

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM  
JOURNAL

---

VOLUME 49 / 2014



The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

## EDITORIAL BOARD

KATHARINE BAETJER  
Curator, European Paintings

JULIE JONES  
Curator Emeritus, Arts of Africa, Oceania, and the Americas

ELIZABETH MANKIN KORNHAUSER  
Alice Pratt Brown Curator of American Paintings and Sculpture

DENISE PATRY LEIDY  
Curator, Asian Art

MARCO LEONA  
David H. Koch Scientist in Charge, Scientific Research

DOROTHY MAHON  
Conservator, Paintings Conservation

JOAN R. MERTENS  
Curator, Greek and Roman Art

JOANNE PILLSBURY  
Andrall E. Pearson Curator, Arts of Africa, Oceania, and the Americas

LUKE SYSON  
Iris and B. Gerald Cantor Chairman, European Sculpture and Decorative Arts

This publication is made possible by a gift from Assunta Sommella Peluso, Ada Peluso, and Romano I. Peluso, in memory of Ignazio Peluso.

The *Metropolitan Museum Journal* is published annually by The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Mark Polizzotti, Publisher and Editor in Chief

Elizabeth L. Block, Managing Editor

Bruce Campbell, Designer

Paul Booth, Production Manager

Ling Hu, Image Acquisitions Associate

Valeria Cafà's article was translated from the Italian by Lawrence Jenkins; Masako Yoshida's article was translated from the Japanese by Monica Bethe; Cornelia Reiter's article was translated from the German by Russell Stockman. All other translations are by the authors.

The Editorial Board is especially grateful to Sarah McFadden for her assistance with this issue.

Manuscripts submitted for the *Journal* and all correspondence concerning them should be sent to [journalsubmissions@metmuseum.org](mailto:journalsubmissions@metmuseum.org). Guidelines for contributors are given on page 6.

Published in association with the University of Chicago Press. Individual and institutional subscriptions are available worldwide. Please direct all subscription inquiries, back issue requests, and address changes to: University of Chicago Press, Journals Division, P. O. Box 37005, Chicago, IL 60637-0005, USA. Phone: (877) 705-1878 (U.S. and Canada) or (773) 753-3347 (international), fax: (877) 705-1879 (U.S. and Canada) or (773) 753-0811 (international), email: [subscriptions@press.uchicago.edu](mailto:subscriptions@press.uchicago.edu), website: [www.journals.uchicago.edu](http://www.journals.uchicago.edu)

ISBN 978-0-226-21267-8 (University of Chicago Press)

ISSN 0077-8958 (print)

ISSN 2169-3072 (online)

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 68-28799

The Metropolitan Museum of Art endeavors to respect copyright in a manner consistent with its nonprofit educational mission. If you believe any material has been included improperly in this publication, please contact the Editorial Department.

Photographs of works in the Metropolitan Museum's collection are by The Photograph Studio, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, unless otherwise noted.

Copyright © 2014 by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Typeset in Optima LT Std

Printed on Creator Silk, 100 lb.

Separations by Professional Graphics, Inc., Rockford, Illinois

Printed and bound by Puritan Capital, Hollis, New Hampshire

Cover illustration: Detail of Tullio Lombardo (Italian, ca. 1455–1532), *Adam*, ca. 1490–95. See Figure 1, page 34.

FOR JULIE JONES

A meticulous and probing reader who significantly  
broadened the *Journal's* scope

FOR BRUCE CAMPBELL

An exceptional designer  
who lavished his talents on this publication



# Contents

*Adam* by Tullio Lombardo

<i>Adam</i> by Tullio Lombardo LUKE SYSON AND VALERIA CAFÀ	9
Ancient Sources for Tullio Lombardo's <i>Adam</i> VALERIA CAFÀ	33
The Treatment of Tullio Lombardo's <i>Adam</i> : A New Approach to the Conservation of Monumental Marble Sculpture CAROLYN RICCARDELLI, JACK SOULTANIAN, MICHAEL MORRIS, LAWRENCE BECKER, GEORGE WHEELER, AND RONALD STREET	49
A New Analysis of Major Greek Sculptures in the Metropolitan Museum: Petrological and Stylistic LORENZO LAZZARINI AND CLEMENTE MARCONI	117
Hellenistic Etruscan Cremation Urns from Chiusi THERESA HUNTSMAN	141
Redeeming Pieter Coecke van Aelst's <i>Gluttony</i> Tapestry: Learning from Scientific Analysis FEDERICO CARÒ, GIULIA CHIOSTRINI, ELIZABETH CLELAND, AND NOBUKO SHIBAYAMA	151
Trade Stories: Chinese Export Embroideries in the Metropolitan Museum MASAKO YOSHIDA	165
A Greek Inscription in a Portrait by Salvator Rosa MICHAEL ZELLMANN-ROHRER	187
Honoré de Balzac and Natoire's <i>The Expulsion from Paradise</i> CAROL SANTOLERI	193
Another Brother for Goya's "Red Boy": Agustín Esteve's Portrait of Francisco Xavier Osorio, Conde de Trastámara XAVIER F. SALOMON	201
Nature as Ideal: Drawings by Joseph Anton Koch and Johann Christian Reinhart CORNELIA REITER	207
A Buddhist Source for a Stoneware "Basket" Designed by Georges Hoentschel DENISE PATRY LEIDY	225

## Manuscript Guidelines for the *Metropolitan Museum Journal*

The *Metropolitan Museum Journal* is issued annually by The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Its purpose is to publish original research on works in the Museum's collection. Articles are contributed by members of the Museum staff and other art historians and specialists. Submissions should be emailed to: journalsubmissions@metmuseum.org.

Manuscripts are reviewed by the *Journal* Editorial Board, composed of members of the curatorial, conservation, and scientific departments. **To be considered for the following year's volume, an article must be submitted, complete including illustrations, by October 15.** Once an article is accepted for publication, the author will have the opportunity to review it after it has been edited and again after it has been laid out in pages. The honorarium for image costs is \$300, and each author receives a copy of the *Journal* volume in which his or her article appears.

Manuscripts should be submitted as double-spaced Word files. In addition to the text, the manuscript must include endnotes, captions for illustrations, photograph credits, and a 200-word abstract. Each part of the article should be in a separate file except the endnotes, which should be linked to and appear at the end of the text file.

For the style of captions and bibliographic references in endnotes, authors are referred to *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Guide to Editorial Style and Procedures*, which is available from the Museum's Editorial Department

upon request, and to *The Chicago Manual of Style*. Please provide a list of all bibliographic citations that includes, for each title: full name(s) of author or authors; title and subtitle of book or article and periodical; place and date of publication; volume number, if any; and page, plate, and/or figure number(s). For citations in notes, please use only the last name(s) of the author or authors and the date of publication (e.g., Jones 1953, p. 65; Smith and Harding 2006, pp. 7–10, fig. 23).

When submitting manuscripts, authors should include a PDF of all illustrations. Please do not embed images within text documents. If the manuscript is accepted, the author is expected to provide publication-quality images as well as copyright permissions to reproduce them in both the print and electronic editions of the *Journal*. We require either digital files of at least 300 dpi at 3,000 pixels wide, color transparencies (preferably 8 x 10 in. but 4 x 6 in. is also acceptable), or glossy black-and-white photographs (preferably 8 x 10 in. with white borders) of good quality and in good condition.

In a separate Word file, please indicate the figure number, the picture's orientation, and any instructions for cropping. Reproductions of photographs or other illustrations in books should be accompanied by captions that include full bibliographic information. **The author of each article is responsible for obtaining all photographic material and reproduction rights.**

---

## ABBREVIATIONS

MMA	The Metropolitan Museum of Art
MMAB	<i>The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin</i>
MMJ	<i>Metropolitan Museum Journal</i>

Height precedes width and depth in dimensions cited.

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM  
JOURNAL

VOLUME 49 / 2014





---

# Adam by Tullio Lombardo

---

LUKE SYSON

*Iris and B. Gerald Cantor Chairman of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts,  
The Metropolitan Museum of Art*

VALERIA CAFÀ

*Assistant Curator, Museo Correr, Venice*

Tullio Lombardo's marble *Adam* was displayed at The Metropolitan Museum of Art for some sixty-five years, its acquisition in 1936 celebrated as "an occasion for justifiable rejoicing" (Figure 1).<sup>1</sup> Lamentably, early in the evening of October 6, 2002, shortly after closing time, the pedestal supporting this great work buckled and the sculpture fell to the ground, shattering into innumerable pieces. The shock and distress of the Museum staff in the wake of this tragic accident can hardly be overstated. Director Philippe de Montebello described it as "about the worst thing that could happen" in a museum.<sup>2</sup> He and his colleagues quickly decided to undertake a restoration that would, to the fullest extent possible, return the sculpture to its original appearance. With new voices added to the discussion in the years that followed, this resolve has never altered.

In this volume, conservators and scientists describe the methods—many of them pioneering—they employed. Against the odds, *Adam* has survived: the fragments have been joined, the breaks in the stone disguised though not completely hidden, and the (thankfully small and few) losses filled. True, the sculpture is not intact and never can be again; this the Museum acknowledges. Despite the skill and dedication of those working on the restoration project, its success thus cannot be the cause of undiluted celebration. Nonetheless we have been true to our mission: to ensure that Tullio's subtle mastery of his medium, in what is probably his most meditated work, can even now be fully appreciated. This sculpture is extraordinary not just because of its art historical importance as the "first monumental nude of the Renaissance [that] followed closely the idealism of ancient Roman antiquities,"<sup>3</sup> but because it constitutes one of the most profound contemplations of divine and

artistic creation, of human beauty and frailty, of temptation and sin and redemption ever realized. One of the principal ways by which its meaning is conveyed is the rendering of the human body as simultaneously perfect and imperfect. To understand this delicate balancing act, we must see *Adam's* sculpted body in an undamaged state. Only then can we hope to understand something of what the artist and his clients believed and intended. The work's nuanced message is, moreover, entirely indivisible from the fact that it was sculpted at a particular moment in a great artist's career. Timeless though these themes may be, they arose out of a very specific set of historical circumstances. It is that intersection between context and artistic achievement that this article sets out to explore.

## THE FIGURE OF ADAM

The creation of *Adam* was a weighty, complex task that would have entailed profound consideration of God's labor in forming and giving life to the first man. For when, about 1490, the supremely gifted sculptor Tullio Lombardo (ca. 1455–November 17, 1532) was called upon to carve the figure of Adam for the funerary monument of the Venetian doge Andrea Vendramin (1393–1478), he was being asked to use his considerable talents to perform an act of re-creation, to reenact the first moment when divine purpose was given corporeal reality.

This is not merely an art historical trope. The turning of an artist—especially one talented enough to be perceived as divinely inspired—into a metaphor for God himself was a familiar conceit at the turn of the sixteenth century. Most pertinently, it can be found in the treatise *De sculptura*, by the young Neapolitan scholar Pomponio Gaurico (1481/82–1530; often called by the Latinized version of his name, Pomponius Gauricus), which was published in 1504.<sup>4</sup> The



author had seemingly realized that this linking of God and artist would gain potency when embodied by a sculptor—one who worked, as God had done, in three dimensions. Gaurico had studied in Padua, where so much sculpture was made in response to the scholarly and antiquarian culture that flourished at the city's famed university. Moreover, he was a friend of Tullio's and expressly praised him as "among the most skilled sculptors" of all time.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, Tullio's own thinking quite likely informed Gaurico's important theoretical tract.<sup>6</sup> The sculptor may have considered his undertaking all the more charged because his Adam was to be the size of a human being, thereby making this pious act of imitation more precisely emulative. God, in a divine act, "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."<sup>7</sup> Tullio, on the other hand, needed to animate the stone through his talents as a carver. By so doing, he ensured that the viewer would experience an especially vivid encounter with his—and God's—creation.

It might be thought that two prominently displayed sculptural precedents, both of them works associated with the Doge's Palace, would have been important for Tullio in this enterprise. However, Tullio apparently set out to make an Adam that was conspicuously different from both of these, and particularly from the figure carved by his rival, the talented Veronese Antonio Rizzo (ca. 1430–1499), just a few years earlier (Figure 2). For the artist/God metaphor to be expressed meaningfully, Tullio's solution needed to be personal and original. This challenge would have been of special significance for Tullio, operating as he did within the family workshop led by his father, Pietro Lombardo (ca. 1435–1515). Tullio's carving of *Adam* coincided with his assumption of the dominant role within this *bottega*. Thus it is noteworthy that he put his name to this sculpture, the only surviving figure from the Vendramin monument that bears a signature and the first of a sequence of seven known works by Tullio to do so. *Adam* is inscribed *TULLIO LOMBARDI. O[PVS]*—"the work of Tullio Lombardo." In addition to its metaphorical resonance, this statement of creative authorship had professional significance.

Adam was made, the book of Genesis and later apocryphal accounts relate, in God's own image. So he would have been assumed in Renaissance minds to be perfectly beautiful. In imitating God's creation, Tullio needed to fashion this ideal, and this at a time when philosophers and art theorists were giving much thought to how divine perfection might be seen, imagined, and made physically present. One solution for the modern artist—and Tullio was a pioneer in this respect—was to look closely at examples of

1. Tullio Lombardo. *Adam*, ca. 1490–95. Carrara marble, H. 78¼ in. (191.8 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fletcher Fund, 1936 (36.163). Photograph: Schecter Lee, The Photograph Studio, MMA, 1985



2. Antonio Rizzo (Italian, ca. 1430–1499). *Adam*, ca. 1471–75. Marble, H. 85 $\frac{1}{8}$  in. (216 cm). Doge's Palace, Venice. Photographs of Figures 2, 3: Scala/Art Resource, New York



3. Antonio Rizzo. *Eve*, ca. 1471–75. Marble, H. 84 $\frac{1}{4}$  in. (214 cm). Doge's Palace, Venice

the much-praised sculpture produced by the ancients. (This is the theme of the following article.) But, as others did, Tullio would also have studied the most handsome specimens of manhood he could see around him. This is not a sculpture that ignores real human beauty.

Perfection was not, however, the only necessary ingredient of this work. After all, Adam was also the victim of the Serpent's wiles, tempted to succumb to sensual gratification by Eve, the very woman who had been created his helpmeet. When Adam and Eve ate from the Tree of Knowledge, they established humankind as having the free will to err, sin, feel shame, repent, and sin again. Just as God had created beings that were at once perfect and flawed, Tullio needed to encapsulate not only the story of the Creation of Man but also the story of the Fall. He had to find a way of containing this narrative of human transgression within the image of a God-made ideal. Finally he must have been

aware, as Anne Markham Schulz has pithily summarized, that the significance of Adam and Eve on a tomb is that "they refer to man's corrupt state from which the Church is empowered to redeem him through the medium of Christ's sacrifice."<sup>8</sup> The figure would be essential for the overall meaning of the Vendramin monument. Adam's sin stands for that of all humankind, but more specifically of the deceased, who hoped to find salvation after death, as Adam had done, through Christ's mercy. Moreover, it was through the eating of the apple that death entered the world. The theme of death, no less than those of sin and corruption, would be apt for a tomb.

Tullio's patrons were the heirs of the decidedly undistinguished Andrea Vendramin. As doge of Venice from 1476 to 1478, he had exercised, theoretically at least, considerable earthly power, but during his time in office, large tracts of Venetian territory had been lost to the Ottoman Empire



4. Tullio Lombardo and workshop. Funerary monument of Doge Andrea Vendramin, ca. 1488–95. Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice. Photographs of Figures 4, 9–13, 15–20, 25: Anne Markham Schulz and Mauro Magliani, 2012



under Sultan Mehmed II, viewed as infidel. Vendramin therefore had much in his worldly existence to be forgiven for. Since the figure of Adam already had a civic context in Venice, Tullio, or those advising him, may have exploited a tradition that identified Adam with Doge and State. The

politics of Venice required the city's ruler to be both great and human, so here is another reason why Adam's simultaneous strength and weakness needed to be made evident.

By being placed in a church, Tullio's *Adam* would also have had a specifically ecclesiastical audience. The



6. Tullio Lombardo. Shield-bearers from the Vendramin monument, ca. 1488–95 (photographed before 1945). Marble, figure on left, H. 66 $\frac{3}{8}$  in. (168.5 cm); figure on right, H. 67 $\frac{1}{2}$  in. (171.5 cm). Staatliche Museen, Skulpturensammlung, Bode-Museum, Berlin (212-213). Photograph: bpk, Berlin/Skulpturensammlung und Museum für Byzantinische Kunst, Staatliche Museen/Art Resource, NY



engraving, published five years later,<sup>12</sup> that represents *Adam* and *Eve* still in place. The accompanying text, however, recounts that between the execution of the engraving and the publication of the book, these principal figures were removed, evidently because the nudity of *Adam* and *Eve* had been judged inappropriate for a church interior.<sup>13</sup>

The two female figures by Lorenzo Bregno that now flank the monument were taken from the suppressed parish church of Santa Marina.<sup>14</sup> They displaced two warrior figures in *all'antica* armor that now occupy the niches flanking the columns. Those niches once held *Adam*<sup>15</sup> and, from the end of the sixteenth century, at least, the figure of *Eve* (about which, more below). According to Anne Markham Schulz, this rearrangement happened surreptitiously on the night of Sunday, April 18, 1819, a week before Easter.

Even in its altered state, this is a truly sumptuous monument, and with Tullio's *Adam* still in place, it must have

been triumphal indeed. This is more than can be said for its occupant. Despite the civic preeminence that came at the end of his life, Andrea Vendramin was a long-lived non-entity.<sup>16</sup> Born in 1393, he was eighty-three by the time he was elected doge of Venice in 1476, receiving just the minimum number of votes needed to put him in office. Politically inept and a victim of fortune in Venice's military failures, he became the subject of public resentment.

Vendramin's last wishes were formulated in a will dated March 24, 1472. The document, drawn up before he became doge and nearly six years before he died on May 5, 1478, was quite specific regarding his funerary monument, stipulating the dimensions, quality, and richness of ornament, as well as its placement in the mendicant church of Santa Maria dei Servi,<sup>17</sup> where the Vendramin already had a family tomb.<sup>18</sup> Typically for a will, it did not contain instructions for the tomb's imagery.



Santa Maria dei Servi was located in Venice's Cannaregio district (Figure 7), not far from the Vendramin palaces.<sup>19</sup> Construction of the church had begun in 1330 and continued for more than a century, an effort that was supported by several leading Venetian families—including the Vendramin—who wanted their tombs installed there.<sup>20</sup> With its numerous buildings, the Servite complex was one of the largest religious establishments in Venice.<sup>21</sup> The church itself must have been enormous—it consisted of a single nave with a monumental choir terminating in three deep apsidal chapels, the central one of which, as we see in Jacopo de' Barbari's perspectival plan, was crowned by a circular dome. Patronage rights to its chapels were held by Venetian patrician families such as the Emo (for whom Antonio Rizzo created a tomb, beginning in 1493, with a "living" effigy of the deceased), the Donà, and the Condulmer.<sup>22</sup> According to the most recent reconstruction of the interior of Santa Maria dei Servi, the Vendramin tomb was located on the left side of the nave, near the choir and the door leading to a cloister.<sup>23</sup> The church was officially consecrated in November 1491, at about the time the Vendramin monument was constructed.<sup>24</sup>

Clues to a more precise dating for the monument come from the Venetian diarist Marin Sanudo (1466–1536). The only contemporary to report its construction, Sanudo was sufficiently interested to write about it twice.<sup>25</sup> In 1493 he reported that the monument was underway: "At the Servi, the tomb of Doge Andrea Vendramin is now being built, which will be, I daresay, the most beautiful in this terrain by virtue of the worthy marbles that are there."<sup>26</sup> Sanudo was always precise in his observations, and so it should be remarked that in the first passage he used the verb *fabricare* (to fabricate or build) rather than the more generic *fare* (to make), and that he focuses entirely on the various marbles used in the monument's construction. Work on the structure must therefore have been sufficiently advanced for the richness of these materials to have been noted particularly. White and veined Carrara marble and ancient red porphyry were being skillfully combined with black marble from Verona and less expensive Tuscan *pavonazzetto*, which was introduced in Venice perhaps as a substitute for the costlier and rarer *pavonazzetto antico* used by the Romans.<sup>27</sup> It may be that the sculptures carved in the round were added only gradually. The rather restrained gilding and polychromy that now appear as decorative flourishes would surely have been among the final tasks.<sup>28</sup>

Sanudo's second account of the tomb, which probably dates from some years later, is slightly more informative. By then almost all the statuary was in place, though the tomb was still missing a sculpture<sup>29</sup> and the epitaph.<sup>30</sup>

This doge reigned two years, two months, two days; died on 6th May at the 3rd hour of night, 1478, and was buried at the Servi church, where his family's



7. Jacopo de' Barbari (Italian, active 1497–d. by 1516). *Perspective View of Venice*, detail showing Santa Maria dei Servi, 1500. Woodcut. Photograph: Trustees of the British Museum

tombs are. They held funeral rites for him [there]; Dottore Girolamo Contarini, son of Messer Bertucci of the knights of St. John of the Templars, gave the funeral oration. He was placed in a temporary tomb in that church, where his remains rested for some time, and then his heirs had made for him in the *coro* a very beautiful marble tomb, into which they have still not put one figure, and it is without any epitaph.<sup>31</sup>

Work on the Vendramin monument is generally believed to have begun in 1488–89, though the start date is hard to determine precisely.<sup>32</sup> There is evidence that Doge Vendramin's heirs first assigned the project to the Florentine Andrea del Verrocchio (1436–1488), a sculptor, painter, and designer who was then at the peak of his fame. Confirmation of Verrocchio's involvement comes in the form of two drawings: one now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, and the other a simplified design in the Louvre that can plausibly be attributed to his chief assistant, Lorenzo di Credi.<sup>33</sup> Probably only after Verrocchio died in June 1488 did the Vendramin commission pass to the Lombardo family—to the workshop founded by Tullio's father.

It is equally difficult to say when work on the monument came to an end. Alison Luchs has noted that there must be some connection between the pair of sirens installed above the cornice at the top of the tomb and a composition described and illustrated in Francesco Colonna's *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, published in Venice in 1499, which has mermaids placed rather similarly above a doorway.<sup>34</sup> Which of these works came first cannot be

8. Pietro Lombardo and workshop. Funerary monument of Doge Pietro Mocenigo, ca. 1477–81. Santi Giovanni e Paolo, Venice. Photograph: Cameraphoto Arte, Venice/ Art Resource, NY



firmly established, but Tullio haunts the pages of the *Hypnerotomachia*, and it is likely that the author was inspired by the sculptor.

#### A FAMILY FIRM

The workshop of Pietro Lombardo, Tullio's father, was among the most successful in Venice. Not only did the master import and furnish materials, marble, semi-finished architectural elements, and labor, he also developed into a much sought-after interpreter in the visual arts of the ambitions of the Venetian ruling class. (His only real competitor in the field of sculpture was Antonio Rizzo.) One of the two *botteghe* of choice for dogal funerary monuments, the Lombardo workshop had executed those dedicated to Nicolò Marcello (1478–79), Pietro Mocenigo (1474–81), and Giovanni Mocenigo (after 1485). The Vendramin heirs

desired a certain novelty, as their initial choice of Verrocchio suggests. Tullio may already have impressed them with his powers of innovation while working for his father; however, their selection of the Lombardo workshop probably would have resulted in a more conventional project had Tullio not been at the helm. Certainly, the overall schema for the monument respects family tradition, but it also moves it ahead.

Considered from a certain perspective, then, the Vendramin monument was just one in a line of tomb commissions given to the Lombardo family by the heirs of doges. However, the signature on *Adam's* base could suggest that the leading role in the workshop had passed to Tullio, who perhaps for the first time was entrusted with overseeing an important project. No known records explain the reasons for this transition or its timing, although a legal document of 1488 names Tullio as the family representative, indicating that it was at about that time that his responsibilities increased.<sup>35</sup> And it is clear that Pietro was then occupied with other significant and notably challenging commissions at the cathedral in Treviso and for the facade of the Scuola Grande di San Marco.<sup>36</sup> He may have been simply too busy to undertake another major project. It is possible, however, that the Vendramin heirs, seeking a result that would be both traditional and new, chose Piero Lombardo's workshop while requesting that a leading role be given to the more artistically progressive and, arguably, more talented son. The innovative nature of the project as a whole is entirely in accord with the radical aesthetic statement made by Tullio's *Adam*.

Though the precise date of Tullio's birth is unknown, he was probably between thirty and thirty-five years old by the time he came to carve *Adam*. His beginnings remain mysterious. He is thought to have begun his professional life between the ages of twelve and fifteen, working more or less anonymously and for well over a decade alongside his father and his younger brother, Antonio (ca. 1458–1516). He was first mentioned in 1475 by the humanist Matteo Colacio, who categorized the two brothers as "emerging."<sup>37</sup> It is usually argued that Tullio's hand can be detected in the ornamentation of the Venetian church of Santa Maria dei Miracoli, which was carried out about 1481. At that time, within the family's workshop, Tullio was also working on the completion of the tomb of Doge Pietro Mocenigo in the church of Santi Giovanni e Paolo (Figure 8). Some twenty years later, Gaurico would enthusiastically claim that by the mid-1480s Tullio had publicly demonstrated his singular talent in his works for the cathedral in Treviso.<sup>38</sup> This may be a literary invention, as Gaurico cannot himself have witnessed the events he describes, but if true, Tullio's success was far from precocious: it seems reasonable to think that by the time Tullio came to carve *Adam*, he had been employed in his father's shop for about twenty years.



Indeed, Tullio was still to be found living and collaborating with his brother in the first decade of the sixteenth century; though the brothers often worked independently, the family firm was still flourishing. It is therefore very likely that Tullio was operating inside the bounds of the Lombardo workshop when it received the Vendramin commission. The scale and complexity of that project are such that its execution would have required considerable collaboration from the other family members and from a team of assistants and pupils. So when Tullio chose, in his early thirties, to sign the *Adam*, using that gesture to proclaim his new status as an autonomous artist, how might this statement of authorship have been read against the rest of the tomb complex? What might it have meant within the context of a collaborative effort?

In accordance with the standard practice of the time, the Vendramin heirs were almost certainly shown a drawing with a proposed design for the monument.<sup>39</sup> Is it possible, then, that the signature on *Adam* should be read as a claim to authorship of the monument's whole design, as opposed to a statement of individual talent within a collective effort? Does it imply that such a drawing would have been executed by Tullio? True, the monument's architectural scheme—the wall tomb treated as a triumphal arch—depends, as we have seen, on a model rooted in the practice of Pietro Lombardo. But in both design and detail, the Vendramin tomb constitutes a new chapter in the history of Venetian funerary monuments and marks a departure from Pietro's prototypes. This is the result of the keenly attuned interest in classical antiquity so characteristic of Tullio's later practice.

Though it is not known how Tullio learned this new language, the professional peregrinations of his father before 1474 must have been important for his cultural and aesthetic formation. In the 1450s Pietro had been active at Padua, where he was employed at the Santo (the Basilica of Saint Anthony). Padua was a lively cultural magnet, drawing students from all over Europe to its renowned university and attracting artists like Donatello and Andrea Mantegna, who created a visual language that corresponded to the city's humanist ideology. Tullio may have received some form of classical education;<sup>40</sup> certainly, his classicizing name suggests his father's lofty ambitions for him. Moreover, Tullio himself may also have traveled. Scholars writing about the large perspectival reliefs he made for the facade of the Scuola Grande di San Marco at the end of the 1480s posit an undocumented trip to Rome, where he would have seen ancient reliefs that provided indispensable knowledge. Any such journey would have proved invaluable when he came to work on *Adam* and the rest of the Vendramin monument.

That the signature on *Adam* was about more than the execution of a single figure is borne out by the style and quality of the other three surviving principal figures: the



9. Detail of Figure 4 showing the effigy of Doge Andrea Vendramin



10. Detail of Figure 4 showing the effigy of Doge Andrea Vendramin from above

reclining figure of Andrea Vendramin and a pair of standing warriors. Vendramin's effigy is an odd affair, a masterpiece of illusionism, with just one side "complete," and that designed to be seen only from below (Figure 9). Only its proper right side is fully carved, with the head shifted to the left (as we look at it from above), so as to make it more visible (Figure 10). The body is really not a body at all, resembling instead a rather grand sack of potatoes. Oddly proportioned, the torso is impossibly elongated and the shoulders undefined; a single, large hand emerges from

11. Detail of Figure 4 showing the helmeted warrior on the left



12. Detail of Figure 4 showing the warrior on the right



13. Detail of Figure 11 showing the marble block in the hand of the warrior on the left



nowhere, and the two feet allow the spectator to intuit that the figure has legs, which are in fact missing. Though the all-important dogal costume is described in some detail, it too is carved on just one side. The body is thus reduced to its ceremonial and physiognomical essentials. When observed from the proper distance and angle, however, the effigy reads as a complete figure. This brilliant economy, through which the sculptor manipulates the viewer into believing that an incomplete image fully describes its subject, was a crucial part of Tullio's method, as we will see.

Though the two armored warriors are much more fully conceived, they, too, persuade the viewer of the presence of elements that are not actually there (Figures 11–13). These figures have been universally attributed to Tullio himself, in part because of the newly classicizing, *all'antica* rendition of their armor. Moreover, the younger warrior, on the right, is so close in spirit and handling to *Adam* as to suggest that the Bible's first man is now suited for battle and ready to fight under a Roman imperial flag. His companion, wearing a somewhat incongruous pig's-head helmet, is more tense in both stance and countenance, with larger facial



features and a knitted brow that recall, as Wendy Stedman Sheard has pointed out, the animated expression of the young man in Tullio's signed, roughly contemporaneous Ca' d'Oro relief of a couple (Figure 14),<sup>41</sup> as well as those of the figures in the much later relief *The Miracle of the Miser's Heart* in the Santo, signed and dated 1525. Like *Adam*, both warriors raise the little toes of their weight-bearing feet, a pose governed once again by the needs of a viewer looking up at them. Other aspects of Tullio's sculptural method that we have identified in the effigy are present as well. Although both warriors appear to wear cloaks thrown over their shoulders, adding swagger to their poses, the mantles do not in fact extend down their backs, which are only roughly finished. Rather, the garments' continuation is inferred by the mind's eye. The drapery bunched between the (unseen) thumb and index finger of the helmeted warrior might allude to the cloak. This omission preserves the clarity of the sculptures' dynamic contours while permitting the figures to be read as fully dressed in proper ancient fashion. Their poses would also suggest that they are leaning on something. On other Venetian tombs, warrior figures support shields; here the presence of shields is merely implied. Each warrior holds one hand over a small, simple block of marble that describes nothing in particular. In each case, the figure's "leaning" arm, slightly bent at the elbow, would have been at the farthest point from the spectator, so the marble blocks would have been in shadow and the view of the "leaning" sides of the figures would have been obstructed



14. Tullio Lombardo. *Double Portrait*, 1490–95. Marble, H. 18½ in. (47 cm). Galleria Franchetti alla Ca' d'Oro, Venice (inv. sc. 24). Photograph: Cameraphoto Arte, Venice/Art Resource, NY



15. Detail of Figure 11 showing the head on the central decorative element below the breastplate



16. Detail of Figure 11 showing the head on a decorative element below the breastplate



17. Detail of Figure 12 showing the head on a decorative element below the breastplate



18. Detail of Figure 4 showing the head of the angel at the left behind the effigy of Doge Andrea Vendramin



19. Detail of Figure 4 showing the angel at center behind the effigy of Doge Andrea Vendramin



20. Detail of Figure 4 showing the angel at right behind the effigy of Doge Andrea Vendramin



21. Tullio Lombardo and workshop. *A Young Warrior*, 1490s. Marble, H. 34½ in. (87.6 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam, 1931 (32.100.155). Photograph: Juan Trujillo, The Photograph Studio, MMA

by the architecture. Very cleverly, Tullio leads us to assume the presence of more palpable supports.

While, as the preceding discussion suggests, Tullio appears to have been responsible for the conception and most of the carving of these figures, he was not alone in fabricating them. Close examination of the little heads that decorate the breastplates of the warriors' cuirasses reveals three distinct hands at work: one can be seen on the helmeted soldier, two on his bare-headed companion (Figures 15–17). This reminds us that much of the ornamental carving elsewhere on the monument would have been delegated, and, indeed, it is immediately evident that many hands were put to work in these parts. It is clear, too, that Tullio received help with the figurative sculpture, with entire figures given over to associates. This is not the place to attempt a detailed taxonomy, but some obvious places where Tullio gave the work over to others should be pointed out.

The three torch-bearing angels arranged around the bier are manifestly by three different stone carvers (Figures 18–20). The angel at the foot of the effigy resembles the *Young Warrior* in the Metropolitan Museum (Figure 21). Both have long, slightly craned necks, massy hair, and birdlike features. While the angel at the center is simply



awkward, the one at the head of the catafalque has a classicizing mien that takes us closer to Tullio, though the regularity and slight blandness of its features suggest this figure might be better attributed to his brother, Antonio, who was surely involved in the project, in accordance with the family's working practice. At the bottom, the paired angels holding the tablet with the epitaph might be the result of collaboration between the two brothers, with Tullio responsible for the angel on the right and Antonio for the one on the left. It is possible, too, that their father contributed his skills. In the lunette depicting the Virgin and Child with saints, which was carved in three sections, the center part shows a close kinship with works securely attributed to Pietro. The kneeling figure carved on the right-hand section is by another, more delicate hand, and the portrait of Vendramin, who appears in the lunette as a supplicant, is by another hand again. This part, with the figure of Vendramin, is cruder than the others and is actually unfinished; it is somewhat astonishing to notice that his praying hands are merely roughed out.

#### ADAM . . . AND EVE?

It appears, then, that only *Adam* was completely conceived and carved by Tullio himself. There are many good reasons for thinking of this figure as the spiritual and artistic lynchpin of the monument. As the signature announces, it is the piece in which Tullio laid claim to an autonomous professional identity and to the role of artistic creator, two concepts that are here intimately related one to the other. The monument has a sacred character, and by proclaiming his authorship—his creation—of *Adam*, Tullio was boldly likening himself to God and implying, therefore, that he was the creator of the entire monument.

One mystery remains, however: we know nothing at all of how an Eve carved by Tullio would have added to the meaning of the work, or even if such a figure ever existed. It is impossible to imagine that Tullio and his Vendramin patrons did not intend such a pairing. The couple appears, for example, in the grotesque relief on the east side of the right-hand pilaster of the organ loft in Santa Maria dei Miracoli that was produced by the Lombardo workshop, and thus certainly known to Tullio (Figure 22).<sup>42</sup> This example came from close to home, but the tradition of representing Adam and Eve together was particularly strong in Venice and its mainland territories. They were often depicted on either side of a church entrance<sup>43</sup> or just inside it, as in the eleventh-century mosaics at Torcello. Always referring to the hope for redemption and eternal salvation, their representation in Venice was—rather unusually—also overlaid with political significance. They were depicted twice at the Basilica of San Marco, not only the city's most important ecclesiastical institution but also



22. Lombardo workshop. Detail of a pilaster with carving of Adam and Eve, 1485–89. Stone. Santa Maria dei Miracoli, Venice. From Piana and Wolters 2003, pl. 150



23. Filippo Calendario (Italian, d. 1355). *Adam and Eve*, 1340s. Stone. Palazzo Ducale, Venice. Photograph: Wolfgang Moroder

the palatinate church of the seat of government. They are still to be found inside, in the Genesis cycle mosaic in the first of the cupolas in the narthex.<sup>44</sup> More important, carved figures of Adam and Eve, dated before 1430 and already classicizing in style, are to be seen among other biblical scenes on the extrados of the central archway, providing both a public and a sculptural forerunner for Tullio.<sup>45</sup> (Adam, unfortunately, is missing his head.) Finally and crucially, Adam and Eve appear in the sculptural decoration of the southwest corner of the Doge's Palace (Figure 23).<sup>46</sup> In this elaborate composition, traditionally ascribed to Filippo Calendario (d. 1355), Adam and Eve are represented frontally, separated by the Tree of Knowledge, their intense discussion suggested by their animated gestures. Small, leafy branches cover both figures' genitalia.

The most immediate and important precedent is the project by Tullio's rival, Antonio Rizzo, who carved lifesize figures of Adam and Eve (Figures 2, 3) as well as a classical warrior for the Arco Foscari, just inside the entrance to the Doge's Palace.<sup>47</sup> (These sculptures are usually dated to the first half of the 1470s, though they may well be slightly later, made only shortly before Tullio started work on the Vendramin monument.)<sup>48</sup> While the inclusion of Adam and Eve on that structure would have communicated the canonical message of sin and redemption, the figures' presence also would have recalled and reinforced an established nexus of Venetian civic identity and visual tradition.

Yet, as stated above, it is unknown whether Tullio (or, less likely, a member of the shop) ever carved an Eve. True, by 1821, figures of both Adam and Eve that had come from the tomb were to be found in the Ca' Vendramin Calergi. This beautiful palace and its contents were sold in 1844 to Maria Carolina, duchesse de Berry (1798–1870). The duchess sent many of her works of art to be auctioned in Paris in 1865. These included Tullio's *Adam*, which passed through a number of distinguished European collections, including that of Henry Pereire, who showed it in the entrance hall of his house on the boulevard de Courcelles.<sup>49</sup> The figure of Eve, however, stayed behind in Venice, and it remains to this day at the Ca' Vendramin Calergi. Why it failed to make

the journey north is easy to explain: *Eve* is a work of a flagrantly lower quality than *Adam*. Not by Tullio or even a member of his shop, it is by an unknown, rather mediocre sculptor who worked in the late sixteenth century. Long attributed to Francesco Segala (d. ca. 1593), this figure may in fact have been executed by Giulio del Moro (ca. 1555–ca. 1615), as James David Draper has proposed on the basis of its apparent relationship to Giulio's signed *Risen Christ* in the church of Santa Maria del Giglio.<sup>50</sup> This idea might profitably be investigated further.

Whoever the author, his motivation for fabricating an Eve for the monument in the second half of the cinquecento is still not clear. There are three possibilities. It may be that Tullio never started such a figure. Given its iconographic importance, however, this would have been a puzzling omission. Another possibility is that he began or even completed the sculpture, but for some reason it was never installed on the monument. Might there have been an argument over money, as was not unusual for such large commissions? Could Eve's naked body have elicited Servite qualms about female nudity? (Tullio's female protagonist in the Ca' d'Oro relief [Figure 14] is, after all, frank in its sensuality.) If the last of the three scenarios holds true, then maybe Tullio's figure survives and is to be recognized elsewhere, converted, perhaps, into a mythological figure.<sup>51</sup> Either of these circumstances would account for Sanudo's observation that such a figure was lacking. Exactly when he made that statement, however, is uncertain, and scholars have proposed alternative readings of his meaning. One interpretation is that his remark did not pertain to a missing Eve but instead to a minor piece of statuary; another possibility is that *Eve* was then lacking but her figure by Tullio was finished and installed shortly after. Implicit in the latter theory is the coincidence that the figure by Tullio that was not yet installed when Sanudo wrote about the tomb was the very one (and possibly the only one) which was later damaged or destroyed in a natural disaster. Sheard (who believed that it was possibly one of the Virtues that was absent in Sanudo's time) noted that the widow of Zaccaria Vendramin was given permission to make repairs in the Servi in 1563.<sup>52</sup> There had been a devastating earthquake

24. The inscription *TVLLII LOMBARDIO* on the base of *Adam*. Photographs of Figures 24, 26, 27–30: Joseph Coscia Jr., The Photograph Studio, MMA, 2014



in Venice in March 1511—strong enough to cause the bells in all the church towers to ring—that was reported by Sanudo, Girolamo Cardano, and Pietro Bembo, among others. Tremors were also felt in 1523, 1570 (with the epicenter in Ferrara), and 1591.<sup>53</sup> It is just possible that one of these dislodged *Eve*, though odd that such an event would have gone unmentioned, and that *Eve* was the sole victim.

## SIGNATURE, SIGHTLINES, AND STORY

Tommaso Temanza in 1778 was the first to observe Tullio's signature, *TVLLII.LOMBARDI.O[PVS]*, on the base of the *Adam* (Figure 24).<sup>54</sup> He nonetheless attributed the monument to Alessandro Leopardi because of similarities that he perceived in the base of the Colleoni monument.<sup>55</sup> This attribution persisted in the later literature, following the tomb's move to the church of Santi Giovanni e Paolo and the subsequent removal of *Adam* and *Eve* from their niches. Only in 1893 did Pietro Paoletti first ascribe the monument to Pietro Lombardo's shop and identify Tullio as the artist responsible for its sculpture.<sup>56</sup>

If Temanza doubted that the signature was genuine, he was not the last skeptic in this regard. The placement of the inscription along the base of the sculpture and the anomalous, if not actually irregular, shape of the letters have long puzzled scholars. Some have thought it odd that the signature is organized asymmetrically, starting on the left side of the front face of the base and continuing onto the chamfered corner. Consequently it has been suggested that the base was altered and the last four letters recut at some later time,<sup>57</sup> and alternatively, that the whole inscription was a later addition.<sup>58</sup>

Since we have argued so strenuously for the significance of this signature, it is important to establish its authenticity. Many indicators lead us to believe that it is genuine. First, there was an established tradition of signing works in Pietro Lombardo's shop.<sup>59</sup> In addition, the inclusion of a signature appears to mimic Antonio Rizzo's work on the Arco Foscari; Rizzo carved his name, ANTONIO + RICO (*sic*; the C means ZZ), on the *Eve*, which, significantly, is his only signed work.<sup>60</sup> While Tullio's seven known inscriptions differ one from another in content, abbreviations, and technique, the word "opus" appears, shortened or in full, on all but one.<sup>61</sup> The irregular shape of *Adam's* base was determined by the niche's projecting platform, on which the sculpture was placed (Figure 25), so it is both intentional and original. An analysis of the inscription, moreover, reveals a similarity in the execution of all the letters, precluding the possibility that the last four were reworked later. There remains the issue of its lopsided positioning. This turns out to be fundamental for the viewing, and consequently for the reading, of Tullio's *Adam*.



25. Detail of Figure 11 showing the platform of the niche on the Vendramin monument where *Adam* once stood

The siting of the monument in the Servi would imply that visitors to the church, encountering the left side of the monument as they approached from the nave, would first obtain a side view of *Adam*. When they moved forward to stand in front of the effigy, the viewpoint would shift. *Adam* would be seen by looking back to the left. The positioning of the inscription shows that this was indeed considered the principal vantage point. The particular impact of that third view would, however, depend on the figure's first having been seen face on. In these three aspects, Tullio aimed to elicit discrete and sequential reactions to the work. Striking subtly different emotional chords, this one figure could thus come to embody the first two parts of Adam's story.

Though the account in the book of Genesis of the creation of Adam and Eve and of their temptation was—and is—so well known, it is worth rehearsing here the several stages of the narrative. First, the creation of Adam himself: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them" (Genesis 1:27). "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." For the man whom he had formed, God planted the Garden of Eden as the pleasant and fruitful setting where there grew the Tree of Life and "the tree of knowledge of good and evil" (2:7–9).

This is followed by God's prohibition against eating the forbidden fruit and by the creation of Eve: "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make



26. *Adam's* left hand with an apple and a leaf



27. *Adam's* back



him an help meet for him" (2:16–18). "And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed" (2:25).

The account concludes with the narration of the temptation, fall, and punishment—the wily serpent persuading Eve to eat of the tree, her own enticement of Adam, and their realization of their nakedness: "and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons" (3:7). Their shame gives them away, and God punishes them: "And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil. . . . God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken" (3:22–23).

Antonio Rizzo chose to show Adam in a state of desperation after the fall. His sinewy, tormented Adam is a man consigned to suffering and labor. His lined face belongs to this flesh-and-blood world, and every detail, from his hand on his breast to his mouth open in frantic entreaty, contributes to the figure's moving naturalism. The taut muscles, a virtuoso anatomical display, transmit the figure's psychological trauma. This Adam is afraid and ashamed, a human being begging God for forgiveness.

Tullio's *Adam* is conceived very differently. Each artist approached this subject in a way that not only told different versions of the story but was also emblematic of his style. As the viewer approaches, *Adam's* figure appears open and innocent. From the front, Tullio's youthful nude is seen to be

standing in classical contrapposto position, his weight on his right leg, and his left bent, resting on the ball of his foot. In accordance with classical precedent, the individual parts of the body are counterbalanced; the bent left arm corresponds to the taut, engaged right leg, and the extended right arm to the relaxed left leg. This leg is pulled back only slightly because the niche for which it was intended is so shallow. The figure's right arm hangs almost straight down; the right hand rests on a stylized branch and, almost imperceptibly, grazes his right hip. *Adam* holds his left forearm in front of him, his elbow away from his torso, and a round fruit—the apple of the biblical account—in his left hand. His head is inclined slightly to his left.

This stance endows the figure with both calm and internal energy, suggesting potential movement in a position of repose. *Adam's* body is solid, supple, and even gently heroic, but it is also subtly abstracted. Once again, Tullio carefully describes some parts, creating elements that arrest the eye as it travels over the surface of the body, and elsewhere he persuades the viewer that the body is more completely described than it actually is. Thus, for example, the receding navel, so delicately carved, punctuates an abdomen in which the muscles are only just suggested. By not describing every bone and muscle, Tullio ensured that the contours of the body would flow smoothly, with a deliberate, subtle energy. This is a figure with the timeless character of



28. View of *Adam* from  
the right



29. Detail showing  
*Adam's* mouth



ancient sculpture—a carefully calibrated posture, a controlled sense of movement, eternal youth. And this is an Adam whose beauty, both human and ideal, is clearly shown to be God-made.

Framed by thick, full curls carefully arranged across his forehead, his facial features are similarly regular, with a strong nose and jaw. Attention is given to his large eyes, in which the raised pupils are carefully delineated, and to his mouth, with its soft lips slightly open to reveal his upper teeth. As with the body, the face from the front seems calm and slightly detached emotionally.

The element needed to support the figure is seen to his proper right, carved in the form of a tree trunk with ivy and a small serpent wriggling around it. Another little snake emerges from a hollow in the base of the tree. There are ancient precedents for this element, including examples that have the clinging vine, the tiny bird that has just landed toward the top, and the snakes. But Tullio departs from his sources by carving a trunk that comes up only as high as the figure's thigh and that lacks the traditional supporting brace at the ankle. Adam's right hand rests on a branch growing out of the trunk—another element that is completely novel. The same is true of the leaf attached to the fruit in his left hand (Figure 26). This serves as the connecting, supporting, and reinforcing element for his fingers. In stone sculpture, such elements are generally purely functional—simple blocks, spurs, or bridges that are meant to be read out of the sculpture. The leaf is an ingenious visual trick that allows the sculptor to reinforce what would be one of the most vulnerable points in any marble, and to ensure that the orb is understood as a fruit.

Tullio roughly blocked out *Adam's* hair at the back, since it would not be seen once the sculpture was in position. Similarly, the back of the figure was rather summarily finished (Figure 27). Nonetheless, *Adam* should be considered

a sculpture in the round. The back, shoulders, and buttocks are almost fully worked up so as to suggest a solid and believable figure. It is likely that the sculptor needed to represent those parts if he was to give a convincing account of the front and especially of the sides of the body.

One of these side views is fundamental for our understanding of the piece. *Adam's* pose, seen frontally, at first suggests a calm, untroubled beauty. From this angle, it will be seen as well that the forbidden fruit is similarly unblemished. Sustained examination, however, reveals a certain discomfort in the figure: it becomes evident that the load-bearing and free elements within the body are less balanced than they at first appear, and that the whole pose is in fact a touch unstable. For example, the right hand resting on the branch and the tilt of the head result in a stance that is somewhat uncertain. In this respect, the figure of *Adam*, though conventionally proportioned and with a well-developed musculature, deliberately departs from the classical canon. Adam has apparently already decided on his course of action, and, as he raises the apple to his open mouth, these variations on classical contrapposto begin to convey his troubled state of mind.<sup>62</sup>

Viewed from the right, as the chamfered corner of the base and the placement of the signature direct, this slight uncertainty of *Adam's* pose is accentuated to become a tense anxiety (Figure 28). His expression, with his eyes raised to heaven, is revealed as supremely uneasy, intense,



30. Detail showing the fig leaf



31. Michelangelo (Italian, 1475–1564). *Bacchus*, 1496–97. Marble, H. 80 in. (203 cm). Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence (inv. 10 sculpture). Photograph: Erich Lessing/Art Resource, New York

and sad. From this angle, it can be observed that the forefinger on his right hand, which in more relaxed mode would gently curve, is bent at just one knuckle; clearly he is pressing hard into the end of the branch, another sign of his emotional turmoil. And the apple is partly concealed; from here we cannot determine whether or not he has bitten into it, but his nervous state tells its own story. “I was afraid,” Adam said after he had eaten and when his transgression was discovered by God (Genesis 3:10). Now his open mouth might be interpreted as speaking (Figure 29). Tullio has very gently moved the narrative on to the point where Adam’s fear and frailty are fully revealed. Exploiting ambiguities of pose and gesture and assuming movement on the part of the viewer,

Tullio has brilliantly contained the story of the Fall within this single figure.

Tullio was concerned to preserve the clean, gently modulated contour of the body from this angle too. To that end he flattened Adam’s right nipple so that it does not break the line of his chest. (His left nipple is carved proud of the body so that it catches the light to animate this part of his torso when the figure is viewed frontally; the chief light source must have been from the left.) And though Adam is provided with his modest fig leaf, there is no additional foliage that would interrupt our view of his body (Figure 30). We are left to imagine the twig that should connect the leaf to the small bough—there, in part, for that purpose—on which Tullio’s *Adam* rests his right hand (the twig is supplied in Musitelli’s engraving). So habituated are we now to the coy convention of the fig leaf that we often forget that the genitalia are never covered by this means in ancient sculpture; all the fig leaves we see attached to them today are later additions. Thus Tullio’s decision to include the fig leaf without explaining its presence—it is neither woven into a loincloth nor attached to a conveniently placed branch—allows him to render it symbolic. Most unusually, Tullio has represented the leaf from the back so as to carve all its veins, making this an area of intense detail. This leaf has become a concealment that draws attention to itself. In this way, Tullio alludes to, but does not actually represent, the denouement of Adam’s decision to eat the forbidden fruit. The fig leaf is a synecdoche for his discovery and banishment, the symbol of his disgrace.

Tullio’s *Adam* thus distills a series of dramatic moments, and it is precisely by this emotional sequence that we can read the message of redemption. Troubled by his disobedience to God’s dictate, Adam’s fear increases. The second-century Church Father Irenaeus wrote that “the fear of the Lord is the beginning of Wisdom,” and this is precisely the Christian message intended here.<sup>63</sup> Adam knows himself to be guilty, and he repents, a gesture that “signals the *felix culpa* of the progenitors, the beginning of human redemption.”<sup>64</sup> There could be no better subject for a funerary monument.

And there could be no better subject for a sculptor bent on demonstrating his creativity. Tullio’s *Adam* is the artist’s own triumph, a marvelous moment in the history of sculpture. The young Michelangelo, who traveled to Venice in the autumn of 1494, understood its utter novelty and found in *Adam* one of the principal sources of inspiration for his own *Bacchus* (1496–97) (Figure 31).<sup>65</sup> Now that the restoration of *Adam* is complete, it is apparent to all why he was so impressed.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to the many friends and colleagues who, over many months in both New York and Venice, have discussed with us Tullio's *Adam* and its place on the Vendramin monument. In particular, we are beholden to the entire conservation team and to Anne Markham Schulz for organizing the close viewing and photography of the monument and for her many observations and insights. Matteo Ceriana, too, has helped us hugely in our thinking. We thank Linda Wolk-Simon, Peter Bell, and Michael Cole for their readings of our first draft; in style and content, this essay owes much to all three. Finally, we dedicate this essay to our friend Jim Draper, *Adam's* champion for so many years.

## NOTES

1. Remington 1937, p. 58.
2. De Montebello quoted in Bohlen 2002, p. E1.
3. James David Draper quoted in *ibid.*, p. E3.
4. See "De claris sculptoribus," in Gaurico (1504) 1999, section 8, pp. 246–47.
5. "che egli è il più valente di tutti gli scultori che abbia mai visto alcun'epoca"; *ibid.*, pp. 250–51. Gaurico's friends included other Veneto sculptors such as Riccio, Severo da Ravenna, and the artist who dubbed himself Pyrgoteles.
6. *Ibid.*
7. Genesis 2:7.
8. Schulz 1983, p. 33.
9. Many of the motifs on this monument have a marine theme. There are marine hybrids everywhere, deriving from ancient coins and cameos as well as Roman sarcophagi. The theme carries both a religious and spiritual significance (water as purification) and a political meaning (Venice's domination of the seas). Water also bore meaning for the Vendramin family, which owed its wealth and relatively late entry into the Venetian patriciate to maritime trade. See Sheard 1971 and Luchs 2007.
10. Engraved by Benedetto Musitelli after a drawing by Giuseppe Borsato that was included in the first edition of Count Leopoldo Cicognara's *Storia della scultura*; see Cicognara 1813–18, vol. 2 (1816), pl. XLII and details.
11. For these figures, see Knuth 2007. Possibly owing to their quasi-nudity, they seem never to have reached Santi Giovanni e Paolo, but instead to have appeared immediately on the antiquarian market.
12. The engraving is by Antonio Bernatti after a measured drawing by Marco Comirato.
13. Selvatico and Lazari 1881, pp. 224–25; Sheard 1971, pp. 108–14; Schulz 1991, p. 175.
14. Schulz 1991, pp. 174–77.
15. Thanks to the examination of *Adam's* niche undertaken on the occasion of the Metropolitan Museum's photographic campaign in October 2012, we can be certain of the correspondence between the measurements of the sculpture and its original location.
16. Andrea Vendramin was among the richest men in Venice in his day and held the office of Procurator of San Marco before becoming doge. See Sheard 1978, p. 120n8 (with earlier bibliography).
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 122–24, "I wish that a tomb should be made in the center of [or in the nave of] the church [Santa Maria dei Servi] by our family chapel where the Sacrament is kept; the said monument to be placed above one near the said chapel [and should be] of a good size and carefully made and well adorned, in which I wish my body to be placed" ([in Santa Maria dei Servi] voglio siano fatto far una archa in [centro] in giexia per mezzo [di] la capella nostra dove se tien el sagramento laqual archa [sia posto] sopra uno apresso [la] deta capella [as] a [assai] grande e ben f[ato] e asa adorna in laqual voglio sia messo il mio corpo); translation by Wendy Sheard.
18. Sheard (*ibid.*, p. 126) placed the Vendramin family tomb in the monastery's cloister.
19. For Santa Maria dei Servi, see Pavon and Cauzzi 1988 and Urbani 2000; Vicentini 1920 is still useful.
20. Urbani 2000, p. 23.
21. The entire complex occupied about 11,000 square meters; the area of the church has been calculated at more than 1,900 square meters. See *ibid.*, p. 17.
22. For other works in the church, see Pavon and Cauzzi 1988, pp. 57–68. The reliefs by Andrea Brioso, called il Riccio, depicting the Story of the True Cross (now at the Ca' d'Oro) were in this church; they date to about 1500 and reflect in many of their details the character of the Vendramin monument. See Gasparotto 2007.
23. Pavon and Cauzzi 1988; Urbani 2000.
24. Benci and Stucky 1987; Urbani 2000, p. 24.
25. Sheard 1977.
26. "Ai servi è l'archa d'Andrea Vendramin Doxe che al presente si fabbrica che sarà dirò cussì la più bella di questa terra per li degni marmi vi sono"; *ibid.*, p. 224.
27. For Veronese black marble, see Lazzarini 2006, especially the table on p. 262. Lorenzo Lazzarini (2006, pp. 258–60) notes that the use of Tuscan *pavonazzo* in Venetian building projects is a marker for the period 1470–1540.
28. Gilding is found on the doge's robe, for instance, with traces of red pigment, probably bole residue. The rosettes of the arcosolium are also gilded and have a blue ground beneath them.
29. Robert Munman (1968, p. 230) suggested that the missing figure was Eve. Sheard hypothesized (1971, p. 324) that it was a more minor piece, "probably the Charity." Sheard (*ibid.*) also suggested that it is possible that Tullio never executed the figure of Eve.
30. Debra Pincus (2013, p. 172), gives a late date—1522—for the epitaph, but does not support this with any specific rationale beyond the quality of the inscription itself. The twelve-line epitaph reads, "Andreae Vendrameno Duci/Opum Splendore Claro Sed Ex Mira In Patriam/Pietate Opum usu Longe Clarissimo qui Croia/Turcarum Obsidione Liberata Eorundemq/Irruptione in Carniam Reiecta Felix Insigni/Prole Impletis Omnibus et Fortunae et/Naturae et Virtutis Numeris Principatus/Brevitatem Sempiterna Caeli Gloria Compensat/Vixit Annos LXXXV Menses VIII/Obiit Pridie Nonas Maii/Anno MCCCCLXXIIX/Principatus Sui Anno Secundo" (To Andrea Vendramin Doge, famous for the splendor of his riches, and yet more for his employment of them in devoted loyalty to his country. He liberated Kroja [in north central Albania] from the Turkish siege and drove back the Turkish invasion in Carnia. Happy in outstanding children and filled with all qualities of nature and virtue, heaven's eternal glory compensates him for the brevity of his rule. He lived 85 years and 8 months. He died on the day before the Nones of May in the year 1478, the second of his principate). See Sheard 1978, p. 128n27.
31. "Questo Doge avendo dogato anni due, mesi due, giorni due, morì a dì 6 di Maggio a ore 3 di notte del 1478 e fu sePELLITO nella Chiesa de' Servi, dove sono l'arche de' Suoi. Gli furono fatte

- l'esequie, fecce l'Orazione Girolamo Contarini il dottore di Ser Bertucci Friere di San Giovanni del Tempio. Fu posto in un deposito in quella Chiesa, dove stette certo tempo, e poi pe' suoi figliuoli ivi gli fu fatta nel Coro una bellissima arca di marmo, alla quale ancora manca a mettersi una figura, senza però epitafio alcuno." Sheard 1977, p. 239.
32. Sheard's dissertation (1971) remains the most exhaustive study of the Vendramin monument. For the author's later additions and further considerations, see especially Sheard 1977, p. 243n4, and Sheard 1978. For an excellent summary, see Romano 1985.
  33. Verrocchio's involvement is attested to by a pen and ink drawing in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (inv. 2314). The second, simpler version of this drawing is by another hand, plausibly that of Lorenzo di Credi (Musée du Louvre, Paris, inv. 1788); see Sheard 1978, pp. 133–46, figs. 10, 11. For the relationship between Verrocchio and Tullio, see Sheard 1992, pp. 81–83. For a more recent discussion of Verrocchio's drawing, see Bambach 2003, pp. 255–58, with earlier bibliography.
  34. Francesco Colonna's *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, 1499, fol. CVIII; reproduced in Luchs 2007, p. 4, fig. 6.
  35. Pizzati and Ceriana 2008, p. 32.
  36. It is important to note that about 1486, Pietro was held responsible for the collapse of the dome of the Duomo in Treviso and that work there was continued under Tullio's direction. In November 1490 Pietro Lombardo and Giovanni Buora were dismissed from the works at the Scuola Grande di San Marco because of rising costs; they were replaced by the architect Mauro Codussi, who was named head of the project. For the building works at the Scuola Grande di San Marco, see Schofield 2006. For Tullio's appointment by the Vendramin, see also Sheard 1971, pp. 322–23, where it is suggested that the decision was made by the patrons or by Pietro himself.
  37. "Habet item statuaries Petrum Lombardum et patrio artificio surgentes filios"; Matteo Colacio's *Laus perspectivae cori in Aede Sancti Antonii*. . . quoted in Pizzati and Ceriana 2008, pp. 271–72 and pp. 309ff., doc. F1.
  38. Gaurico (1504) 1999, p. 251; Pizzati and Ceriana 2008, p. 272, doc. F3.
  39. This practice is known to have been adopted by the Lombardo family. See various documents published in Pizzati and Ceriana 2008. For the Tomb of Dante drawing attributed to Tullio, see Pincus and Comte 2006 and, more recently, Ceriana 2013.
  40. See Matteo Ceriana's suggestion in Pizzati and Ceriana 2008, pp. 315–16.
  41. Sheard 1971, pp. 161, 174.
  42. Piana and Wolters 2003, pl. 150.
  43. For example, on either side of the Lions' Portal (1240) at the cathedral of San Lorenzo in Traù (known today as Trogir) in Dalmatia.
  44. Jolly 1997.
  45. In Augusti 2008, p. 33, "Luca della Robbia (?)" is offered as a possible maker of these panels.
  46. Brown 1996, p. 43.
  47. For the Arco Foscari, see Pincus 1976. For Antonio Rizzo, see Schulz 1983, and for the Adam and Eve in particular, pp. 32–38, 152–53, where the author considers the relationship between Tullio and Antonio Rizzo.
  48. Schulz 1983, and for the Adam and Eve in particular, pp. 32–38, 152–53, where the author considers the relationship between Tullio and Antonio Rizzo.
  49. For *Adam's* provenance, see Wardropper 2011, pp. 36–39, no. 9.
  50. James David Draper, email communication with the authors, April 2014.
  51. Francesco Caglioti (2013, p. 218) suggests that the figure of Venus in the Giardino di Venere, Villa Brenzoni, Punta San Vigilio (Lago di Garda, Verona), started life as Tullio's *Eve*, a work left unfinished and converted into the Goddess of Love about 1550 by a less competent hand. We await Caglioti's full account of the work with great interest. The sculpture's life size supports his idea, and to judge from old photographs, the work does seem to have the proportions and stance of a female figure conceived about 1500. It is perhaps worrying that the tree stump is on the same side as in the *Adam*, meaning that it would have been in the line of the principal view of the figure. Elsewhere Tullio was careful to ensure that this view was left unimpeded (the warriors' tree stumps are on opposite sides and would have been concealed somewhat in shadow). The contrapposto of this putative *Eve* also repeats *Adam's* rather than mirroring it, and consequently so does the line of her shoulders. It may be that we should not be so insistent on symmetry; when Baccio Bandinelli came to carve an *Adam* and an *Eve* for the Florence Duomo, he placed tree stumps on the same side of each.
  52. Sheard 1971, p. 105, citing Mariacher 1950, pp. 107–9.
  53. Baratta 1901, p. 708.
  54. Temanza (1778, p. 120) also questioned the attribution to Tullio of the figure of *Eve*. It was attributed to Tullio by Filippo De Boni (1840, p. 578).
  55. Temanza 1778, p. 114.
  56. Paoletti 1893–97, vol. 2, p. 231.
  57. Sheard 1971, p. 392n5; reiterated in Luchs 1989, p. 232.
  58. Ulrich Middeldorf's opinion, as reported in Ruhmer 1974, p. 54.
  59. See Pincus 2013, and for Pietro's signatures, see *ibid.*, pp. 162–67.
  60. *Ibid.*, p. 165.
  61. Tullio's inscriptions are sometimes carved and then colored, sometimes only carved, and sometimes lightly incised into the stone and then painted. In the case of *Adam*, the inscription is carved deeply into the stone, and laboratory analyses have confirmed that it was never pigmented.
  62. Sheard 1971, p. 172; followed by Wills (2001, pp. 336–37), who believes that Tullio's *Adam*, like Rizzo's, has not yet bitten into the fruit. We may agree that Tullio's *Adam* has yet to eat, but we should note that the belt of fig leaves Rizzo's *Adam* wears is an incontrovertible sign that he has committed the sin. Rizzo also includes the detail of slightly raised skin on the fruit, which signals the bite.
  63. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 3.23.5.
  64. Salvadori 2009, p. 275. It is also known as the "Fortunate Fall." See Sheard 1971, pp. 215–22.
  65. Sheard 1971, p. 209. This hypothesis is discussed in Smyth 1979, pp. 210–15, and reaffirmed in Ceriana 2005, p. 532; Pincus 2007, pp. 283–84 (where it is suggested that Michelangelo may have made a second trip to Venice in 1529); and Ceriana 2009a, p. 22.

## REFERENCES

- Augusti, Adriana  
 2008 "Scultori toscani a Venezia nei primi decenni del Quattrocento: Presenze, assenze, riflessi." In *Andrea Bregno: Il senso della forma nella cultura artistica del Rinascimento*, edited by Claudio Crescentini and Cladio Strinati, pp. 23–39. Florence: Maschietto.
- Bambach, Carmen C., ed.  
 2003 *Leonardo da Vinci: Master Draftsman*. Exh. cat. New York: MMA.
- Baratta, Mario  
 1901 *I terremoti d'Italia: Saggio di storia, geografia e bibliografia sismica*. Turin: Fratelli Bocca.
- Benci, Jacopo, and Silvia Stucky  
 1987 "Indagini sulla pala belliniana della *Lamentazione*: Bonaventura da Forlì e i Servi di Maria a Venezia." *Artibus et historiae* 8, no. 15, pp. 47–65.
- Bohlen, Celestine  
 2002 "Met's 15th-Century 'Adam' Shatters as Pedestal Collapses." *New York Times*, October 9, pp. E1, E3.
- Brown, Patricia Fortini  
 1996 *Venice & Antiquity: The Venetian Sense of the Past*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Caglioti, Francesco  
 2013 "Venezia sul Lago di Garda: L'altare di Giovanni Dalmata per la Scuola Grande di San Marco." *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 55, no. 2, pp. 182–237.
- Ceriana, Matteo  
 2004 as editor. *Il Camerino di Alabastro: Antonio Lombardo e la scultura all'antica*. Este a Ferrara. Exh. cat. Castello di Ferrara. Milan: Silvana.  
 2005 "Lombardo, Tullio." In *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 65, pp. 530–39. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.  
 2007 as editor. *Tullio Lombardo: Scultore e architetto nella Venezia del Rinascimento; Atti del convegno di studi, Venezia, Fondazione Giorgio Cini, 4–6 aprile 2006*. Verona: Cierre.  
 2009a "Tullio Lombardo, Sculptor and Architect." In Luchs 2009, pp. 20–37.  
 2009b "Young Warrior (Saint George or Saint Theodore?)." In Luchs 2009, pp. 98–101.  
 2013 "Progetto grafico per la tomba di Dante a Ravenna, by Pietro e Tullio Lombardo." In *Pietro Bembo e l'invenzione del Rinascimento*, edited by Guido Beltramini, Davide Gasparotto, and Adolfo Tura, pp. 101–2. Venice: Marsilio.
- Ceriana, Matteo, and Victoria Avery, eds.  
 2008 *L'industria artistica del bronzo del Rinascimento a Venezia e nell'Italia settentrionale: Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi, Venezia, Fondazione Giorgio Cini, 23 e 24 ottobre 2007*. Verona: Scripta.
- Cicognara, Leopoldo  
 1813–18 *Storia della scultura dal suo risorgimento in Italia*. . . . 3 vols. Venice: Picotti.
- Colonna, Francesco  
 1499 *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*. Venice: Aldo Manuzio.
- De Boni, Filippo  
 1840 *Biografia degli artisti*. Venice: Co' tipi del Gongoliere.
- Gasparotto, Davide  
 2007 "Andrea Riccio a Venezia: Sui rilievi con le Storie della Vera Croce per l'altare Donà già in Santa Maria dei Servi." In Ceriana 2007, pp. 389–410.
- Gaurico, Pomponio  
 1999 *De sculptura*. Translated, edited, and with notes by Paolo Cutolo; contributions by Francesco Divenuto, Francesco Negri Arnoldi, and Pasquale Sabbatino. Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane. Originally published Florence: Giunti, 1504.
- Guerra, Andrea, Manuela M. Morresi, and Richard Schofield, eds.  
 2006 *I Lombardo, architettura e scultura a Venezia tra '400 e '500*. Venice: IUAV; Marsilio.
- Jolly, Penny Howell  
 1997 *Made in God's Image?: Eve and Adam in the Genesis Mosaics at San Marco, Venice*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Knuth, Michael  
 2007 "I Paggi del monumento Vendramin nel museo di Berlino: Storia e stato di conservazione." In Ceriana 2007, pp. 15–22.
- Lazzarini, Lorenzo  
 2006 "Primo studio sulle pietre e i marmi dei Lombardo a Venezia." In Guerra, Morresi, and Schofield 2006, pp. 255–63.
- Luchs, Alison  
 1989 "Tullio Lombardo's Ca' d'Oro Relief: A Self-Portrait with the Artist's Wife." *Art Bulletin* 71, no. 2 (June), pp. 230–36.  
 2007 "Il mare e la salvezza: Il repertorio di immagini marine nella tomba di Andrea Vendramin." In Ceriana 2007, pp. 2–14.  
 2009 as editor. *Tullio Lombardo and Venetian High Renaissance Sculpture*. Exh. cat. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art.
- Mariacher, Giovanni  
 1950 "Problemi di scultura (II): 2) Aggiunte ad Antonio Rizzo; 3) L'Eva Vendramin." *Arte veneta* 4, pp. 105–9.
- Munman, Robert  
 1968 "Venetian Renaissance Tomb Monuments." PhD diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
- Paoletti, Pietro  
 1893–97 *L'architettura e la scultura del Rinascimento in Venezia: Ricerche storico-artistiche*. Venice: Ongania-Naya.
- Pavon, Giuliano, and Graziella Cauzzi  
 1988 *La memoria di un tempio: Li Servi di San Marcilian ed il Canal-Marovic in Venezia*. Collana saggi e documenti 37. Venice: Helvetia.
- Pedrocco, Filippo  
 1983 "Il patrimonio artistico disperso dei Servi di Maria a Venezia." In *Fra Paolo Sarpi e i Servi di Maria a Venezia nel 750° anniversario dell'ordine*, pp. 103–25. Venice: Stamperia di Venezia Editrice.
- Piana, Mario, and Wolfgang Wolters, eds.  
 2003 *Santa Maria dei Miracoli a Venezia: La storia, la fabbrica, i restauri*. Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti.
- Pincus, Debra  
 1976 *The Arco Foscari: The Building of a Triumphal Gateway in Fifteenth Century Venice*. Outstanding Dissertations in the Fine Arts. New York: Garland.

- 2007 "Lo scorrere del tempo: Antonio Rizzo, Pietro e Tullio Lombardo e Michelangelo." In *Ceriana* 2007, pp. 279–90.
- 2013 "Signatures of the Lombardo Workshop." *Artibus et historiae* 34, no. 67, pp. 161–74.
- Pincus, Debra, and Barbara Shapiro Comte  
2006 "A Drawing for the Tomb of Dante Attributed to Tullio Lombardo." *Burlington Magazine* 148, pp. 734–46.
- Pizzati, Anna, and Matteo Ceriana  
2008 *Tullio Lombardo: Documenti e testimonianze*. Verona: Scripta.
- Remington, Preston  
1937 "Adam by Tullio Lombardo." *MMAB* 32, no. 3 (March), pp. 58–62.
- Romano, Serena  
1985 *Tullio Lombardo: Il monumento al Doge Andrea Vendramin*. Venice: Arsenale Editrice.
- Ruhmer, Eberhard  
1974 "Antonio Lombardo: Versuch einer Charakteristik." *Arte veneta* 28, pp. 39–74.
- Salvadori, Sharon  
2009 "Sin and Redemption, Sexuality and Gender: Adam and Eve in the Funerary Art of Late Antique Rome." In *Anathemata heortika: Studies in Honor of Thomas F. Mathews*, edited by Joseph D. Alchermes et al., pp. 271–82. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Schofield, Richard  
2006 "La facciata della Scuola Grande di San Marco: Osservazioni preliminari." In Guerra, Morresi, and Schofield 2006, pp. 160–93.
- Schulz, Anne Markham  
1983 *Antonio Rizzo: Sculptor and Architect*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.  
1991 *Giambattista and Lorenzo Bregno: Venetian Sculpture in the High Renaissance*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Selvatico, Pietro, and Vincenzo Lazari  
1881 *Guida artistica e storica di Venezia e delle isole circonvicine*. Revised edition by Rinaldo Fulin and Pompeo Gherardo Molmenti. Venice: G. Antonelli.
- Sheard, Wendy Stedman  
1971 "The Tomb of Doge Andrea Vendramin in Venice by Tullio Lombardo." 2 vols. PhD diss., Yale University, New Haven.  
1977 "Sanudo's List of Notable Things in Venetian Churches and the Date of the Vendramin Tomb." *Yale Italian Studies* 1, no. 3 (Summer), pp. 219–68.  
1978 "'Asa adorna': The Prehistory of the Vendramin Tomb." *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen* 20, pp. 117–56.  
1992 "Verrocchio's Medici Tomb and the Language of Materials: With a Postscript on His Legacy in Venice." In *Verrocchio and Late Quattrocento Italian Sculpture*, edited by Steven Bule, Alan Phipps Darr, and Fiorella Superbi Gioffredi, pp. 63–90. Florence: Casa Editrice le Lettere.
- Smyth, Craig Hugh  
1979 "Venice and the Emergence of the High Renaissance in Florence: Observations and Questions." In *Florence and Venice: Comparisons and Relations*, vol. 1, *Quattrocento*, pp. 209–49. Villa I Tatti (series) 5. Florence: La Nuova Italia.
- Temanza, Tommaso  
1778 *Vite dei più celebri architetti e scultori veneziani che fiorirono nel secolo decimosesto*. Venice: C. Palese.
- Urbani, Elena  
2000 "Storia e architettura delle chiese dei Servi di santa Maria di fondazione trecentesca in area veneta: Venezia (1316), Verona (1324), Treviso (1346) e Padova (1392)." *Studi storici dell'Ordine dei Servi di Maria*, anno 50, pp. 7–140 (especially pp. 16–39 for Venice).
- Vicentini, Antonio M.  
1920 *S. Maria de' Servi in Venezia*. Treviglio: Tipografica Editrice Messaggi.
- Wardropper, Ian  
2011 *European Sculpture, 1400–1900, in The Metropolitan Museum of Art*. New York: MMA.
- Wills, Garry  
2001 *Venice: Lion City; the Religion of Empire*. New York: Simon & Schuster.