BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Jacobus, Laura (2017) "Propria figura": The advent of facsimile portraiture in Italian art. The Art Bulletin 99 (2), pp. 72-101. ISSN 0004-3079.

'*Propria figura*': the Advent of Facsimile Portraiture in Italy c.1300

In recent decades, our ideas about what constitutes 'likeness' in medieval and early

renaissance portraiture have become increasingly complex. It can seem naïve to suggest that a

medieval or early renaissance image truly captures a person's physical appearance. We now

tend to understand portraits as constructions, in which real or imagined aspects of a person

which are deemed significant in a particular historical context are selectively presented, whilst

aspects deemed insignificant or undesirable may be suppressed.[1] And we understand

'likeness' as a very fluid concept which, in the medieval period, might not extend to likeness of

physical appearance at all.[2] A tomb effigy, votive image or independent representation of an

individual might have been considered a likeness if it featured typological indicators of age,

gender, marital status, occupation, rank, lineage or kinship- or even if it simply corresponded

with one or more of the subject's measurable dimensions.[3] Exact physical likeness may even

have been regarded as undesirable in portraiture, since the face and body were subject to the

vagaries of age and personal circumstance and hence their copies could be considered less

'true' than a more conceptual representation of an individual.[4] To further complicate the

relationship of portrait to prototype, medieval and renaissance physiognomic theories

attached moral characteristics to physical features, and portraits could be expected to convey

their subject's real or imagined moral character.[5] Thus even where an image of a person

displays realistic or idiosyncratic qualities that we might deem portrait-like, we must recognise

that such features do not necessarily record an individual's appearance, and may have been

included as signs of that person's idealised or stereotyped character. Finally, the physical

likeness of a portrait to its subject could also be compromised by other factors such as the

artist's style and training, skill, and knowledge of the sitter- who would not necessarily have 'sat' for the portrait at all.

Allowing for all these qualifying factors, I nevertheless wish to assert that the concept and practice of portraiture as the exact reproduction of physical likeness did exist in the medieval period, and that examples of such portraits were created in Italy as early as the beginning of the fourteenth century.[6] This is very much earlier than the Florentine marble busts which are often (though not necessarily correctly) accepted as the first instances of such portraits.[7] In this article I demonstrate the use of facial casting as a technique employed in the production of what I will term 'facsimile portraits', that is to say portraits which exploit mechanical means of reproduction with the intention of capturing and recreating exact physical likeness. I coin the term to draw attention to the importance of the mode of representation being initiated, since facsimile portraits have been created at all periods of subsequent history, not only by the cast-based practices discussed here but also by projection-based practices.[8]

Two sculpted portraits of the Paduan businessman Enrico Scrovegni form the basis of this study (figs 1,2). Each was produced in the early fourteenth century for the chapel he founded, the Arena (or Scrovegni) Chapel in Padua. The chapel has an established place in the art historical canon due to the presence of its hugely influential frescoes by Giotto, but the two sculpted portraits of its founder which are still to be seen there have received little scholarly attention until recently.[9] The earlier of the two is a statue, which I have argued once stood in a niche beside the north portal, the quotidian point of entry to the chapel.[10] There, I have suggested, it was accompanied by a lengthy inscription which commemorated the dedication of the chapel in 1303 (Appendix 1).[11] When the statue was moved to the chapel's sacristy later in the fourteenth century (where it remains today) the statue was re-inscribed on the base as

the '*propria figura* of Lord Enrico Scrovegni, knight of the Arena'.[12] The second of the portraits

of Enrico I will consider is the effigy which adorns his tomb in the chapel's apse, which was

commissioned prior to Enrico's death in 1336 .[13] A third portrait of Enrico Scrovegni also exists,

painted by Giotto, in which he is shown offering a model of the Arena Chapel to the Virgin

Mary (fig.3), and this provides a useful point of comparison with the sculpted portraits. It is to

be expected that portraits of the same man by different artists will exhibit a range of

similarities and differences, not least because of the different styles and aims of the artists

concerned, and unsurprisingly, the three portraits of Enrico Scrovegni do show variations.

Examining these, I argue in the first part of this article that the statue and effigy share certain

characteristics which could only result from the use of facial casting, whilst the portrait by

Giotto indicates a different approach. In demonstrating this I rely on very close observation of

the art-works under discussion– an empirical methodology which I hope to show remains

capable of yielding new knowledge.

Giotto's fresco and the statue appear to have been executed within a few years of each

other, during Enrico Scrovegni's early maturity.[14] They are broadly similar in showing a man

with relatively sharp features, but not so close that a viewer could immediately assume that

they show the same sitter: closer inspection suggests that the statue has the better claim to be

an objective reproduction (figs 4, 5).   For instance, the nose of Giotto's Enrico is smoothly

aquiline, while the nose of the statue shows a slight concavity marking the transition between

cartilaginous ridge and fleshy tip. Giotto shows a full, firm and rounded chin while the Master

of the Scrovegni Statue shows a more meagre, receding chin which is in keeping with the rest

of Enrico's face. He also records Enrico's adam's apple, while Giotto does not. Finally, Giotto's

Enrico has larger eyes in proportion to the face that those of the sculptor's Enrico; they are

very like those of St. Francis, and this is a flattering correspondence given the popular idea that

the eyes revealed the soul (fig.17).[15] Broadly speaking, Giotto has smoothed out and otherwise

manipulated the irregularities of Enrico Scrovegni's face to bring it more into line with the ideal

male type exemplified by his images of Christ in the Arena Chapel (fig. 18).[16] Still, Giotto has

included one unideal and even mildly-disfiguring feature; an extremely unusual 'webbed'

earlobe which extends into the jaw-line. This peculiarity is seldom found in nature or art (I

have yet to see another example in either) but it is also found in the statue, and in Enrico's

effigy. We may deduce that Giotto's approach was to preserve an essential impression of his

subject's actual appearance, individuating it by inclusion of a recognisable idiosyncrasy (the

ear-lobe), whilst modifying it in accordance with contemporary ideals and physiognomic theory

(the chin, nose and eyes). The Master of the Scrovegni Statue appears to have aimed for a

more objective reproduction of the sitter's features- but to prove that this is the case we must

examine Enrico Scrovegni's effigy.

It might be expected that the tomb effigy of Enrico Scrovegni would differ from the

other two portraits in similar ways (fig.6). Enrico died in 1336, and is depicted in death. He has

aged by at least a quarter of a century between his last portrait and his earlier ones, so that

likeness is not immediately apparent.   However, upon more detailed examination of the facial

structures of the two sculptures, it emerges that there is far less difference between them than

would be anticipated. Figures 7-10 show orthogonal (or as close to orthogonal as possible)

views of the faces of the statue and effigy, in profile and frontal views.[17] Mapping these views

onto each other reveals the underlying bone-structure of each to be more-or-less identical

(with the exception of the forehead, which I will consider below), whilst the fleshier parts of

the face diverge from each other in ways that are explicable by the ageing process (figs 11,

12).[18] For instance, the tip of the effigy's nose is fleshier than that of the statue (reflecting the

sad tendency of nose-tips in general to carry on growing when other parts of us shrink with

age), but the bone bridge and cartilaginous ridge of the nose align well in each view. Similarly the lachrymal pouches that were incipient in the statue of Enrico as a younger man have swelled and sagged in old age, and the skin around the eyes has become more lined, as one would expect. The treatment of the eyes themselves is harder to compare as they are open in the statue and closed in the effigy, while the eyebrows are at rest in the statue and more contracted in the effigy. However it can be seen from the superimposed profiles that the eyes of the effigy have sunk further in their sockets, as often happens with age - while the position of the sockets, (discernable at their outer and upper limits, just beneath the more mutable eyebrows), is unchanged. The lines of the jaw and philtrum, and the outline of the mouth, have scarcely changed during the approximately thirty years which have elapsed between the two portraits. However, there are indications of jowls in the sagging corners of the effigy's mouth, and the hint of a dewlap in the taut line of skin beneath the chin, neither of which were present before. Sharp creases in the skin just above the bridge of the nose and in the hollow of Enrico's left cheek have deepened over the course of a quarter of a century, but remain in exactly the same positions.

The coincidences of bone-structure revealed by this comparison would have been practically impossible to achieve if both sculptors had observed their subject by eye alone, working from sittings and freehand drawings of Enrico.[19] The precise correspondences revealed here are far more likely if both sculptors had been able to work from an inanimate three-dimensional prototype.   A cast taken from a mould, taken directly from the subject's face, would have allowed the sculptors to refer to their subject again and again during the carving process. Using callipers, they could copy measurements from the cast in any direction, and in three dimensions. Dividing the mould vertically down the centre, they could also make a negative template of the subject's profile, against which the sculpted profile could be

continually matched and adjusted during the carving process (much as renaissance

stonemasons did when carving classical mouldings). [20]

The fact that the only major discrepancy between the facial structures of the two

sculptures occurs in the region of the forehead and temples paradoxically serves to confirm the

use of a facial cast as model in each case. Around 1400, Cennino Cennini, a Tuscan artist with

very strong links to Padua, described the technique of facial casting in a way that accounts for

the differences seen in the sculptures' foreheads (fig.13).[21] It is noteworthy that Cennini

describes making a cast from a *living* subject, and this is most likely to have been the case even

if the cast was made for use in the production of a tomb effigy.[22] During the process the

subject wore a snugly-fitting cap drawn down sufficiently far that towards the back of the head

it came into contact with a tall collar covering his neck. A continuous band of material was

then sewn onto this clothing, along the front and sides of the cap ('from one ear to the other'),

down both sides of the tall collar and part-way along the shoulder seams, before being folded

across the throat and held in place a few inches away from the subject's face by a toothed

metal hoop that would grip the material. The subject's face was thus enclosed by a protective

sleeve of material, sewn into place on his clothing and held away from his face by a hoop.

Earplugs were placed in his ears, breathing tubes in his nostrils, and he then lay prone and very

still as plaster of Paris was applied in layers through the framed opening in the sleeve; this

arrangement prevented the plaster from running down the sides of the face or into the hair

before it set. The plaster mould which resulted from this process therefore included the

subject's lower brow, ears and jaw, which were contained within the casting sleeve, but not

the temples, hairline or cranium, which were beneath the cap. Thus when the sculptors of

Enrico's statue and effigy created his portraits, they could precisely reproduce those parts of

his face that had been cast in plaster, but were obliged to render the forehead and temples

more freely- with the divergent results now seen. This divergence, combined with the coincidence of bone-structure and other features previously noted, leads to the conclusion that these are the earliest incontrovertible instances of facial casting being employed in Western art in post-Roman times.[23] The use of facial casts is the *only* way to account for the appearance of the two sculptures.

New aims, new challenges

The evidence presented here allows us to conclude that the statue and effigy of Enrico Scrovegni were produced with the intention of creating exact physical likenesses of their subject. This was a novel aim. As mentioned earlier, 'likeness' was a fluid concept in medieval portraiture, and among the many aspects of similitude, physical likeness seldom took priority. *Exact* physical likeness was of even less importance, as well as being beyond what was technically possible.[24] Hence the masters of the Scrovegni statue and effigy were confronted with unprecedented artistic challenges generated by what were, at this time, both a new technology and a new art-form.[25]   They had to discover how to translate facsimiles into facsimile portraits.

The challenges were numerous. Even with their makers' best mimetic intentions the finished sculptures of Enrico Scrovegni would not be identical to their subject, nor even to the casts used in their creation. There was an intervening carving process- and in at least one case a painting process- between the making of a cast and the production of a portrait, and the acts of carving and painting admitted the artist's style into the process of portrait-making. Moreover any cast which provided the model for a portrait sculpture would itself have fallen

short of complete reproduction of the subject's physical appearance, even in those parts of the face that it captured. It would reproduce the face's bone-structure and the form and relationship of the features, but the subject's eyes and mouth would be closed. It would reproduce the exact textures of the skin, but not of any facial hair, which would have been shaved off or heavily greased before casting. The subject's colouring would remain unrecorded by the process. Only the area encircled by the protective sleeve would be cast, so the full relationship of the face to the head would be lost. And the features would be immobile. Facial casting produces a mask, in both of the usual senses of the word.

Comparison of the statue and effigy of Enrico Scrovegni can illustrate how their respective sculptors came to terms with some of these novel issues. Of the two, the Master of the Scrovegni Statue was apparently the more inclined to aim for objective reproduction of the life-mask, using mechanical means such as callipers and a profile template to reproduce it as accurately as possible. Yet his task was more complicated than this. The inscription which first accompanied the statue indicates that the image shows 'Enrico Scrovegni, knight, saving his honest soul, here celebrat[ing] the venerable feast day'. To produce an exact likeness of a man saving his soul was a novel task indeed, not made any easier by the fact that the cast presented him with an image of a man flat on his back with his face encased in plaster. While the sculptor's primary response to his brief was to represent Enrico standing (and possibly about to kneel) with his hands joined in prayer, he also needed to adapt his cast prototype to make it better serve his purpose. Accordingly he attempted to make the statue look alive, rendering the eyes wide open and the lips very slightly parted to suggest prayer. It is notable that he did not allow the parting of the lips to greatly disrupt the outline of the mouth or the position of the chin, for these are near-identical in the statue and effigy. He just carved a gap between the lips, leaving the overall dimensions of the mouth and the rest of the lower part of the face

unchanged. He may have lacked an awareness of the mutability of the face during speech, but he may also have consciously given priority to preserving the data given by the cast, privileging the measureable aspects of physiognomic accuracy over all other considerations. Carving the eyes would have presented a greater challenge, as the cast would have given no information about their appearance when open. Enrico's eyes in the finished work have drooping quality which, while unusual, does not look out of keeping with the rest of his face. If the sculptor had been relying on his own invention, it is probable that he would have created a more conventionally 'correct' pair of eyes, so it is likely that he traced the shape of the open eyes onto the closed eyelids of the cast, following the curvature of the forms. However, the master could not fully compensate for the deficient information supplied by the cast as he lacked the anatomical awareness to do so; the statue has no proper eyelids.   He was more successful in other areas where the cast was of little help; the brow and temples, which could not have been fully recorded in the casting process, are convincingly proportioned so that the face and head 'fit' well together.

The Master of the Scrovegni Statue, or more probably an associate, also polychromed the statue.[26] Whether this was intended to further the statue's mimetic likeness to its subject, or simply to create a heightened effect of verisimilitude regardless of Enrico Scrovegni's actual colouring, is difficult to determine. In the portrait that Giotto painted at around the same time as the statue's production Enrico Scrovegni is shown as he is in the statue, with a fair complexion and light golden-brown hair. Light colouring is not uncommon in the Veneto, and it is a combination seen in none of Giotto's other male figures (although some depictions of the young John the Evangelist seem to approximate it using different pigments), so this could suggest that the frescoed portrait is indicative of Enrico's actual colouring. However, as with Giotto's rendering of his patron's features, there may have been a degree of idealization in his

making Enrico Scrovegni 'go blond'. Fair skin and golden hair in youth were much-admired in courtly circles. [27]

The question of how exactly the polychromy of the statue reproduces Enrico Scrovegni's true colouring is further complicated by the statue's state of conservation. In its post-restoration state (fig.14), much of the statue's face is painted a light pink, and its hair is yellow.[28] The overall aesthetic now seen tends towards a rather crude approximation of natural colouring, leading to a perception that the statue's polychromy is closer to the solid colours of romanesque sculpture than the more naturalistic colouring of gothic work. [29] However my understanding of the original painting technique, based on observations made before and after cleaning, leads to a different perception.   Prior to restoration the hands and face had an unevenly distributed brownish 'patina' (fig.15). This was removed during cleaning as it was believed to be an accumulation of 'particularly resistant layers of oily dirt…[some of which] had apparently soaked into the colour'.[30] However, pre-restoration photographs suggest that this 'patina' consisted of layers of translucent washes or oil glazes (more probably the latter, given the description in the restoration report). Although discoloured, these layers still modulated the underlying pink base-colour to impart a flush to the cheeks, increasing in intensity as it extended down and outwards from the sides of the nose. The pigment used in glazing the cheeks was probably vermilion, as it appears to match the traces of vermilion still visible on the statue's lips. Restoration has revealed more of the polychromy of the hair; this is predominantly covered by a basecoat of yellow, with some strands in a much darker colour remaining visible in the carved grooves. These naturalistic techniques of graduating colour over the cheeks, and differentiating the strands of hair in two or three colours over a base-colour, correspond with those used in Giotto's frescoes. So too, but in a contrastingly non-naturalistic convention, does the technique of outlining the rim of the eye with a dark colour to

give definition. Finally and most tellingly, prior to the recent cleaning, it was also possible to

see individual fine dark hairs apparently painted over a strip of brownish base-colour on the

statue's eyebrows. The density and direction of the brushstrokes is subtly varied to suggest the

pattern of the hairs' natural lines of growth (fig. 16). The polychromist's remarkable attention

to such naturalistic details, and his pictorial techniques in general, find strong parallels in the

images produced in the different medium of fresco by Giotto and his workshop in the Arena

Chapel. The parallels are particularly strong in the most attentively-painted faces such as that

of Christ in certain scenes, or the faces of Enrico Scrovegni and St. Francis (Figs. 19, 4, 18).[31] In

general I suggest that the painter intelligently adapted the Giotto workshop's fresco-painting

techniques for use in tempera and glazes on a three-dimensional object, omitting elements

concerned with modelling (eg. underpainting with *verdaccio,* shading, highlighting), but

retaining elements concerned with the naturalistic rendering of surface qualities. Whoever

was responsible for polychroming the statue probably also worked on the frescoes.   It is worth

noting that since Giotto himself almost certainly painted the portrait of Enrico Scrovegni in the

Dedication Scene, there is a possibility that he was called upon to perform the same service

with respect to his patron's statue. Whether or not that was the case, and whatever the degree

of correspondence between Enrico's true colouring and that of his statue, the polychromy of

the statue surely contributed to its overpowering impression of this being the exact likeness of

a living person.

Thus, the Master of the Scrovegni Statue met the challenges of facsimile portraiture by

closely copying the dimensions of the facial cast, combined with small adaptations (tracing the

outline of the open eyes onto the closed lids, creating a parting between the lips while leaving

their outline unchanged) and the use of naturalistic polychromy by himself or an associate. He

also added narrative elements (the parted lips, the joined hands). However, the statue's

expression is almost as blank as the life-mask which was its prototype. Whilst it is possible to read characterisation into Enrico's features, it is as an incidental by-product of our tendency to perceive faces in this way, rather than the result of a conscious effort on the part of the artist to give the face expression.[32] The most expressive elements of Enrico's face, the short frown lines above his nose, were reproduced simply because they were there: the effect is not dissimilar to that of a passport photo. Ultimately, the earliest known experiment in facsimile portraiture serves to demonstrate that facial casting allowed huge gains in physical resemblance, but no necessary advance in psychological portrayal.

The work of the Master of the Scrovegni effigy reveals a different sensibility, and a quite different response to the inexpressive facial cast on which he based the effigy of Enrico Scrovegni. Whilst copying the cast, he introduced variations which were clearly intended to re-introduce movement and expression into the face and hence produce a more psychological portrayal. He reproduced the closed eyelids of the cast with almost-total accuracy, yet created a flicker of an opening by distinguishing between the carved edge of the upper eyelid and the creased skin of the lower lid, allowing a smooth, crescent-shaped sliver of the eyeball to show. He copied the deep creases above the bridge of the nose directly from Enrico's facial cast (hence they match those seen on the statue), but went further by re-creating the habitual expression which had etched those lines into Enrico's face over the years. Consequently the eyebrows of the effigy deviate from those of the statue and cast: they are drawn down below the line of the eye-sockets by a contraction of the muscles of the forehead, and the movements of the overlying skin of the forehead are registered by additional lines and puckered undulations. The immobility of the face during the casting process makes it unlikely that these expressive features had been preserved in a mask; they must have sprung from the sculptor's imagination, informed by an awareness of the mutability of the face and observation

of facial expressions in life.[33] Variation has also been introduced on the lower side of the face, which sags inventively under the imagined force of gravity as it falls to one side on the pillow; Enrico's face would actually have been turned towards the ceiling during the casting process.

While departing from direct reproduction of the facial cast for expressive effect, the Master of the Scrovegni Monument was highly responsive to the cast's textural qualities and aimed to mimic these as closely as possible in stone. In fact one of the defining features of his style is that he renders the qualities of skin and surface with keen sensitivity, for instance in the way he differentiates in the effigy between the membranous lips, the fine papery skin of the eyelids and lachrymal pouches, and the puckered and creased forehead.   This distinctive element of his style is not seen in the faces of the two diminutive angels accompanying the effigy and so may be a result of the artist's direct response to the new technology of the cast. Preservation of the skin's textural qualities was probably the reason why polychromy appears to have been applied only very lightly in this case, perhaps without a base coat (which might have ensured the colours' survival but which would have obscured the finer elements of carving). Given the state of the effigy's conservation it is difficult to be sure on this point. Recent restoration noted traces of gilding and pigment on the edge of the effigy's mantle and on his pillow, and a residual base-coat on the feet, although no polychromy in the flesh areas was recorded.[34] However it is improbable that, in an effigy which demonstrates such extraordinary effort to obtain naturalistic effects, the garments were coloured but the flesh was not. The stone has a thick vein of grey running through the face which would have destroyed the carefully-nurtured verisimilitude of the work if it had been left on display. In fact, prior to restoration, an area of colour was visible on the lower side of the forehead and hair where it had the effect of concealing the vein in the stone (fig.17). It seems fair to conclude that the face was naturalistically polychromed, though the colour has been lost.

We are now in a position to summarise some of the key artistic issues posed by the advent of

facsimile portraiture and the opportunities for reproducing exact physical likeness that it

introduced. The Master of the Scrovegni Statue, who surely has a claim to have pioneered the

use of a life-cast in portraiture, apparently felt the full force of the mask's compelling

objectivity. He interpreted his role as one of pure *mimesis*, reproducing as accurately as

possible the physical data supplied by the cast, supplemented by polychromy which again was

probably as accurate a reproduction of his subject's colouring as his pigments and media would

allow. The only adjustments to the cast prototype that he made were those demanded by the

narrative function of the commission; it was to show Enrico Scrovegni in pious activity, and

hence he carved open the eyelids and lips whilst still taking care to preserve the forms supplied

by the cast. Some thirty years after this first facsimile was made, the Master of the Scrovegni

Effigy made an effort to escape the objectivity of the life-cast. He still preserved its essential

features in accordance with his patron's apparent commitment to facsimile portraiture, but he

reproduced this physical data in keeping with his own sensitivities, reproducing surface texture

as well as physiognomic dimensions. He also added elements of movement and expression

which could not be found in the mask. His reasons for doing so are unclear. He may have

wished to suggest the moment of separation of the soul from the body, or the re-animation of

the body at the moment of its resurrection. Or he may have been influenced by the

Aristotelian notion of *dispositio* revived in the work of Pietro d'Abano, as considered below.

He may even have consciously wished to imprint his own personal style upon the work he was

creating, since that is certainly what the effect of his decisions was.[35] What is clear is that both

artists in their differing ways had taken a decisive turn towards exact physical likeness in

portraiture, using the novel technology of facial casting to do so, whilst exploring different

solutions to the novel challenges of their task.

Facsimile Portraiture, Paduan Humanism and the Notarial Tradition

The artistic issues confronted by the Masters of the Scrovegni Statue and Effigy were ones

which were familiar to artists and theorists in Antiquity but had all but disappeared in post-

Roman times until they resurfaced in Padua in the early fourteenth century. It remains to

consider why they should have done so in that time and in that place. Tomb effigies had after

all been produced in Italy without recourse to facsimile portraiture for more than half a century

before the creation of Enrico's effigy, and they probably continued to be produced without

such recourse for at least a century after.[36] This makes it unlikely that it was a sudden change

in the function of tomb effigies which triggered the use of facsimile portraiture in this isolated

instance.   By contrast, Enrico's statue was an entirely novel form of monument; a free-

standing statue of a layman, placed in a niche in a semi-public position.[37] This suggests that it

was the patron's desire for exact physical likeness in portraiture that caused the statue to be

made in the form that it took, and it was that same personal preference that dictated that the

tomb effigy was to be a facsimile portrait. Enrico Scrovegni's reasons for commissioning the

statue, and for commissioning it in a completely new style, are surely key to understanding the

introduction of facsimile portraiture.

At this point I must stress that we should resist the temptation to assume that Enrico's

statue is an *ex voto* statue, or that it borrows its form from such works.[38] It is highly

improbable that wax votives of this date took the form of realistic individual portraits.[39]

Moreover Enrico's motives in building his chapel, and commemorating his act of foundation in

the statue and its inscription, were not of a kind which would place the statue within a votive framework. The statue's accompanying inscription makes no reference to any vow of gratitude by Enrico, but rather his expectation of the Virgin's gratitude to him. It states that he built her chapel 'so that he would be blessed with eternal reward'.   His endowment fleshes out this motivation, stating that 'he himself had had built [the chapel] from the laying of the first stone and erected [it] in honour and reverence of the said inviolate Virgin Mother of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, to the honour and good estate of the city and commune of Padua, and as an aid to salvation for his soul and that of his predecessors'.

In my view, although I do not doubt that Enrico Scrovegni had pious motives in building his chapel, the explanations for the statue's existence and form are to be found a more secular set of patronal concerns. I have explored his social and political motivations elsewhere, suggesting that he was concerned to present himself as a public benefactor and citizen of high standing.[40] But the fact that Enrico, out of personal preference, instituted a new art-form in a new style, requires further explanation. This is to be found in the intellectual environment in which his preferecnes were formed and exercised.

In the city and university of early *trecento* Padua there existed a precocious humanist movement, actively promoting a revival of classical letters, and in the person of Enrico Scrovegni there existed a wealthy and innovative patron who was consistent in his leanings towards classical art.[41] I suggest that it was from within the humanist circles of Padua that the idea of facsimile likeness most likely emerged, and that it was through the agency of Enrico Scrovegni that a link was forged between the humanists' world of ideas and literary form and the artists' world of paint, plaster and stone.

Enrico Scrovegni's classical tastes in art are evident in the architecture and decoration of his palaces and chapel. He was responsible (possibly in collaboration with his brother

Manfredo) for renovating his family's palace on the Via Maggiore with the addition of a giant-order portico, a classical design so advanced that it was until recently taken for a sixteenth-century work. He also built a new palace and chapel in the Roman arena of Padua, both of which conformed to classical principles of architectural design.[42] In addition to the sculptures considered here, in the decoration of his chapel he employed two artists known for their use of classicising elements in their work; Giotto frescoed the walls, and Giovanni Pisano carved the sculptures which now stand on the chapel's high altar. He also appears to have been an early collector of antiquities.[43]

Enrico Scrovegni's broader awareness of classical ideas about art and letters can be strongly inferred from his connections to some of the major intellectual figures of his day. As is well-known, Giotto's work for Enrico Scrovegni was viewed by the Florentine poet Francesco da Barberino shortly after its completion. The poet's close examination of the fresco of *Envy* and his informed awareness of its iconography are indicative of a private viewing at the patron's invitation; a similar visit by Dante is often posited on the basis of his allusions to both Giotto and a member of the Scrovegni family in his *Divine Comedy.*[44] Awareness of Giotto's achievements also extended to the faculty of the University of Padua where in 1310, the natural philosopher Pietro d'Abano published what was possibly the first medieval discussion of the art of portraiture, making direct reference to Giotto as a portraitist.[45] Pietro d'Abano had composed his *Expositio problematica Aristolelis* over several years, finalizing it in Padua in 1310, and it is likely that he too was prompted to make reference to Giotto by a visit to Enrico Scrovegni's chapel. Pietro's *Expositio* was his commentary on a 3rd-century BCE pseudo-Aristotelian text, the *Problematica physica*, which had posed the question 'Why do men make images of the face?', and had answered it with a twofold proposition 'Either because...[the face] shows what kind of people they are, or because the

images allow [men] to recognize them best'. Pietro glossed the original answer with some of his own observations. He seems to have appreciated that the author of the Aristoteleian text was describing a naturalistic style of portraiture which had prevailed in classical Antiquity but was not to be found in medieval portraiture before his own time, but he struggled to find a vocabulary to express the idea of exactly what such portraits might have showed. He settled on the somewhat nebulous term *dispositio'*, which relates primarily to physical likeness but incorporates aspects of character as well, and he claimed that in contemporary painting Giotto was capable of capturing this.[46]   As we have seen, Giotto's semi-idealised portrayal of Enrico Scrovegni did involve an idealised compromise between characterisation and recognisability. It may be significant that Pietro d'Abano did not cite the statue of Enrico as an equivalent exemplar of *dispositio* in contemporary sculpture. This may be because it had not yet been commissioned, or because Pietro did not think it met the classical criteria as well as Giotto's portrait. Viewed in the light of the classical ideas explored in Pietro's *Expositio*, the use of facial casting in Enrico's statue would appear to have overly-prioritised recognisability over characterisation. Enrico's effigy (commissioned much later than Pietro's work) somewhat redressed that balance.

The pseudo-Aristotelian *Problematica physica* was not the only classical text discussing portraiture which was available to the Paduan intelligensia, and Enrico's circle had access to another, very different text which had greater practical application. Pliny's *Historia naturalis* was widely available throughout the Middle Ages , and contained information on classical practices of portraiture more strongly concerned with the exact reproduction of physical appearance by mechanical means.[47] In a famous story of the invention of portraiture (later cited by the Paduan-educated art theorist Leon Battista Alberti) Pliny describes how a daughter of the potter Butades captured her lover's features by drawing

around his silhouette projected on a wall, and how this became the template of a relief portrait in clay.[48] This is an instance of facsimile portraiture.

Even more pertinent is Pliny's account of the invention of facial casting. This outlines the basic technique of life-casting and, significantly, frames the invention as a historical progression from the idealised portraits of a previous era.

> The first person who modelled an image in plaster of a human being from the living face itself, and established the method of pouring wax into this plaster mould and then making final corrections on the wax cast, was Lysistratus of Sicyon… he introduced the practice of reproducing likeness, where before they had applied themselves to making the most beautiful. [49]

Other passages make explicit Pliny's preference for exact physical likeness in portraiture. He not only viewed the invention of life-casting as a progressive event in the history of art, but also stressed the social, moral and historical value of life-casts which preserved the features of ancestors and honoured men of merit. Displayed as wax masks, or worked into statues of bronze or clay, portraits modelled from life-casts were seen as material evidence of the past. Describing the significance of facsimile portraits in a domestic setting Pliny draws explicit parallels between visual and documentary forms of historical evidence

> The painting of images [was] used to transmit through the ages extremely correct likenesses of persons... In the halls of our ancestors…wax models of faces were set out … pedigrees too were traced in a spread of lines running near the several painted portraits. The archive-rooms were kept filled with books of records and with written memorials of official careers [50]

Describing the significance of facsimile portraits in a public setting, Pliny offers a more

direct model for emulation by Enrico Scrovegni, whose statue originally stood in a niche

in the semi-public courtyard between his palace and the Arena Chapel

> It was not customary to make effigies of human beings unless they deserved lasting
>
> commemoration… [the earliest such statues, of Olympian winners] were likenesses
>
> formed by impressions from their bodies—what are called *iconicae*…. the custom
>
> proceeded to arise of having statues adorning the public places of all municipal
>
> towns and of perpetuating the memory of human beings and of inscribing lists of
>
> honours on the bases to be read for all time, so that such records should not be
>
> read on their tombs only. Soon after a public place was established even in private
>
> houses [and portrait statues would be erected there]…[51]

For Pliny, such developments had been progressive. He was neutral in his observation

that portraits prior to the invention of life-casting had been ideal representations but he

roundly condemned what he saw as the disregard of exact physical likeness in portraits

made in his own day, deeming them symptomatic of artistic decline and moral turpitude.

If, in early *trecento* Padua, Pietro d'Abano's philosophical commentary stoked a general

interest in classical principles of portraiture, Pliny's polemical history provided a sense of

direction, an indication of the means to follow it, and a sense of its proper purpose.   The

pursuit of exact physical likeness was a preferred alternative to the pre-existing practice

of creating ideal forms, and was expounded as the highest aim of portraitist and patron.

Life-casting was presented as the way to achieve that aim. The preservation of historical record was its proper purpose. [52]

Further stimulus towards the development of facsimile portraiture probably came from Paduan humanists concerned with poetry and history writing, some of whom can also be directly associated with Enrico Scrovegni. The previously-mentioned inscription of 1303 (which recorded the chapel's dedication and which originally accompanied Enrico's statue) is a product of the poetic humanism then flowering under the auspices of Lovato Lovati (d.1309) and Albertino Mussato (d.1329). [53]   As Joseph Spooner demonstrates in Appendix 1 of this article, the lines were a highly accomplished work of classical Latin composition, executed under the additional constraints of medieval epigraphic convention. Significantly in this context, Spooner's shows that the inscription also served as *titulus* to the statue of Enrico Scrovegni. By skilfully manipulating the poem's structure the poet placed the words 'Enrico Scrovegni, Knight' metrically (and almost certainly visually) in the exact centre of the composition.

Not only was the inscription a piece of humanist poetry of high order, it also served as a historical document. It followed Pliny's recommendation of recounting the patron's personal qualities and deeds in a context separate from his tomb, highlighting Enrico's recently-bestowed knighthood and recording his role as patron of the chapel as well as his other patronal activity in purchasing the site, building the adjacent palace and sponsoring civic festivities on the Feast of the Annunciation. It also placed the Arena Chapel and its patron within a much broader historical context, recording the date of the chapel's dedication (in a less-elegantly written but necessary final couplet which records the liturgical date) and pointing to the Roman origins of the place and its more recent medieval past. It is clear that the dedicatory inscription of the Arena Chapel must have

been composed by one of the foremost figures in the revival of classical letters then stirring in Padua, and that it is closely attuned with the humanistic impulses at work in the commissioning of Enrico's facsimile portrait.

Among the Paduan humanists, Albertino Mussato in particular appears to have been well-acquainted with Enrico Scrovegni. A notary, lawyer, diplomat, historian and poet, his political life intersected with Enrico's at various points and his work includes admiring observations on Enrico's architectural patronage.[54] Mussato is thus a likely candidate for authorship of the dedicatory inscription, but his work as a historian may be of equal relevance to our understanding of the portrait. Mussato's historical work drew strongly on classical literary models, and it is this aspect of his *oeuvre* which has garnered most attention from scholars of early humanism. However I suggest that his work was also shaped by a local tradition of evidence-based historical writing by fellow notaries. How this tradition emerged is unclear, but it may be relevant that the study of grammar and rhetoric constituted an unusually large component of notarial training in the *studium* of Padua.[55] Through their professional studies the Paduan notary-historians such as Rolandino da Padova, Zambono de Favasochis, Giovanni da Nono, and Mussato himself would have come in to contact with works of classical history. The histories they produced varied in form but had in common a concern with contemporary or near-contemporary history, conspicuously based on evidence and experience. Rolandino's explicitly factual account of the region's recent past, the *Cronica in factis et circa facta Marchie Trivixane*, was publically authenticated by his colleagues.[56] Giovanni da Nono consulted public and private records to research a genealogical history of the city's most significant families, the *De generatione*, and he drew attention to his archival research efforts throughout the work. [57] Albertino Mussato collected and published historical

data, and sought personal testimonies. At a time when the predominant modes of

history were the narrative romance and the chronicle, the Paduan notary-historians'

interest in historical veracity and authenticity is striking. It is especially interesting when

considering the reasons for the advent of facsimile portraiture, since it can be argued

that the facsimile portrait can itself be considered as a form of historical evidence.

First, we must establish in more detail the evidential nature of Mussato's

historical writing as it pertains to portraiture. His *Historia Augusta* (also known as *De

gestis septimis Henricis*), was written before 1315 as an account of the new Holy Roman

Emperor's recent descent into Italy and is a work which may be regarded as a turning

point in the development of modern historical writing.[58] Its importance was instantly

recognised by the Paduan intelligentsia, and Mussato was publically crowned with laurels

for his efforts.[59] Amongst the book's many novel passages of writing it includes two

'pen-portraits' of the Emperor Henry VII and his consort Margaret of Luxemburg

(provided here as Appendix 2). Mussato's descriptions of the pair have received some

attention by scholars of humanism who have placed them within the context of a revival

of classical letters. It has been suggested that the passages are modelled on the 1st-

century author Suetonius's descriptions in the *De vita caesarum* (*The Twelve Caesars*).[60]

While this may be true to an extent, it does not fully account for Mussato's descriptive

choices, and it blinds us to a very revealing difference. Mussato's descriptions of Henry

and his consort are not offered, as Suetonius's pen-portraits are, as summative

character-sketches within a historical biography.   Rather, they are presented as

reportage. As an envoy of the Paduan Commune (along with Enrico Scrovegni) Mussato

had attended upon Henry during his stay in Milan, so his account carried evidential

weight. The pen-portraits directly follow on from his account of Henry VII's coronation

procession in Milan in 1311, in which the newly-crowned imperial couple displayed

themselves in their regalia to the crowd.   Switching from a historical account of the

procession in the past tense, into a present-tense account of the couple's appearance

and character, Mussato effectively places himself and the reader as eye-witnesses.

      Mussato's description of the appearances of the Emperor and his consort in fact

draws on medieval literary forms as well as classical ones and mixes them with personal

observation. The mixture of forms arises because- like the Master of the Scrovegni

statue but in a different medium- he is using all technical means at his disposal to convey

the actuality of what he has witnessed. Mussato's observations of the couple's faces and

figures may owe their inclusion to Suetonian precedent, but they are also filtered

through the categorizations of physical traits found in medieval physiognomic texts (all of

classical derivation) which were known to Mussato and his contemporaries, and which

influenced his observational habits.[61] Thus Mussato notes that Henry VII had reddish

hair and complexion and a sharply-pointed nose, as well as a balanced frame and

proportionate limbs- all of which were matters to which both classical and medieval

physiognomic theory paid much attention. He also tells us that the Emperor had hair

styled in a French manner, with a small bald-patch at the back of his head; that he had a

wandering left eye; that he spoke slowly and succinctly with an obviously French quality,

but took care to make himself understood by his Italian audience . The inclusion of such

individual details as Henry's eye condition and incipient baldness can be understood as

part of the Suetonian tradition, but nevertheless Mussato's attention to Henry's

idiosyncrasies is convincingly his own. In his concern with the Emperor's foreign hairstyle

and his grasp of languages and diplomacy we hear Mussato's contemporary voice,

likewise in his noticing that the processional horses were caparisoned in the deep-dyed,

high-quality woollen cloth known as *scarlatto.* Mussato's descriptions are also systematically ordered according to the classically-inflected example of French thirteenth-century poetry, again suggesting that Mussato goes beyond Suetonian pastiche. [62] In short, the Suetonian elements in Mussato's description of Emperor Henry VII should not obscure the fact that he personally observed the Emperor with the 'period eye' of a medieval humanist and that he endeavoured to bear witness to Henry's appearance using every weapon in his literary arsenal to do so.

Mussato's description of Henry's consort Margaret of Luxemburg is less specific about her face, and is more a reflection of medieval ideas of female beauty than an attempt to accurately record her features. He describes a courtly ideal of a lady who was fair-skinned with dark hair, had a softly feminine bone-structure, pretty little features and a smiling face, all contributing to the impression that she looked more like a young girl than the woman of thirty-six years that she was. However he also provides a summary of her pious preferences and a detailed account of her foreign manner of dress- a German-style wimple which covered her neck and the lower part of her face, and a dress which was less structured than was usual in Italy at that date. [63] Such details again suggest that Mussato may have observed the Empress, even though their inclusion contradicts part of his own idealised account of her facial features (her 'smooth jawline' would have been largely concealed by the wimple). His statement that 'some have said that she is of a more than regal affability towards inferiors, which several have attributed to her gentleness' underlines the fact that he had gathered information about her from several sources to ensure the reliability of his account. Within a few years, Mussato updated and revised his account of the 1311 coronation, amending the description of Margaret to the past tense to take account of the fact that she had died later that year. [64]

He was making sure that his readers did not take his descriptions of Henry VII and Margaret simply as humanist literary set-pieces, but also as reliable first-hand evidence to be placed on record in the Paduan notarial-historical tradition.

If we seek analogies between the style of Mussato's literary portraiture and the visual portraits of his time, we find that they have much in common with the works of art previously discussed. For instance, in parallel with Mussato's pen-portrait of Henry VII, Giotto's portrait of Enrico Scrovegni offers an impression of his facial type and gives it individual definition by the inclusion of a unique characteristic (Enrico's webbed ear-lobe is in effect equivalent to Henry VII's defective eye). Giotto's portrait may itself relate to the Paduan humanists' interest in classical texts.[65] Mussato's less exact portrayal of Margaret of Luxemburg also finds a parallel in the Arena Chapel, this time with the image of an attendant in Giotto's fresco of the *Nativity*, which I have argued represents Enrico's wife Jacopina d'Este.[66] Mussato's Margaret and Giotto's Jacopina share the combination of generic, ideally-feminine features and distinctive, personally-identifying costumes. But the effigy and statue of Enrico Scrovegni provide even closer parallels to Mussato's pen-portraits in the sense that they too are a form of witness statement, intended and understood to be *prima facie* evidence of their subject's appearance.

As we have seen, Enrico Scrovegni's statue was originally placed in an external niche by the north door of the Chapel, where it was accompanied by an identifying inscription. This was composed, perhaps by Mussato, as a historical document. That the inscription was understood, and used, as historical and quasi-legal evidence is suggested by the circumstances under which it was written and by its later history. The inscription effectively stakes Enrico's claim to be the chapel's sole donor , stating that he 'caused this sacred temple to be dedicated to the Mother of God, so that he would be blessed

with eternal reward'. This was a contested claim at the time, and vague rumours persisted for decades suggesting that he had in some way reneged on a co-donor arrangement with a chivalric order, the *Militi di Santa Maria Gloriosa*.[67] Prior to c.1360 when the inscription was still *in situ* next to Enrico's statue, the chronicler Guglielmo Cortusi (a lawyer, though not of the humanist school of history) appears to have consulted it when seeking evidence of the facts of Enrico Scrovegni's life. In his *Chronica* he correctly gave the date of Enrico's death as 20th August 1336, almost certainly deriving this information from Enrico's lost tomb epitaph, but he incorrectly stated that Enrico had founded the Arena Chapel in 1330 rather than 1303 .[68] Almost certainly he misread the dedicatory inscription's penultimate line, interpreting an abbreviation of 'tribus' as 'triginta'. His mistake is unlikely to have occurred if he had consulted a deed of foundation; legal documents precisely noted the date by indiction (a system of fifteen-year cycles) combined with the day of the month as well as the year, whereas the inscription gave the only the year, and referred somewhat cryptically to the liturgical week.   Nevertheless, the legally-trained Cortusi accepted it as evidence. Even as late as 1520 a copy of the dedicatory inscription was included in a volume of documentary evidence complied in support of litigation over the chapel's patronal rights. [69]

Around 1360, the statue of Enrico Scrovegni was moved from its niche on the exterior of the Chapel to a new location in the sacristy.[70] The move may have been a pragmatic one related to building work taking place along the north side of the Chapel, but it also had wider consequences within the politically fraught environment of late-medieval Padua. Enrico Scrovegni had been exiled from Padua in 1320 and formally banished in 1328; his family were readmitted to the city after his death in 1336, only to be banished again in 1380, readmitted in 1404, and finally banished in 1443-5.   Their

claims to their palace and to patronage of the chapel would have been repeatedly put to the test, and consequently the original combination of Enrico Scrovegni's statue and the dedicatory inscription which served as its titulus would retrospectively have acquired additional significance as evidence in supporting the family's claims. Once the statue had been moved and so parted from the dedicatory inscription, re-inscription was essential to confirm its veracity. In consequence the words '*propria figura Domini Enrici Scrovegni militis de larena*' were added to the base of the statue (fig. 20). The Latin term '*propria figura*' can have multiple meanings, and a further range of associations arises if the inscription is inflected with *trecento* Italian usage, but the inscription is probably best translated as 'The own true form of Lord Enrico Scrovegni, knight, of the Arena'.[71]

The new inscription on the base of the re-located statue is not only unusual in its wording but also in its physical form. It is unevenly arranged to leave gaps at the beginning and end of the phrase, and before the 'P' of 'Propria' is a grape-sized depression. The depression is too deep (c.1cm) to indicate erasure of a mistakenly-carved letter, and prior to recent restoration it was visibly surrounded by traces of pigment or bonding agent which formed a square shape. This indicates that an object was once set into the depression. A corresponding space is left at the end of the inscription, after the final letter 'a' of 'Arena'. One possibility is that the depression at the commencement of the inscription held a lead seal, and that the corresponding space at the end was filled by a painted notarial mark of 'manu propria' (a calligraphic sign used in all legal documents). Such a combination of seal and signature would be unique on a statue, according it the legal validation normally applied to parchment documents- but then the statue of Enrico Scrovegni is a unique statue. A case could even be made that the statue itself was kind of seal; Enrico Scrovegni's 'own true face' being its positive

matrix, the mould taken from the face being its first negative impression, the life-mask

cast from the mould being a second positive impression, and the marble '*propria figura*'

copied from the cast being a further replication of the original matrix. The final product

thus served to verify the erstwhile presence of the patron, now *in absentia*, in a manner

analogous to that of a personal seal.[72]

 Nearly two hundred years later, the statue's validity as a correct record of

Enrico's appearance was accepted by the local historian Bernardino Scardeone, who

presumably relied on its new inscription to confidently state that it 'is in no way dissimilar

to him in countenance, dress and height'.[73] Whether or not there was once a seal

attached to the re-located statue's base, it is clear that both the statue's original

inscription and its replacement inscription preserved its evidential status. The statue was

always understood as a facsimile portrait, and as historical evidence in the humanism-

inflected notarial traditions of Paduan humanism.

****

This article has demonstrated that the statue and effigy of Enrico Scrovegni were created

using life-casts of his face as the models from which they were carved. It has shown how

two sculptors, together with a painter of sculptures, translated the raw data of the

plaster casts to polychromed marble, thereby producing works which aimed to

accurately preserve the features of their subject, recreated according to the artistic

choices of their makers.   The life casts were facsimiles, the finished works were facsimile

portraits.   It has further suggested that behind the development of this new art-form lay

a new consciousness, combining humanistic and legalistic awareness of the importance

of accurate historical record. Under specific conditions, within the intellectual and

artistic environment inhabited by Enrico Scrovegni, Albertino Mussato, Pietro d'Abano,

Giotto and the Masters of the Scrovegni Statue and Effigy, portraiture and physical likeness moved towards a point where they became synonymous.

These findings have implications for the historiography of the period and for our understanding of portraiture in general, although here I can only sketch out some possibilities as to what those implications might be. I began by noting that recent trends in medieval art history have explored the many ways in which medieval concepts of likeness, when applied to portraiture, worked against the production of exact physical likeness. We already understand that *mimesis* was not an aim of most medieval portraiture, and even that it was antithetical to some of those aims. The discovery of facsimile portraits produced in the early fourteenth century might seem to contradict this view, but ultimately it reinforces it. I have presented a historically and geographically-specific case in which concepts of portraiture and physical likeness coincide under particular circumstances, but it is not a case which can be generalized. In fact, despite their achievement of near-exact physiognomic resemblance, Enrico Scrovegni's statue and effigy remained isolated instances of sculpted facsimile portraiture for another one hundred years or more. Although the Scrovegni portraits did produce a discernible local 'ripple effect' it was not in the form of more sculpted portraits of the living or recently-deceased based on facial casts. Rather, it is mostly seen in the superficial attempts of local sculptors to endow their portraits with stronger physical verisimilitude and characterization, often regardless of actual physical likeness.[74] Sculptors and their patrons wished to imitate the visual language of verisimilitude seen in the Scrovegni portraits, but they were mostly uninterested in or positively rejected the idea of physical likeness. The partial and selective manner in which the Scrovegni portraits impacted on their immediate successors ultimately serves to confirm our

understanding that a conceptual 'disconnect' between physiognomic likeness and portraiture prevailed until late in the medieval period.

What then is the importance of these two portrait sculptures for our understanding of post-medieval portraiture? That they ante-date the verism of mid-*quattrocento* Florence by well over a century is certainly of interest, but I would caution against integrating them into a developmental model of stylistic change which simply brings forward the 'start date' of a history of Renaissance portraiture.   Apart from the limitations of such an approach, there is too long a gap in time, and there are too many other forms of portraiture which flourished, for a model of stylistic development to hold. It is preferable to think of the Scrovegni facsimile portraits as instances of an approach to portraiture which periodically recurs to meet particular historical needs. The Italian Renaissance was another such time, when the near-ascendancy of *mimesis* over other concepts of resemblance coincided with diverse social needs for the recreation of exact physical appearances. This coincidence of theory and practice was different from that which produced the Scrovegni portraits, and it produced quite different kinds of objects.[75]

Histories of portraiture need to take into account that with the advent of facial casting in Padua around 1300 it became possible to create near-exact physical likenesses for the first time since the distant and perhaps mythical golden age described by Pliny. Subjecting later portraits to the kind of very close observation I have attempted here could, I think, yield a more nuanced understanding of the artistic choices made in their production, the concepts of portraiture expressed in them, and the social purposes they served. We must be aware that from the fourteenth-century onwards a benchmark of physical accuracy in portraiture existed. By no means all subsequent portraits matched

that benchmark, or even measured themselves against it, but all can be considered in the

light how artists and patrons chose to respond to it.

---

[1] Richard Brilliant's special edition of *Art Journal* 46/3 (1987) *Portraits: The Limitations of Likeness*, contains a number of early examples of this trend in analysis, an especially pertinent example being Joanna Woods-Marsden '"Ritratto al Naturale": Questions of Realism and Idealism in Early Renaissance Portraiture', 209-16. Such approaches are now so widely applied that they may be considered mainstream, eg. Shearer West *Portraiture* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2004)

[2] Richard Krautheimer, 'Introduction to an "Iconography of Mediaeval Architecture" *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 5 (1942), 1-33, first raised this problem in relation to medieval buildings intended as copies of others. Stephen Perkinson provides a succinct overview of many medieval understandings of likeness in 'Likeness' in *Studies in Iconography* 33 (2012) *Special Issue: Medieval Art History Today- Critical Terms* ed. Nina Rowe, 15-28.

[3] Joan A. Holladay 'Portrait Elements in Tomb Sculpture: Identification and Iconography' in *Europäische Kunst um 1300* eds Gerhard Schmidt, Elisabeth Liskar (Vienna: Böhlau, 1986) 217-221 is an influential essay in this respect, while recent treatments of medieval portraits which draw attention to one or more of these components of medieval likeness are found in *Contemporary Approaches to the Medieval Face*, a special issue of *Gesta,* 46/2 (2007), notably Thomas Dale 'Romanesque Sculpted Portraits: Convention, Vision, and Real Presence'(ibid.101-119); Julian Gardner, 'Stone Saints: Commemoration and Likeness in Thirteenth-Century Italy, France, and Spain' (ibid.121-134); Stephen Perkinson 'Rethinking the Origins of Portraiture', 135-157. Numerous instances of wax *ex voto* figures (and candles) documetned as matching the weight and/or height of miraculously healed subjects are cited in Fabio Bisogni 'Ex voto e la scultura in cera nel tardo medioevo' in *Visions of Holiness: Art and Devotion in Renaissance Italy*, eds Andrew Ladis and Shelley E. Zuraw (Athens: University of Georgia, 2001), 67-89.

[4] The point is made by Stephen Perkinson specifically in relation to death masks in *The Likeness of the King: A Prehistory of Portraiture in Late-Medieval France* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 2009), 106, and more broadly in Stephen Perkinson 'Portraits and Counterfeits: Villard d'Honnecourt and thirteenth-century theories of representation' in David S. Areford, Nina Rowe, and Sandra Hindman (eds) *Excavating the Medieval Image: Manuscripts, Artists, Audiences : Essays in Honor of Sandra Hindman* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), which argues that 'counterfeiting' external appearance was regarded as an inferior method of creating resemblance. Perkinson suggests that such ideas can be traced in Christian thought to at least the early fifth century. In Augustine's *De doctrina christiana,* external appearances (*species*) are treated warily as being sensual and mutable, whereas more conceptual modes of representation (*signa*) refer to something beyond themselves, 'mak[ing] some other thing come to mind beside the impression that it presents to the senses'. Hence a mimetic portrayal, by referring only to *species,* is considered inferior to a more conceptual or idealised portrayal that refers to the ineffable qualities that derive from man's likeness to the Divinity.

[5] For physiognomic writings known in Italy around 1300, and the proposal that Giotto's depictions of fictional or imagined characters (though not his portraits of known individuals) were moralized in accordance with such ideas, see Hubert Steinke, 'Giotto und die Physiognomik' *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* , 59/4 (1996) , 523-547 esp.526-531.

[6] Intriguingly, there exists an early *fictional* instance of a medieval portrait sculpture which is an exact physical likeness. That is a life-size wooden figure of Sir Gawain in the bedroom of a lady, described in *Le Roman de Hunbaut* (c.1250-75), to which Stephen Perkinson has drawn attention in *The Likeness of the King...*74-5

[7] For this 'classic' understanding of renaissance busts see Charles Avery, *Florentine Renaissance Sculpture* (London: John Murray, 1970); Jane Schuyler, *Florentine Busts: Sculpted Portraiture in the Fifteenth Century* (New York and London: Garland, 1976); Charles Seymour Jr., *Sculpture in Italy 1400-1500* (Harmondsworth: Pelican, 1966); John Pope-Hennessy, *Italian Renaissance Sculpture* 3rd ed. (London: Phaidon, 1986).

[8] Instances of the latter would include two-dimensional images produced using the 'veil' as described by

Alberti (Leon Battista Alberti, *On Painting*,trans. John R. Spencer (New Haven and London: Yale University, rev.ed. 1966) 68-69, where the illustrative example chosen is a head); silhouette portraits; photographic portraits; and digitally-captured, three-dimensionally printed portraits.

[9] Wolfgang Wolters, *La scultura veneziana gotica 1300-1460* 2 vols, (Venice: Alfieri, 1976) I, 153-4, 161-2; Kurt Bauch, *Das mittelalterlicher Grabbild* (Berlin and New York: Gruyter, 1976), 175-6; Volker Herzner, 'Giotto's Grabmal für Enrico Scrovegni' *Münchner jahrbuch der bildenen Kunst* 3/33, (1982), 39-66; Catherine King, 'Effigies: Human and Divine' in D. Norman (ed.) *Siena, Florence and Padua: Art, Society and Religion 1280-1400* 2 vols (New Haven and London: Yale University, 1995), Vol.II, 105-128; Laura Jacobus, 'A Knight in the Arena: the 'true image' of Enrico Scrovegni in the sacristy of the Arena Chapel in Padua' in Mary Rogers (ed.) *Fashioning Identities in Renaissance Art* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 17-31; Guido Tigler, 'La scultura del Trecento a Padova' in Vittorio Sgarbi, (ed.), *Giotto e il suo Tempo* (Milan: Motta, 2000), pp.248-261; Guido Tigler, 'Maestro delle tombe Scrovegni e Salomone' in Vittorio Sgarbi, (ed.), *Giotto e il suo Tempo* (Milan: Motta, 2000) 382-385; Francesca Flores d'Arcais, *Giotto*, (Milan: Motta, 2001) 109; Moskowitz, Anita Fiderer *Italian Gothic Sculpture c.1250-1400* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University, 2001) Roberto Paulo Novello, in Davide Banzato et al (eds) *La Cappella degli Scrovegni a Padova/The Scrovegni Chapel in Padua,* 2 vols (Modena, Panini, 2005) , 268-274; Volker Herzner, 'Zur Statue des Enrico Scrovegni' *Kunstchronik: Herausgegeben vom Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte* 63 (2010), 172-175; Laura Jacobus, 'The Tomb of Enrico Scrovegni in the Arena Chapel, Padua' *The Burlington Magazine*, 154 (June 2012), 403-409

[10] Jacobus, 'A Knight...'. Alternative positions have been proposed for the statue, most recently by Herzner, 'Zur Statue...'. My thanks to Prof. Herzner for sending me a copy of this article. Whilst I have revised my views on the statue's date and technique since publication of my article my arguments about its position are unchanged and have been reinforced by my further investigations of the chapel's building history.

[11] The inscription is published in Laura Jacobus, *Giotto and the Arena Chapel: Art, Architecture and Experience* (New York and Turnhout: Harvey Miller, 2008, 383-385, and is reproduced in revised translation and with further commentary in Appendix 1.

[12] The interpretation of this inscription is discussed below.

[13] Laura Jacobus, 'The Tomb...'

[14] Neither is dated, but taking account of the withdrawal of the *cavalieri gaudenti* as co-sponsors of the Chapel, (as detailed in Jacobus, *Giotto...*24-30)I suggest that the statue was commissioned c.1303-5 and the fresco executed c.1304-5, both being completed in time for the consecration ceremony in March 1305.

[15] 'Gli occhi sono lo specchio dell'anima' is a contemporary adage which probably has roots in the Roman 'oculi animi index' Gregory Y. Titelman *Random House Dictionary of Popular Proverbs and Sayings* (Random House, New York, 1996)

16 This tendency accords with the findings of Peter Seiler, who analyses several of Giotto's portraits to point to a number of ways in which his subjects' features conform to types 'Giotto als Erfinder des Porträts' in M.Büchsel and P.Schmidt (eds), Das Porträt vor der Erfindung des Porträts (Mainz am Rhein : von Zabern, 2003), 153-172

[17] My thanks to Giuliano Ghiraldini, who photographed the statue in pure profile and frontal views for me. A pure profile view of the effigy was unobtainable, and the profile shown here is a few degrees out-of-true. The degree of deviation from true profile is most readily gauged in the area of the forehead.

[18] My thanks to Liz Drew and Nick Lambert who helped me superimpose views of the statue and effigy.

[19] In 'A Knight…' I argued that the sculptor of the statue relied primarily on a profile drawing of Enrico Scrovegni which may have been supplied by Giotto. My view was formed without the benefit of the photographic evidence employed here, and I take this opportunity to correct it.

[20] In theory, the same mould could have been used for each cast, but it is more likely that new moulds were taken for each commission. The first cast was made before Enrico fled for his life from Padua to Venice in 1320, where he remained an exile until his death in 1336. Even if the first cast had survived, and the sculptor of the effigy had been able to consult it (or had been able to make a new mould and cast from the statue), it would have offered little guidance as to how to produce the convincingly aged face of the effigy. It cannot be supposed that any sculptor at this date possessed a modern forensic artist's awareness of anatomy and the aging process.

[21] Cennini may have learned the technique in Padua, which would suggest that it remained in use there. His wife was Paduan, his brother a musician in the employ of the Carrara court, and his treatise draws on Paduan vocabulary. The technique is described in Cennino d'Andrea Cennini, *The Craftsman's Handbook: the Italian 'Il libro dell'arte'* trans. Daniel V. Thompson, Jr. (New York: Dover, 1954) 124-7. However the illustration on page 124 is incorrect in showing the protective sleeve drawn taut across the subject's skin from ears to the chin;

Cennini describes it being sewn in a continuous line onto the subject's clothing in the manner illustrated here. He is unsepcific as to the purpose of life-casting beyond stating that 'in this way you will have a simulacrum of the face, or really the features, or really the imprint of every great lord'. He adds that this plaster cast could subsequently be reproduced by a foundry-master in precious materials, and hence become a finished precious object which a patron might want, but no such object is known from this period. Cennini seems to be writing of a cheap object that the artist could make for his own use; not a portrait, but a record that would be of use to him in making a painted portrait. In 1504 a plaster 'head of Girolamo Martelli' was listed in the workshop of the painter Filippino Lippi, whose father had been painter working for the Martelli family (Doris Carl, 'Das Inventar der Werkstatt von Filippino Lippi aus dem Jahr 1504', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 31, (1987, 373-91). My thanks to Mick O'Malley for this reference.

[22] Facial casting as a developed technology could involve living or dead subjects, but at its apparent advent- as discussed in this article- it appears to have been confined to the living. It is not possible for me to consider the literature and evidence for the use of death masks in the medieval period in any depth here, and the following remarks must suffice. The idea that death-masks were used in the production of medieval tomb effigies was advanced by Julius von Schlosser, 'Geschichte der Porträbildernerei in Wachs. Ein Versuch', *Järbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammmlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, 29, no. 3, 1911, 171-258 (republished in a translation by James Michael Longbridge as 'The History of Portraiture in Wax' in *Ephemeral Bodies: Wax Sculpture and the Human Figure* ed. Roberta Panzanelli (Los Angeles: Getty, 2008). The view was popularised by Joseph Pohl, *Die Verwendung des Naturabgusses in der italienischen Porträtplastik der Renaissance* (Würzburg : Konrad Triltsch, 1938). Although the suggestion that some medieval tomb effigies are based on death masks remains highly influential, none of the pre-1400 effigies proposed by Pohl or von Schlosser can be shown to be based on a death mask and almost all demonstrably conform to established medieval schema for representing the face. John White, *Art and Architecture in Italy, 1250-1400* (Harmondsworth and New York: Penguin, 1966, 2nd ed. 1987) 98-9, points to one such schema (for the effigy of Clement IV), and my own ongoing investigations point to others. It must be stressed that the earliest surviving, verifiable death-mask is that of Brunelleschi (d. 1446), though claims may be made for the mask of S. Bernardino of Siena (d.1444) (Machtelt Israëls, 'Absence and Resemblance: Early Images of Bernardino da Siena and the Issue of Portraiture (With a New Proposal for Sassetta)' *I Tatti Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 11 (2007), 77-114 esp.113, and Roberto Cobianchi, 'Fashioning the Imagery of a Franciscan Observant Preacher: Early Renaissance Portraiture of Bernardino da Siena In Northern Italy' *I Tatti Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 12 (2009), pp. 55-83). An ambiguous entry in accounts relating to the funeral of Charles VI of France in 1422 also suggests that a death mask may have been used for his funeral effigy (Perkinson, *The Likeness...*141). Julian Gardner points to the practical difficulties involved in making a death mask during the Middle Ages (*The Tomb and The Tiara: Curial Tomb Sculpture in Rome and Avignon in the Late Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992) 172-75), concluding that the practice was 'improbable'. Respecting the present discussion, such practical considerations would certainly apply to Enrico Scrovegni's death during the heat of an Italian August. The documentation surrounding the commission of his tomb also points to his effigy having been commissioned and made prior to his death (Jacobus, 'The Tomb...').

[23] David Jackson, 'Verism and the Ancestral Portrait', *Greece and Rome* 2nd series 34/1 (1987), 32-47, offers a subtle discussion of the role of death masks in the development of veristic Roman portraiture.

[24] Georgia Sommers Wright 'The Reinvention of the Portrait Likeness in the Fourteenth Century' *Gesta* 39/2 (2000), 117-134 draws attention to the practical difficulties (as well as the imaginative limitations) faced by artists who lacked any tradition of copying from nature. She suggests that the demand for physical likenesses must have come from patrons and would have been difficult for artists to satisfy.

25 It is possible that life-casting technology was used to produce wax *ex-votos* before 1305 but I think this most unlikely. See n.39

[26] For the varied and widespread use of polychromy in medieval sculpture see Harald Theiss 'A Brief Overview of the Decorative Techniques Used in Sculptural Polychromy in the Middle Ages' in Vinzenz Brinkmann, Oliver Primavesi, Max Hollein, eds. *Circumlitio: The Polychromy of Antique and Medieval Sculpture*. *Proceedings of the Johann David Passavant Colloquium*, *10-12 December 2008* (Frankfurt am Main: Liebighaus Skulpturensammlung, 2010), 136-153 and Stefan Roller, 'The Polychromy of Mediaeval Sculpture: a Brief Overview', *ibid.* 338-35. For a well-documented instance of a painter who routinely polychromed the work of a number of sculptors see the notebooks of the fifteenth-century Florentine painter Neri di Bicci *Le Ricordanze (1 marzo 1453 - 24 aprile 1475)* ed. Bruno Santi (Pisa: Marlin, 1976)

[27] In discussing literary portraiture Sarah-Grace Heller states that 'One could hardly have been a romance hero or heroine without golden blond hair'('Light as Glamour: The Luminescent Ideal of Beauty in the Roman de la

Rose' *Speculum* 76/4(2001), 934-959, 941. Peter Seiler, 'Giotto als Erfinder...', notes that Giotto's portrait of Enrico recalls idealised descriptions of young noblemen.

[28] A report on the 2000/1 restoration and present state of the statue is given by Antonio Forcellino 'L'intervento sulla statua di Enrico Scrovegni in preghiera'/'Restoration of the Statue of Enrico Scrovegni at Prayer' in Giuseppe Basile (ed.) *Il Restauro Della Cappella Degli Scrovegni: Indagini, Progetti, Risultati / Restoration of The Scrovegni Chapel: surveys, project, results* (Milan: Skira, 2003), 221-2, 496-7. The report is a factual record of the restoration and refrains from discussing techniques. My thanks to Sig. Forcellino for his courteous and helpful response to my queries.

[29] Roller 'Polychromy...' notes this development in styles of polychromy with respect to Northern European examples.

[30] Forcellino, 'L'intervento...' 496

[31] Excellent details of faces are found in Giuseppe Basile, *Giotto, la Cappella degli Scrovegni* (Milan: Electa, 1992. The use of a dark outline around the eye is fairly ubiquitous in the workshop, as is blending the pink of the cheeks outwards and downwards from the sides of the nose, and the use of several colours to suggest strands of hair. In the frescoes this is generally done by applying light colour over dark, to create modelling through highlights, but this is unnecessary in the statue and it appears that dark may have been applied over light. The 'house-style' of the workshop ensured that throughout the cycle eyebrows were routinely painted to appear darker towards the centre, fading towards the outer edge of the face. However the techniques for achieving this effect varied greatly from the impressionistic (a few horizontal strokes with a medium brush in one or two dark shades, with –or more usually without- a few repeated downward strokes to indicate texture) to the detailing of individual hairs.

[32] Ernst Gombrich notes our propensity to read expression and character into faces in 'The Mask and the Face: the perception of physiognomic likeness in life and in art' in E.H. Gombrich, Julian Hochberg, Max Black, *Art, Perception and Reality* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University, 1972) 1-46. repr. in E.H. Gombrich *The Image and the Eye*, (New York and London: Phaidon, 1982) 105-136. With respect to this statue, my own informal survey asking 'what is his expression?' commonly produced responses such as 'nothing marked' or 'blank' when respondents were shown the frontal and profile views without any context. The profile view also elicited 'gormless' (possibly a culturally-conditioned physiognomic reading of his open mouth and receding chin), and the frontal view 'anxious', 'shocked'(psychological interpretations probably based on the frown lines or wide-open eyes). Once respondents were shown a view including Enrico's praying hands, narrative inflected-responses ensued ('awe-struck', 'pious', 'unstable').

[33] A similar, near contemporary manifestation of informed interest in facial expression is seen in the work of Simone Martini in the frescoes of the St. Martin Chapel in the Lower Church at Assisi, notably the simultaneously raised eyebrows and puckered, drawn-down mouth of the sceptic in the *St. Martin Raises a Child from the Dead*. This degree of observation is seldom seen in other renderings of facial expression during the period, which tend towards schematization. It anticipates the anatomically-informed adaptations of facial casts (usually death masks) of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, for which see Alison Luchs, 'Lorenzo from Life? Renaissance Portrait Busts of Lorenzo de' Medici' *The Sculpture Journal* 4 (2000), 6-23 and Jeanette Kohl, 'Gesichter Machen: Büste und Maske im Florentiner Quattrocento' *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 34 (2007), 77-99

[34] Riccardo Mancinelli 'L'intervento sul monumento funebre di Enrico Scrovegni'/'Restoration on Enrico Scrovegni funeral monument' in Giuseppe Basile (ed.) *Il Restauro …*(Milano: Skira, 2003), 223-4/498-9. The report is brief and recording of polychromy is incomplete. Surviving traces of gilding and colour on the buttons and the top edge of Enrico's collar, and what appears to be a dark colour picking out the edge of his left eyelid are not mentioned. Examination under ultra-violet light, might have revealed areas of colour invisible to the eye (as Forcellino, 'L'intervento...' reports was the case with the garments and feet of the statue).

[35] In Jacobus, 'The Tomb...' I discuss some of the attributional debates which haunt the scholarship of this period, using an analysis of style to detach the Master of the Scrovegni Effigy's artistic identity from that of the Master of the Castellone Monument in Treviso, with whom he is frequently conflated. In a period when artists were just beginning to differentiate themselves by developing personal style, it seems plausible that the Master of the Scrovegni Effigy may have wished to establish his artistic identity in this way, even while he was in effect working to preserve the identity of another. Discussions of the use of facial casting tend to treat the art-works that result from them as style-less, analogue equivalents of modern biometric data. It would appear that many cast-derived portraits do indeed attempt to suppress indications of their maker's presence, however some clearly do not. See for example Francesco Laurana's bust of Battista Sforza, discussed in Kohl 'Gesichter Machen...'. The artist's style is acknowledged as a factor in the bust's appearance, but treated

almost as 'background noise'. I can do little more than draw attention to this issue here, as I am discussing what appear to be unique survivals of earlier artists' *oeurves*. However questioning the extent to which an artist's style is heightened, or passively persists, or is largely eradicated in the finished facsimile portrait (and conversely when the style becomes so strong that the product is no longer a facsimile portrait), may be a fruitful line of enquiry with respect to renaissance and early modern examples. The issue of style is particularly pertinent with respect to the arguments of Georges Didi-Huberman considered in n.38.

[36] Ingo Herklotz, '*Sepulcra' e 'Monumento' del Medioevo* (Rome: Nantes, 1985); Gardner, *The Tomb and The Tiara*

[37] I argue that it was placed at the quotidian entrance to his church, in the semi-public courtyard of his palace in Jacobus, 'A Knight...'

[38] The temptation to understand the statue in such terms arises because of a strong historiographic tradition regarding the connections between *ex votos* and portraiture, which stretches from Aby Warburg, via Julius von Schlosser to Georges Didi-Huberman and beyond. Drawing upon the work of these earlier scholars Georges Didi-Hubermann has written two influential articles ('Ressemblance Mythifiée er ressemblance oubliée chez Vasari: la légende du portrait "sur le vif" Mélanges *Melanges de l'école Francaise de Rome. Italie e Mediterranee,* 106/2, (1994), 383-432; 'The Portrait, the Individual and the Singular: Remarks on the Legacy of Aby Warburg' in *The Image of the Individual : portraits in the Renaissance*, eds Nicholas Mann and Luke Syson (London : British Museum, 1998), 165-185) proposing that the erstwhile existence of highly-realistic wax votive statues in Santissima Annunziata in Florence challenges mainstream (ie. Vasarian) art-historical models. The votives do this partly through their non-humanistic associations with 'fetishistic magic' (Warburg's term, and probably a correct assertion); partly through the low social standing of their artisan makers (again, a valid challenge at least to Vasarian notions of the artist); partly because they were mechanically produced using facial casts in wax. This last assertion is more problematic, and most relevant to explore in relation to the concerns of this article. Although Didi-Huberman rightly notes the influence of Vasari's inherent disdain for mechanical processes (effectively categorized as 'non-art' because lacking the artist's creative input) he wrongly assumes (p.412 ff.'Ressemblance...') that the Santissima Annunziata wax *ex votos* directly incorporated life-masks. This leads him to suggest (as he also does in 'The Molding Image: the genealogy and truth of resemblance in Pliny's *Natural History,* Book 35-1-7'....' in Lynda Nead and Costas *Douzinas Law and the Image: The Authority of Art and the Aesthetics of Law* (Chicago: Chicago University, 1999) that Vasari was unable to accommodate these highly realistic votives into the model of 'imitation of nature' which underpins his narrative of the history of art. Vasari constructed this history as a development of freehand mimetic design driven by the artist's creativity and expressed as his style. In fact Vasari does not maintain a 'strategic silence' on the SS Annunziata votives as claimed by Didi-Huberman ('Ressemblance...' p.410), but in a passage in his *Life of Verrocchio* he groups plaster casts, death masks, plaster portraits and wax-modelled *ex votos* (Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' piú eccellenti architetti, pittori, et scultori italiani, da cimabue insino a' tempi nostri* English translation of 1558 ed. trans. C.G. de Vere http://members.efn.org/~acd/vite/VasariVerr2.html, accessed 14/3/2016). Whilst Vasari does betray ambivalence at the cheap ubiquity of the plaster portraits (which did directly incorporate death masks, re-worked to make the subject appear alive), all these objects are associated in his thinking as instances of exceptionally faithful *mimesis,* and he notes that plaster casts and masks were of use to freehand artists (including himself) helping them in the creation of 'more perfect images'. It is in this respect that Vasari highly praises the life-size wax *ex votos* modelled by Orsino Benintendi, who is treated as a former craftsman of 'no little judgement' in wax modelling, who blossomed into an artist once mentored by Verrocchio and introduced to the exemplary *mimesis* of plaster casts. It is important to note that Orsino Benintendi did not incorporate wax casts of the face into his votive statues; he may well have referred to plaster life-casts of his subjects but his life-like *ex votos* (and those produced later by his family workshop) were modelled in wax built up over a wooden or wire armature, as Vasari describes (in Giorgio Vasari, *Vasari on Technique,* trans. Louisa S. Maclehose, ed. G. Baldwin Brown (New York: Dover, 1960) Ch.II (IX)/43, p.149). It is arguable that Benintendi had a personal style which Vasari recognized in his comment that he had 'no little judgement'. Certainly, Vasari not only admired those later-fifteenth-century *ex votos* that most closely followed the mimetic example of facial casts, he even approved of the practice of adding real hair to the finished waxworks. He exhibits no doubt that such votives were products of freehand design and hence admissible within his idea of resemblance produced through art. Didi-Huberman's account of Vasari's assessment of the *ex votos* makes the mistake of confusing facsimiles and facsimile portraits, but it is quite clear that Vasari was aware of this distinction and places the later fifteenth-century *ex votos* of Santissima Annunziata on the side of facsimile portraiture. The votives were, he stated, modelled 'so beautifully that nothing better or more true to nature could be seen'. This aesthetic assessment is very similar to Bernardino

Scardeone's exactly contemporary assessment of the statue of Enrico Scrovegni as 'in no way dissimilar to him in countenance, dress and height, indeed most beautiful to behold' (*De Antiquitate,* 333).

39 Votive gifts of wax (occasionally but not usually statues) were offered at an altar or shrine either in thanks for a cure or as propitiatory gifts in expectation of averting peril. Written sources and fragmentary survivals suggest that fourteenth-century *ex votos* were usually standard-sized candles or relatively small images representing miraculously-healed body parts or doll-like images of infants, some of which were probably cast in series for general sale. Sources record that the weight and dimensions of bespoke wax votives often corresponded with their subjects' measurements, but never note likeness of appearance (Bisogni, '*Ex voto*...'). It is most improbable that wax votives in the early fourteenth century were facsimile portraits or that they made any use of life-casting. Even the famously life-like wax 'portrait' effigies offered in Santissima Annunziata in Florence are unlikely to have included life-casts much before the 1470s if at all. According to Vasari, (see n.39) before Verrocchio the wax votive images in SS Annunziata were 'small...very clumsy [things]'.

[40] Jacobus, 'A Knight...'

[41] Paul Oskar Kristeller, 'Umanesimo e Scolastica a Padova fino al Petrarca' *Medioevo,* 11, (1985) 1-18 repr. in *Studies in Renaissance Thought* 4 Vols, (Rome: 1996) Vol 4, 11-26; Ronald G. Witt, *In the Footsteps of the Ancients: The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni* (Boston: Brill 2003) esp. 81-173

[42] Fuller consideration of Enrico Scrovegni's palaces is given in Jacobus *Giotto…* 13-17

[43] In 1390 his palace was 'filled with the finest ancient and modern things'('piena d'antichi e moderni e nobilissimi mobili' Galeazzo and Bartolommeo Gatari, *Cronaca Carrarese confrontata con la redazione di Andrea Gatari*, (AA 1318-1407) eds Antonio Medin and Guido Tolomei, Vol.I (*Cronaca Carrarese di Galeazzo, Bartolomeo e Andrea Gatari*) R.I.S. 17, Part I (Città di Castello: Lapi, 1912), 416. By that time Enrico was dead but Giotto's fresco of *Faith* in the Arena Chapel includes a broken antique statuette of a male nude, in foreshortened view. This suggests that it records an actual piece, possibly in Enrico's collection.

[44] Francesco da Barberino describes the fresco in *I Documenti d'Amore di Francesco da Barberino secondo i manoscritti originali* ed. Francesco Egidi, 4 vols (Rome: Società filologica Romana, 1902-1912) Vol 2, 165. For the date of Francesco's visit and Dante's references to the Scrovegni see Peter Murray 'Notes on Some Early Giotto Sources' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 16 (1953), 58-80. Dante's visit is less certain, but quite possible since he was in the region at the time of the chapel's construction and decoration. The member of the Scrovegni family mentioned in his epic poem (Dante Alighieri, *La divina commedia* 'Inferno', Canto 17,) is often assumed to be Enrico's father Rainaldo, although in a forthcoming book I question this.

[45] J. Thomann, 'Pietro d'Abano on Giotto' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 54 (1991), 238-244

[46] Thomann, 'Pietro d'Abano…'discusses the meaning of *dispositio* in an appendix (243-4) and favours the idea that Pietro was referring primarily to the physical arrangement of features within the face. He also notes Pietro's use of the term in his physiognomic writing, applied to psychological and moral readings of the face.

[47] The Latin text is available at http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/L/Roman/Texts/Pliny_the_Elder (accessed 28/2/2016). The English translation utilized here (with some alterations, noted below) is Pliny's *Natural History* trans. H. Rackham (vols. 1-5, 9), W.H.S. Jones (vols. 6-8), D.E. Eichholz (vol. 10) (Harvard Mass. and London: Harvard University and Heinemann, 1949-54). Books 34 and 35, which contain the relevant sections on the visual arts, are contained in Vol.9, (1952) translated by H.Rackham.

[48] Pliny *Natural History* 35:43 (Rackham Vol. 9, 370-3)

[49] 'Hominis autem imaginem gypso e facie ipsa primus omnium expressit ceraque in eam formam gypsi infusa emendare instituit Lysistratus Sicyonius.... hic et similitudines reddere instituit; ante eum quam pulcherrimas facere studebant. Pliny *Natural History* 35:44 (Rackham Vol. 9, 372-5) Where Rackham translates 'imaginem ' as 'likeness' I have preferred 'image' as the more neutral term. Where he translates 'similitudines reddere', as '*giving* likenesses' I have preferred '*reproducing* likenesses' as the verb in this context connotes reflection of an original. And where he translates 'pulcherrimas facere ' as 'to make as handsome a face as possible' I have preferred 'making the most beautiful' as it conveys an ideal form as opposed to a cosmetically-improved real one.

[50] 'Imaginum quidem pictura, qua maxime similes in aevum propagabantur figurae...inter haec pinacothecas veteribus... expressi cera vultus singulis disponebantur armariis....stemmata vero lineis discurrebant ad imagines pictas. Tabulina codicibus implebantur et monimentis rerum in magistratu gestarum'. Pliny *Natural History* 35:2 (Rackham Vol.9, 264-5). I have preferred 'images' for 'imaginum', rather than Rackham's 'portraits', as a more neutral, less anachronistic term.

[51] 'effigies hominum non solebant exprimi nisi aliqua inlustri causa perpetuitatem merentium...ex membris ipsorum similitudine expressa, quas iconicas vocant... et in omnium municipiorum foris statuae ornamentum esse coepere propagarique memoria hominum et honores legendi aevo basibus inscribi, ne in sepulcris tantum legerentur. mox forum et in domibus privatis factum atque in atriis...' Pliny *Natural History* 34: 9 (Rackham

Vol.9, 138-41). 'ex membris ipsorum similitudine expressa' is translated by Rackham as 'modelled as exact personal likenesses' but I have preferred 'were formed by impressions from their bodies' as this seems closer to the process Pliny implies.

[52] Georges Didi-Huberman (in'The Molding Image'...) discusses the moral basis of Pliny's ideas on portraiture, and his preference for 'extreme likenesses' created by imprinting, in a comparative discussion of Pliny's and Vasari's notions of art and artistic development. However, he ignores Pliny's assertion that the invention of facsimile portraiture was preceded by an era in which ideal images were created. This assertion would have had resonance in Padua c.1300, since existing medieval forms of portraiture were also underpinned by a notion of ideal form (that of the Divinity in whose likeness humans were formed).

[53] Benjamin G. Kohl 'Lovati, Lovato', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* Volume 66 (2006) http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/lovato-lovati_(Dizionario-Biografico)/ (accessed 3/7/2015); Marino Zabbia 'Mussato, Albertino' *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 77 (2012), http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/albertino-mussato_(Dizionario-Biografico)/ accessed 14/9/2014. The inscription appears to have been overlooked in the literature on Paduan humanism.

[54] A Venetian spy noted that they both attended a secret meeting in 1311 to discuss responses to Biamonte Tiepolo's proposed coup in Venice (Giovanni Battista Picotti, *I Caminesi, e la loro signoria in Treviso dal 1283 al 1312 : appunti storici* (Livorno : Giusti 1905), Doc XLIX. They were also both part of the deputation to Henry's coronation in Milan in 1311 in the same year (Guglielmo Cortusi *Chronica de Novitatibus Padue et Lombardie* ed. Beniamino Pagnin, (L.A. Muratori), *R.I.S.*, ns. 12/5, (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1941-45) Bk 1, Ch.12, pp.12-13). Mussato's architectural comments are made in *De gestis italicorum post Henricum VII* ed. Luigi Padrin (Venice, 1903), 89

[55] Nancy G. Siraisi, *Arts and Sciences at Padua: the* Studium *of Padua before 1350* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1973)

[56] Siraisi, *Arts and Sciences*, 56

[57] Giovanni da Nono, *De Generatione aliquorum civium urbis Padue* Padua Seminario, MS n.11, and Padua, Biblioteca Civica BP1239 XXIX

[58] The first printed edition, Albertino Mussato, *Historia Augusta Henrici VII Caesaris & alia, quae extant opera* (Venice, Pignori: 1636) is available at http://warburg.sas.ac.uk/pdf/hnh95b2478258.pdf (beginning p.320). Witt's discussion of the book is primarily concerned with its literary form, but the points he makes about its concern to 'reveal the structure of a historical event, that is, to texture its development chronologically and illuminate the interplay of its causes' (*In the Footsteps...*144) point to the work's place in historiography.

[59] He was crowned as a poet and historian for the *Historia Augusta* and his poetic drama *Ecerinis*. Witt (*In the Footsteps...* 130), suggests that the coronation took place in 1315, Siraisi (*Arts and Sciences...* 47) favours 1314. Henry VII's Italian expedition lasted 1310-13.

[60] Manilio Dazzi was the first to call attention to the descriptions in *Il Mussato preumanista (1261-1329) l'ambiente e l'opera* (Vicenza: Pozza, 1964) (esp. 127). Guido Billanovich's analysis of the passage in 'Abozzi e postille del Mussato nel Vaticano Lat. 1769' *Italia medievale e umanistica* 28 (1985) 18-19 finds instances of word-use which suggest to him that Mussato has borrowed his vocabulary from Suetonius. Witt (*In the Footsteps...*143) contextualises the pen-portraits as part of Mussato's confident employment of classical literary forms.

[61] Perkinson, *The Likeness of the King,* 68-71, outlines the diffusion of such texts via southern Italy in the thirteenth century.

[62] His descriptions begin at the top of the head, listing the features of the face, body and limbs, before moving on to a description of dress. Precisely this ordering of descriptive parts is found in Geoffroi de Vinsauf's *Poetria nova* (lines 554-621) in Edmond Faral (ed.) *Les Arts poétique du XIIe et XIIIe siècles* (Paris: Champion, 1924) (214-216). Douglas Kelly, "Theory of Composition in Medieval Narrative Poetry and Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria Nova*." *Mediaeval Studies* 31 (1969): 117-48 shows that de Vinsauf was indebted to Horace for aspects of his poetic theory, and the widespread diffusion of his work is reflected in Brunetto Latini's *Li livres dou trésor* (translated into Italian during his lifetime as *Il tesoro,* and probably known to Mussato).

[63] Confirmation of her distinctive style of dress is found in contemporary images of Margaret. The *Codex Balduini Trevirensis/Codex Balduineum* (Landeshauptarchiv Koblenz Best. 1 C Nr. 1 fols 5b, 7) shows her wearing a wimple which covers her neck and chin up to her lip (my thanks to Zoë Opačić-Masters for bringing this manuscript to my attention). Giovanni Pisano's dynamic effigy of Margaret for her tomb shows her wearing a voluminous dress and a tightly-bound headdress which also conceals her neck (Museo di Sant'Agostino, Genoa).

[64] G. M. Gianola, 'La tradizione del „De gestis Henrici" di Albertino Mussato e il velo di Margherita', *Filologia*

mediolatina, 16, 2009, pp. 81-113 distinguishes between a group of early manuscripts which circulated among Mussato's friends, and those he dates after 1315 which were revised to reflect Margaret's death.

[65] J.Thomann, 'Pietro d'Abano...' details how Pietro d'Abano's commentary on a pseudo-Aristotelian text considers Giotto as a portraitist.

[66] Jacobus, *Giotto*, 179-80, fig. 43 and Pl. XVI

67 Jacobus, *Giotto*¸ 24-30 reviews the evidence for this claim and proposes that a sculpture commemorating the order's sponsorship of the chapel had initially been planned for the external niche that once held Enrico's statue.

[68] Cortusi, *Chronica...* Bk 6, Ch.1, p.7

[69] It was bound into a volume dated 25th September 1520 which included 1319 Enrico's endowment of the Chapel and subsequent documents of sale as proofs of rights of patronage. The volume was recorded in a census of the Foscari archive, published in Bordignon Favero, Elia (ed.) *Carte Foscari sull'arena di Padova. La 'Casa Grande' e La Cappella degli Scrovegni* (Venice: Malcontenta, 1988), 62

[70] A coin dated c.1360 was placed under the statue at the time of its re-installation in the chapel's sacristy, as noted in Antonio Tolomei, *La Cappella degli Scrovigni e l'Arena di Padova: nuovi appunti e ricordi* (Padua: Salmin, 1881) 18.

[71] Latin meanings of 'propria' include 'peculiarly or exclusively one's own' or 'personal'; Latin meanings of 'figura' include 'figure' and 'form'. The Italian meanings of 'propria' include 'authentic' or 'exactly corresponding to reality' and 'figura' , 'the face of a specific individual'. Salvatore Battaglia, *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana* (Turin : Unione tipografico-editrice torinese), 1961) Vol.14, 671; Vol.5 969) The earliest known *volgare* use of the phrase 'sua propria figura' is in a late thirteenth-century poem by Stefano Protonotaro (http://it.wikisource.org/wiki/Assai_mi_placeria accessed 17 April 17, 2014). In context this translates as 'her own true face'.

[72] Like a seal, it might also serve as a proxy presence. Birgitte Miriam Bedos-Rezak has explored the relationship of seals to individual identity and authority in twelfth-century Northern France. She argues that, stimulated by the growing necessity of communication by written or embodied proxy, seals carried the authority of their subjects' presence and articulated their social identity (*When Ego was Imago: signs of identity in the Middle Ages* (Leiden and Boston: Brill , 2011) esp. 109-160 (Chapter Six, also published as 'Medieval Identity: a sign and a concept' *The American Historical Review* 105/5 (2000) 1489-1533)). A personal seal denoted its subject's identity through a central image which indicated the class of personage to which they belonged, and through a peripheral inscription which named and further classified them. If we carry the analogy between facsimile portrait and seal further, then Enrico Scrovegni's statue speaks of a very much stronger projection of individual identity and inherent presence than would a seal. As with a seal, signifiers of what class of personage Enrico belongs to are to be found in the inscription's references to his family and knighthood, in the statue's costume (see next note) and possibly in the heraldry decorating the niche's frame (though this may date from the statue's transfer in c.1360). However the personal individuality or personhood residing in Enrico Scrovegni's particular body and in his actions is more directly and forcefully communicated by facsimile portraiture. Moreover the present-tense inscription describing his deeds (he is shown as he 'sav[es] his honest soul [and].. celebrates a venerable feast day') reinforces the sense of personal presence and suggests that the statue performs perpetual prayers as its subject's proxy.

[73] '...facie, habitu, & longitudine ei nequaquam dissimilis...'. Bernardino Scardeone, *De Antiquitate urbis Patavii & claris civibus Patavinis* (Basel, 1560), 332-3. It is interesting to note that Mussato and Scardeone both attached importance to the description of costume as well as facial features, and that the statue and effigy both take pains to record Enrico's garments exactly. Jane Bridgeman has kindly discussed the costumes of the statue and effigy with me, and concludes that they accurately represent Enrico's garments, which may be official in nature.

[74] Wolfgang Wolters, *La scultura veneziana...*noted how many *trecento* effigies in the Veneto have life-like faces with furrowed brows, considering it to be a local characteristic, (though not one that he attributed to the 'Scrovegni effect'). I plan to consider a number of instances of this ripple effect in Italian portrait sculpture in a future study which will include the statue of Porrina degli Albertini in Casole d'Elsa. Here I will simply note that in the Veneto, when the Scrovegni portraits' properties of physiognomic particularity and expression were transferred to portrait sculptures of the living or recently-deceased, they did not necessarily entail any physical resemblance to the portraits' subjects. Often the increased verism discernable in such 'post-Scrovegni' portrait sculptures disguises underlying schema which pre-date the Scrovegni portrait sculptures. In other Italian cases, continuing well into the fifteenth-century and beyond, physical likeness and schematization are combined to produce hybrid portrait likenesses. It is worth noting that physiognomic verisimilitude and expressive characterisation are also a strong feature of Northern European figure sculpture, appearing well

before the Scrovegni portraits, usually in portraits of the long-dead or of supernumerary narrative figures where they carry no implication of physical likeness. Martin Büschel 'Nur der Tyrann hat sein eigenes Gesicht. Königsbilder im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert in Frankreich und Deutschland', Martin Büschel and Peter Schmidt (eds) *Das Porträt vor der Erfindung des Porträts* (Mainz: von Zabern) 123-40 explores how strongly individualized, expressive heads often had negative associations in twelfth- and thirteenth-century figure sculpture, and how such qualities were avoided when representing contemporary royalty. In similar vein Willibald Sauerländer, '"Physiognomia est doctrina salutis" Über Physiognomik und Porträt im Jahrhundert Ludwigs des Heiligen' in the same volume, 101-121, traces the appearance physiognomic signs of social and moral distinctions in thirteenth-century art, but notes how royal portraiture was largely unaffected by ideas of physiognomic likeness until the fourteenth century.

[75] Among them the quasi-magical wax *ex votos* of Santissima Annunziata and the terracotta busts associated with Verrocchio and the Benintendi, Pietro Torrigiani and others (see fuller discussion in note X). I would suggest that some Florentine profile portraits of young women may have been produced by projection-based facsimile methods for the very different purposes of marriage negotiations. The degree to which Florentine marble portrait busts were facsimile portraits must be decided on a case-by-case basis, but my own informal research suggests that even when casts may have been referred to as *aide memoires*, relatively few such busts meet the criteria with regard to exactitude (ie: the exploitation mechanical means of reproduction with the intention of capturing and recreating exact physical likeness). One plausible example of a marble facsimile portrait is Antonio Rossellino's *Bust of Dr Chellini* (1456, Victoria and Albert Museum, London), which Peter Dent has argued may well be a knowing meditation on the issues raised by utilizing a life-cast. Peter Dent 'Chellini's Ears and the Diagnosis of Technique,' in S. Nethersole, P. Rumberg, J. Harris eds., *'una insalata di più erbe': A Festschrift for Patricia Lee Rubin*, (London: Courtauld Institute, 2011), pp. 138-150. My thanks to Dr. Dent for sending me a copy of his article.