando el debito prezo secondo el costume de l’Uopera Sancte Marie.
9. Item, che tutto e’ lavoro vechio de la muragl[i]a si levarà da la fonte vechia, sia e essere s’intenda del detto maestro Iacomo.

10. Item, ch’ el detto maestro Iacomo sia tenuto e debba fare e curare che le figure de’ lavoro soprascritto siena et essere s’intendano lustranti, second el corso de’ buoni maestri, faciendo tutte le predette cose a buona fede e senza frodo.

Ego Cinus olim Guidonis de Belforte, civis Senensis publicus imperiali actoritate notarius et iudex ordinarius, id tutum quod supra continetur scriptum manu mei, litterali sermonesusque in trigesima linea presentis instrumenti, scriptum inveni, vidi et legi in quodam libro sive memoriali facto in consistorio dominorum priorum civitatis Senarum, esistenti inter abreviaturas et proto colla ser Nicolai Laurentii notarii defuncti, et totum id quod supra continetur vulgari sermone a dicta trigesima linea infra scriptum inveni, vidi et legi in quodam folio bonbicino existenti in quadam filza gestorum in dicto consistorio, manu dicti ser Nicolai omnia premessa scripta fore cognovi ipsumque ser Nicolaum et eius scripturam bene novi et omnia et diligenter auscultavi et in predictis libro et folio. Et quia utrumque concordare inveni nil addito vel diminuto quod secundum mei notarii conscientiam mutet aut variet intellectum, ideo autoritate mihi secundum formam statutorum Senensium concessa hic me publice subscripsi et publicavi anno dominice incarnationis millesimo quodrigentesimo duodecimo, indicatione quinta secundum usum et cursum notariorum civitatis Senarium die prima mensis iunii, Romanorum imperatore, ut fertur Senis, vacante, et ad robur predictorum singnum et nomen meum aposui consuetum.

Ego Francischus olim magistri Agustini de Senis publicus imperii auctoritate notarius et iudex ordinarius totum quod supra continetur et scriptum et exemplatum est manu dicti ser Cini, videlicet ab eius supra, scriptum inveni, vidi et legi in dicto folio bonbicino existenti in quadam filza gestorum in dicto consistorio manu dicti ser Nicolai, quem ser Nicolaum et eius scriptum bene novi et ab eodem ser Nicolao scriptum fore recognovi et dictum sumptum cum dicta originali abreviatura simul et una cum dicto ser Cino diligenter legi et auscultavi, et quia utrumque ad invicem bene concordare invenimus, ideo ex commissione in me facta secundum formam statutorum Senarium propria manu scripsi et publicavi anno Domini, indicatione, mense et die hic supra de proximo annotatis, vacante Romanorum imperatore, prout dicitur Senis, et cetera.

Die xx mensis octobris 1419 cassatum et cancellatum per me Anthonium Iohannis Gennari notarium de voluntate dicti magistri Iacobi ob liberationem factam domino Caterino operario, pro comune Sanarum, opere Sancte Marie et dicte fontis de qua constat de manu mea.

Location: ASS, Opera metropolitana, Diplomatico, January 22, 1409.


Letter to the Civic Magistrate of Siena from Gaspero Pini and Gaetano Milanesi.
Archivio Storico del Comune di Siena, Preunitario. Atti magistrali 545 (1844), cc. 219 and 226.
III.mi Sig.ri Gonfaloniere e Priori del Magistrato Civico di Siena

Vedendo noi a che miserabile termine è condotta la Fonte della nostra Piazza, e conoscendo altresì che se più s’indugia, ogni provvedimento si fa vano ed inutile; abbiamo stimato essere debito di buono e zelante cittadino di muovere con povere si, ma pur sentite parole l’animo de’ Senesi a togliere alfine questo danno e vergogna della Città. Che se la nostra voce può avere alcuna forza ed autorità noi la innalziamo per confortarli a procurare con una volontà dispostissima, e con una costanza non ordinaria che questa impresa possa avere quello effetto che è più conforme ai desideri nostri. Intenzione nostra è adunque che della Fonte di Piazza si debba fare una copia in marmo in tutto eguale e somigliantissima: che le parti ornative, e precisamente le esterne siano de’ marmi nostrali di Montarrenti, di Vallerano, e di Gerfalco; i quali oltreché saranno di minima spesa ci sembrano per la loro durezza più atti a resistere alla inclemenza del Cielo; che i bassorilievi figurati e le quattro statue che debbono stare negli angoli della Fonte medesima si facciano del marmo o di Seravezza, o di Carrara; e che infine per ovviare al pericolo che gente malnata ed ignorante non rattenuta da nessuna reverenza, gettando brutture ed immondezze, non guasti sì bello ornamento, consiglieremmo che intorno intorno alla Fonte, e alla distanza di qualche braccio si facesse camminare uno sprangato di ferro. Cosa di maggiore importanza è quella che riguarda la somma necessaria a ciò e il modo di raccoglierla. Fra i molti mezzi che ci si prestano tutti pieni di difficoltà, quest’una abbracciamo: il quale è che da 10.000 firme spontanee di lire due all’anno, ed obbligatorie per cinque anni, si componga la somma di lire centomila, le quali per quanto dai calcoli fatti si può conoscere basterebbero per condurre a termine il lavoro. Ogni sottoscrittore adunque, mensilmente due crazie si troverebbe al fine di cinque anni aver pagato 10 lire: le quali se si riguardano in complesso sono somma forte per molte persone, ma se si considerano come a piccolissime e determine frazioni, vedremo che anche il più povero, e il più miserabile uomo può giungere in quello spazio a sborsare senza suo disagio. Ma siccome difficile cosa è che di 20.000 persone, 10.000 possano o vogliano sottoscriversi, così alla difficoltà di raccogliere firme in tanta quantità, si rimedierebbe agevolmente, se molti e ricchi, e agiati e mercanti, e capi di bottega volessero secondo le loro forze prendere e due e quattro e sei azioni per ciascuno. Raccolte le somme, saranno dal numero de’ sottoscrittori creare due Deputazioni: una delle quali che sarà detta Economica e Amministratrice avrà il carico di ricevere le forme medesime che di mani in mano dalle persone incaricate di raccoglierle saranno depositate nella cassa di un Camarlingo o Cassiere, per spese in seguito versate in una Cassa Pubbica, da dove si estrarranno, preciso mandato della Deputazione suddetta tutte le volte che occorrerà fare dei pagamenti per l’acquisto dei materiali, o per retribuzione e mercede degli artefici. All’altra composta egualmente del numero de’ sottoscrittori incomberà in compagnia dei Conservatori degli Oggetti di Belle Arti, di sopravvedere al regolare e spedito andamento del lavoro, di giudicarlo, e di approvarlo tutte le volte che sarà dagli artefici presentato; e di stabilire infine quei patti e quelle condizioni che crederà opportune nella allogazione di esso lavoro agli artefici: rispetto ai quali raccomandiamo che siano nostri concittadini ragionevole essendo che in un lavoro patrio, e fatto dal consenso della città, essi soli debbano felicissimamente esercitare l’ingegno e
la mano. Protestiamo in ultimo che nel fare questo progetto non intendiamo di menomare in niente quel diritto e quella proprietà che alle Signorie Loro Illustrissime sulle cose del Comune giustamente si appartiene; ma che anzi prima di mostrarlo in pubblico abbiamo voluto che le Signorie Loro Illustrissime ne fossero informate, e al tempo senza ricerche di assenso, di approvazione, e di aiuto.

Siamo frattanto con più rispettosi sentimenti delle Signorie Loro Illustrissime,
Devotissimi e Obbligatissimi Servitori,
Gaspero Pini ingegnere
Dott. Gaetano Milanesi

Document 3.

Antica ed approvata sentenza è, nessuna gloria essere né più desiderabile, né più giustamente pregia di quella che dall’esercito delle miti e gentili Arti del Bello alcuna volta le nazioni conseguono.

Sulle Piramidi dell’Egitto passarono ben trenta secoli: e quelle immense moli stanno ancora a testimonianza dell’ardimento d’un popolo, e de’ suoi re, i quali rinnovando con miglior fortuna la stolta vanità di Babele, vollero innalzarsi un ricovero, comporsi una tomba che sfidando le tempeste della terra, i fulmini del cielo, e l’ala distruggitrice del tempo, durerà quanto il mondo lontana.

Pei marmi del Partenone, pel Colosseo, pel Panteon e per mille emille altri monumenti vive e splende bella, conta ed onorata la memoria della Grecia e di Roma. E alla vista di quelli l’animo nostro si esalta, il cuore si accende, e l’intelletto con reverenza ed amore considerandoli, ne prende materia ed argomento a studi che gli partoriranno tante care satisfazioni, e i termini della umana scienza allargheranno.

Dopo i portenti della Grecia e di Roma, una densa caligine stendendosi lentamente sulla misera Europa, spense quasi quel fuoco sacro che aveva alimentato il genio delle nazioni: se non che era fato all’Italia, che dall’ignobile loco in che le Arti per voler di fortuna, per la rovina di tanti popoli, pel guastamento di tante terre eran cadute, per la virtù di lei risorgessero a tale altezza da contrastare nella fama con le nazioni che in quella lode la precedettero. Si, fu per noi Italiani, se quel fuoco ritornò a splendere di novella luce; fu per noi, se le Arti salirono a quell’onorato seggio, nel quale tanti sovrani artefici nello spazio di appena tre secoli le ebbero collocate.

Svestita l’arte della ruggine bizantina che la dominazione dei Greci aveva portato in Italia, prese ella forma e colore più veramente Italiano, massime per opera di quel gentile intelletto di Giotto; il quale primo aprendo un campo novello alla pittura, di tanto la vantaggiò, che fin dal suo risorgere diede segni manifesti di quell’altezza, a cui Masaccio, e il Da Vinci, e il Sanzio l’ebbero poi condotta. Ma la scultura, che prima in questa rigenerazione s’acquistò lode bellissima per Niccolò, Giovanni e Andrea da Pisa, e per l’Orcagna, era ricaduta nell’antica rozzezza, per non esser sorto da quasi un mezzo secolo chi il valore di quelli artefici avesse pareggiato. Quando apparvero il Ghiberti e
Donatello in Firenze, Giacomo della Quercia e i Turrini a Siena: ingegni privilegiati, i quali studiando con grande amore negli esemplari dell’arte antica, trassero da quella il bello stile che vestito di gentilezza, di grazia e di forza grandissima aperse una via novella all’arte, e mostrò qual passo la Scultura per le loro mani fosse acconcia fare.

Di Giacomo della Quercia, splendore della Scuola Senese, dopo gli stupendi bassorilievi delle porte di S. Petronio in Bologna, non avvi al certo altro monumento che più della Fonte Gaja della nostra Piazza faccia fede del valor suo. Ma quei marmi che un di facevano si bella vista di sé, ed erano di sì grande ornamento alla patria, ora, o per oltraggio del tempo, o per incuranza degli uomini, a che miserabile termine sono essi condotti? E in un secolo nel quale ciascuna città vendica dall’oblio tanti monumenti dell’arte propria, quest’uno che di sì chiaro artefice appena ne avanza, non è senza grande sua vergogna che Siena lasci in tutto rovinare e disperdere.

Che se le gentili creazioni de’ Greci e dei Romani hanno tanta potenza sull’animo nostro, quale e quanta non ne avranno in noi queste che nate sotto il beato cielo nostro, furono parte delle menti Italiane? A che col nome di barbari appelleremo quei popoli che con mano feroce mossero guerra alle creazione dell’Arte? A che ci dorremo noi di tanti guastamenti e ruine d’alora operate, se nell’odierno splendore di civiltà, con più miti costumi, non solo con occhio indifferente veggiamo lo strazio e lo sperpero che tutti si fa dei nostri monumenti dalla rapace voglia degli uomini, ma ci facciamo eziandio o consigliatori o con mano sacrilega aiutatori di quella rovina?

A questa bella e pietosa impresa chiamiamo dunque i nostri concittadini, pe’ quali, se quello antico amore della terra natale che partorì sì grande e sì generose azioni non é ancora spento, non saranno in tutto gittate al vento queste povere sì ma pur gentili parole.

Intendiamo adunque di far rivivere quel nobile monumento: proponiamoci di caverne dai guasti e laceri avanzi un esempio ed un ritratto somigliantissimo: e mostriamo al mondo con che religiosa cura le cose nostre si sappiamo noi in questa éta mantenere e conservare. E l’ombra di quel potente ingegno che creò tanta bellezza sarà alfine placata: gli oltraggi del tempo vinti e disfatti; e tornerà all’antico onore quella Fonte che per lunga pezza fu meraviglia dello straniero ed argomento bellissimo, testimonio de’ pensieri grandi e magnanimi dei nostri maggiori.

La impresa che progettiamo per bella che sia, non manca di molte e gravi difficoltà; ma noi proponendola abbiamo tenuto d’occhio più alla necessità e convenienza sua, che considerato agli ostacoli: i quali può combattere con certezza della vittoria solo una accessa carità di patria, un amore sviscerato alle cose nostre, ed un sentimento di vergogna che questo nobile Ornamento della città cada e si disperda per sempre, senza che s’innalzi neppure una voce o si muova una mano per soccorrere generosamente e riparare a tanto danno.

Dai calcoli fatti si ricava, che alla esecuzione di questo progetto si richiederebbe la somma di Lire Centomila: per raccogliere la quale non veggiamo mezzo né più semplice, né di migliore riuscita di quello di formare una società di diecimila sottoscrittori: i quali si obligassero per cinque anni a dare mensualmente la leggerissima moneta di due crazie. Ogni sottoscrittore con questo mezzo, al termine di quello spazio si troverebbe aver pagato Dieci Lire: somma grave, se si riguardi in complesso, a molte persone, ma se si consideri come raccolta a piccolissime e determinate frazioni, tenue e
leggera in modo che anche il più povero e il più miserabile uomo può giungere senza disagio a sborsarle. Ma siccome difficil cosa è che di ventimila abitanti della Città, diecimila possano o vogliano sottoscriversi; così si rimedierebbe a questo difetto se i ricchi, li agiati, i mercanti, i capi di bottega, prendessero ciascuno secondo le proprie forze un maggior numero d’azioni.

Raccolte le somme, dovranno essere depositate in una cassa pubblica, da dove si estrarranno a mano a mano che saranno da farsi i pagamenti del materiale, e degli artefici, previo un mandato della Deputazione Economica ed Amministrative che si comporrà del corpo dei sottoscrittori. Si creerà ancora un’altra Deputazione, la quale unita a quella già esistente dei Conservatori degli oggetti di Belle Arti, avrà l’incombenza di sopravvedere al regolare e spedito andamento del lavoro, di giudicarne e approvarlo tutte le volte che esso risponda in tutto al suo originale, ed ai patti ed alle condizioni che saranno stabilite di comune concordia fra la Deputazione medesima, e gli artefici, i quali raccomandiamo che siano scelti fra i nostri concittadini, perché trattandosi di un lavoro patrio e fatto per il concorso della città, ad essi soli esclusivamente si appartiene di esercitarvi l’ingegno e la mano.

Siena, Porri, 1844
Gaspero Pini, Ingegnere
Dott. Gaetano Milanesi
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Fig. 90. Above: Nineteenth-century photograph of Sarrocchi’s *The Expulsion of Adam and Eve*. Below, Sarrocchi, *The Expulsion of Adam and Eve*, Fonte Gaia.
Fig. 91: Quercia, details of *Justice*, *Wisdom*, and the *Virgin*. 
Fig. 92. Quercia, detail of *Justice*. Sarrocchi, detail of *Faith* and below *Justice* (left: nineteenth-century photographs).
Fig. 94. Quercia, *Charity*, marble relief, after restoration.
Fig. 95. Sarrocchi, *Charity*, plaster cast.
Fig. 96. Above: Nineteenth-century photograph of Sarrocchi’s Charity. Below: Sarrocchi, Charity, Fonte Gaia.
Fig. 97. Sarrocchi, *The Discovery of the Cross*, Church of Santa Croce, Florence.
Fig. 98. Figure of Charity from the Buoninsegni monument, 1864-1870, Misericordia cemetery, Siena.
Fig. 99a. Packing Quercia’s reliefs for transport.
Fig. 99b. The preparation of Quercia’s statues for transport.
Fig. 99c: Details of packing and crating Quercia’s lateral parapet statues.
Fig. 100: Crane transporting Quercia’s fountain.
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