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ABSTRACT: A drawing attributed to the Dutch painter, draughtsman and print designer Maarten van Heemskerck (1498–1574) was acquired in 1973 by Melvin Day, director of the then National Art Gallery of New Zealand. The sheet presents several studies after Antique sculpture, supposedly dating from 1532–6/7, when the artist was in Rome. This article focusses on a sculpture represented at the top of the recto of the sheet, a reclining male nude which is illustrated twice, seen from slightly different angles. In the late 15th and early 16th centuries, the object was located in the courtyard of Casa Maffei in Rome. The sculpture – often referred to as *Endymion* – later travelled to Venice, Verona and Munich, where it resides today. Executed in Rome, probably in the first century CE, at the end of the sixteenth century it was recognised as a replica of a piece forming part of a fourth-century BCE group representing Niobe and her sons. Three other copies of the same subject are known, currently located in Florence, Dresden and Turin. The article discusses similarities and differences between the replicas, as well as their individual stories, with the aim of understanding how the model was read and interpreted when it was depicted on the Te Papa sheet.
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Introduction

The Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa (Te Papa) owns a sheet of drawings attributed to the Dutch painter, draughtsman and print designer Maarten van Heemskerck (1498–1574) (Figs 1-2). It was bought through the Harold Beauchamp Trust Fund in 1973 from the London dealers Colnaghi. The drawing is listed and reproduced in the sale catalogue, where the attribution to Heemskerck is credited to Christopher White. The acquisition reflected the collecting policy of the director of the then National Art Gallery of New Zealand, Melvin Day (1923–2016, dir. 1968–78), who expanded the museum’s Old Master drawings collection. Day built on the highly impressive print collection largely acquired through the same dealers by Sir John Ilott (1884–1973), who in turn had donated it to the gallery. The sheet presents several studies after Antique sculpture, supposedly dating from 1532-6/7, when Heemskerck was in Rome. In that period, the artist observed and illustrated some of the most important buildings – especially famous are his drawings of St Peter’s, which was then under construction – and items from prominent private collections of Antique sculpture, such as the della Valle, Maffei and Galli. It was customary practice for Renaissance artists, in particular when they travelled, to cover sheets of paper with sketches and drawings, which later they could use as models for paintings or other commissions. Heemskerck filled a sketchbook, subsequently dismembered and bound together with drawings by other artists in two albums now located in the Kupferstichkabinett of the Staatliche Museen in Berlin. Other sheets containing sketches and drawings lived separate individual lives, ending up in public and private collections all around the world. These types of objects became of interest to connoisseurs and collectors, who were attracted by their freshness and immediacy.
Although the attribution of the sheet falls outside the objectives of this article, a few words should be said on the matter. In 1951 Ludwig Goldscheider published two sketches taken from it, precisely the ones considered in this article, in his monograph on Michelangelo’s drawings, crediting them to Perino del Vaga (1501–47). The attribution to the Florentine artist was subsequently superseded and the work was ascribed to Heemskerck. Yet the sketches on the sheet seem slightly removed from the fluency demonstrated by the Dutch artist in his Roman drawings. Secondly, the use of the red/brown ink in these drawings is not common in the draughtsman’s production, although this might reflect conservation issues. The format and dimensions of the sheet, moreover, are different from those normally used by Heemskerck in the drawings of this period, evident in the works currently preserved in Berlin (c. 125-135 x c. 190-210 mm). However, Te Papa’s sheet is certainly the product of a skilled and talented artist, as the reputable attributions confirm. The question remains open and can only benefit from further study and discussion.

The recto of the Te Papa sheet shows studies after Antique statuary, including sketches of statues and reliefs, which were then in the collection of Cardinal Andrea della Valle (1463–1534) and in the Casa Maffei. The verso is occupied by drawings on the Labours of Hercules, possibly taken from a sarcophagus now at Palazzo Altemps in Rome, and formerly in the Boncompagni-Ludovisi collection. On the recto three collectors’ stamps can be found, attesting to previous ownership: on the upper right a partially illegible stamp recognisable as Lugt 628 and attributable to the painter and avid collector of drawings Richard Cosway (c. 1740–1821); on the lower centre the initials “C.M”, which can be connected to Lugt 598a, ascribed to the German engraver Conrad Martin Metz (1749–1827), who owned a remarkable collection of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Italian drawings and who – interestingly – published in 1798 a
collection of etchings reproducing a selection of drawings in Cosway’s collection; and finally, on the lower right, an almost faded fleur-de-lis. Considering the area around the stamp, this can be identified as Lught 2781, with three fleurs-de-lis, two on top of the third, and frequently found in drawings from the Cosway collection. The sale catalogue reports the following list of previous owners, in this order: “Richard Cosway, Joseph Mayer of Liverpool, Arnett Hibbert, C.M (unidentified), Dr Pietro del Giudice”.

This article centres on the sculpture illustrated at the top of the recto of the sheet, a reclining nude which the artist drew twice, viewed from slightly different angles (Fig. 3). A male nude is represented in a lying position. The right arm bends upwards to touch the head with the hand, while the left arm rests on the abdomen. The left hand lacks the index finger. The legs are slightly bent, the right one above the other. The right foot is totally missing, while just the left heel is visible. The figure seems to be lying on a cloth or a rock. The hair is short and curly, while the facial expression is barely visible in the sketch on the left. The torso is muscular, and so are the legs. The artist seems particularly interested in the shadows of the areas of the upper body and of the crossing of the legs. In the sketch on the left, the figure is seen from above, adopting a viewpoint slightly rotated towards the right side of the body, while the one on the right is taken from a lower perspective, also favouring a view of the right side of the body.

**Rome**

In the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the sculpture represented on the Te Papa sheet was located in the courtyard of the Casa Maffei in Rome, as testified by – among other sources – a drawing by Heemskerck now in Berlin (Fig. 4). The figure is here depicted foreshortened, barely visible under a flight of stairs leading to the piano nobile (Fig. 5). The building was located in the Via dei Cestari near the Arco della
Ciambella. The Maffei brothers, Benedetto (d. 1494), Agostino (d. c. 1496), and Francesco (d. 1497), settled there in the mid-fifteenth century. Originally from Verona, they were appointed as apostolic scriptors – Agostino in 1455, Francesco in 1466 and Benedetto in 1468. Their house in Rome soon became an intellectual coterie, thanks also to their impressive collection of manuscripts of classical texts, which the brothers frequently commissioned from the most important scholars and copyists of the time.\textsuperscript{20} Agostino especially showed a strong interest in collecting antiquities, such as statues and marble busts, coins and medals, and epigraphs.\textsuperscript{21} In the last two decades of the fifteenth century, the original palace was enlarged through the acquisition of adjacent properties. Inscriptions and epigraphs placed on the fronts on the Via della Pigna and Via dei Cestari, in addition to painted friezes, signalled to interested visitors the presence of antiquities within the building.\textsuperscript{22}

The sculpture was not cited in the fairly detailed description of the Maffei collection in \textit{Delle statue antiche} (compiled 1549–50; published 1556), by the naturalist and antiquarian Ulisse Aldrovandi. This was a catalogue of the most celebrated collections of ancient sculpture in sixteenth-century Rome.\textsuperscript{23} Kathleen Christian believes that when Aldrovandi visited the collection around 1550, many of the objects previously seen by Heemskerck in the courtyard had been moved to other areas of the Maffei properties.\textsuperscript{24}

Several Renaissance artists showed interest in the object: in addition to the Te Papa sheet and Heemskerck’s drawing illustrating the Maffei courtyard, at least four other drawings have been associated with it.\textsuperscript{25} The earliest depiction currently known is probably the one contained on a sheet now at the Prado (Fig. 6), attributed to a draughtsman in the circle of Domenico Ghirlandaio, and possibly executed at the end of the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{26} The other sculpture depicted on the same sheet, a semi-draped
female figure, was also in the Maffei collection at the time, evident in Heemskerck’s drawing of the courtyard (Fig. 4), where it can be distinguished on the right hand side, leaning towards the wall.27

A contemporary literary source, written by the anonymous “Prospectivo Melanese Depictore”, dedicated to Leonardo da Vinci and published in Rome around 1496, refers to our reclining nude in these terms:

The Maffei have many things
A nude male reclined overcome by slumber
Which induces my eyes to droop.28

The sketch in the so-called Umbrian Sketchbook (Fig. 7),29 and the profile contained in the so-called “Codex Wolfegg” by the Bolognese painter and draughtsman Amico Aspertini (c. 1474–1552) (Fig. 8)30 representing the sculpture with the inscription “in casa dei mafei”, are from the same period. The latter artist returned to the subject in the 1530s, in the same years that Heemskerck saw it in the courtyard of the palace, and again drew the reclining nude in a sketchbook now at the British Museum (Fig. 9).31 In general, these representations focus on the torso and the crossing of the legs. The facial expression was apparently of no particular interest to these artists. The right forearm and the feet are frequently omitted or quickly synthesised, probably recording missing parts of the sculpture.

The object seems also to have inspired works such as Aspertini’s decapitated saint in the fresco of The Burial of Sts Valeria and Tiburtius, in Bologna, Oratorio of Santa Cecilia (c. 1504–6),32 the same artist’s Burial of Jacob’s wife, a marble relief for the left portal of San Petronio in Bologna (c. 1514–30),33 the figure hanging down from the wall in Raphael and Giulio Romano’s fresco of Fire of the Borgo in the Vatican Stanze (1514–7),34 and Michelangelo’s Dying Slave now at the Louvre (c. 1513–6).35 A drawing by
Giovanni Ambrogio Figino (1548/51–1608), now at Windsor Castle, has also been claimed to represent the Maffei sculpture, although it seems more likely that the artist was instead inspired by Michelangelo, as applies to the other figures represented on the same sheet.

**Endymion in Venice and Verona (and an offer to the Medici)**

Thanks to the studies of Clifford M. Brown and Anna Maria Lorenzoni, we know that presumably around 1570 the Maffei sculpture joined the collection of Leonardo Mocenigo (1523–c. 1575) in Venice, together with other items from Rome, possibly from Casa Maffei as well. In 1570 a shipment of 18 busts and several statues of various size received a “lasciapassare” (a pass permit) to travel from Rome to Mocenigo’s residence in Venice, signed by Pope Pius V. Francesco Sansovino, in his *Venetia città nobilissima et singolare* (1581), lists Leonardo Mocenigo’s collection of antiquities as one of the most important in the city. When the latter died in the mid–1570s, the collection passed to his son Alvise (b. 1549), who soon began selling items to settle the debts that his father had contracted whilst acquiring valuable and rare objects.

We now know, thanks to Martha McCrory, that at the end of 1581 the sculpture then belonging to Mocenigo was offered to Francesco I de’ Medici. A letter dated 28 November sent by Mocenigo’s agent Ercole Basso to Belisario Vinta, First Secretary of State of the Grand Duchy, containing the offer of the sculpture, is located today at the Archivio di Stato in Florence. The document also included a drawing (“disegno”), now unfortunately lost. Interestingly, the letter refers to the sculpture as “Endimione”, the handsome son of Aethlius (son of Zeus) and of Calyce who, according to Greek mythology, spent much of his life in uninterrupted sleep, in exchange for remaining
forever young. It seems that the negotiation with the Medici was unsuccessful, and the work remained in Venice for a while longer.

Brown and Lorenzoni claim that the Maffei-Mocenigo Endymion formed part of the “ancient things” sold by Alvise Mocenigo to the Veronese collector Mario Bevilacqua (1536–93) in the later 1580s. At the time, Bevilacqua was setting up a “galleria” in his palace – situated on the current Corso Cavour and renovated in the later 1550s by the architect Michele Sanmicheli (1484–1559). Displayed there were some of the most important objects of Bevilacqua’s rich collection, which included paintings, sculpture, prints and drawings, coins and medals, and musical instruments [Figs 10–11]. The numerous objects were installed for the most part in three dedicated spaces: the “antiquarium”, the library and the musical “ridotto”, which were open to the public. It was probably the acquisitions of the Mocenigo objects that provided the impulse for establishing a new display space, the “galleria”, in the second half of the 1580s.

Late sixteenth-century inventories report the content of the room. Together with the Maffei-Mocenigo sculpture, listed as “Endimione ignudo giacente” (“naked lying Endymion”) in 1589 and “Endimione che dorme” (“Endymion sleeping”) in 1594–5, the room contained five large paintings, including Jacopo Tintoretto’s Paradise (c. 1564), now at the Louvre, a drawing, two “carte grandi di cosmografia”, six life-sized statues, 11 marble busts – all but one of Roman emperors – and a bronze “Apollo”, unanimously recognised as the so-called “Adorante”, now in the Antikensammlung of the Staatliche Museen in Berlin.

Endymion became one of the most admired and appreciated works of art in the palace, where it remained for more than two centuries. It was praised by the writer and antiquarian Scipione Maffei in his study of the most important pieces of the Bevilacqua collection (1732), and was illustrated in an engraving published in 1753 by Dionisio...
Valesi in his *Varie fabbriche antiche e moderne di Verona con alcune statue e busti della Galleria Bevilacqua*, where it is clearly identified as “Endimione” (Fig. 12).53 Contrasting with the sixteenth-century representations considered above, in this engraving the right foot is visible, though not the right hand. The sculpture was acclaimed as “delightful” (“köstlich”) by Johann Wolfgang Goethe, who visited the palace in 1786 and published his account in the *Italienische Reise* a few years later.54

**From Verona to Munich**

In 1811 the sculpture was sold by Mario Bevilacqua’s heirs to Georg von Dillis, who was acting as agent for the collection of antiquities of Prince Ludwig I of Bavaria, who was expanding it at the time.55 Described as one of the best pieces among the thirty sculptures bought from Bevilacqua’s heirs, in the initial correspondence between Dillis and the prince, the statue is described as “the so-called gladiator (or, much better, a son of Niobe)”,56 while in the letter confirming the acquisition, dated 16 November 1811, Dillis refers to it as “a son of Niobe”.57

The sculpture is now in Munich, at the Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek (Fig. 13).58 The figure is currently missing both feet; only the left heel is visible, like in the drawing on the Te Papa sheet. The left hand is incomplete, and the right arm is truncated in the upper part, consequently lacking the right hand too. A cavity on the upper left-hand side of the head might suggest former contact with the right hand or with some sort of support. Old photographs record restored parts that now have been dismantled, such as the right arm, the fingers of the left hand and the feet (Fig. 14).59

**The Medici Niobids, Rome and Florence**
In the spring of 1583, a remarkable group of 14 sculptures was excavated in the Vigna Tommasini on the Esquiline Hill, and acquired by Cardinal Ferdinando de’ Medici (1549–1609, Grand Duke of Tuscany from 1587) shortly afterwards.\textsuperscript{60} Eleven of them were recognised as forming part of a group depicting Niobe and her sons. Niobe was the Queen of Thebes, whose children were killed by Apollo and Artemis to punish their mother’s arrogance.\textsuperscript{61} The theme was frequently illustrated in ancient Greece, and the story was narrated by Homer and Hesiod. Later, in Roman times, the myth reappeared in such authors as Apollodorus and Ovid. A famous sculptural version, seen by Pliny in the first century CE and described in his \textit{Natural History},\textsuperscript{62} was possibly executed by Skopas or Praxiteles and commissioned by Seleukos, a king of Cilicia in south coastal Asia Minor in the fourth century BCE. It was moved to Rome in 38 BCE to decorate the rebuilt temple of Apollo Sosianus in the Campus Martius.\textsuperscript{63} This literary source was well known in the late sixteenth century, and the sculptures excavated in the Vigna Tommasini were long reputed to be copies of the group described by Pliny.\textsuperscript{64}

After their restoration, these sculptures were placed by the Medici in the garden of their villa on the Pincio in Rome, and in 1776 were transported to the Uffizi, where they still reside today, in the so-called “Sala della Niobe”.\textsuperscript{65} Two sets of casts were made, in the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries respectively.\textsuperscript{66} The first set was displayed at the Uffizi while the original group was still in Rome, while the second is still displayed in the Villa Medici and was made when the original group, was relocated in the Uffizi.\textsuperscript{67} The sculptures were restored again when they arrived in Florence. Recent studies have confirmed that the group was realised by different workshops in the second century CE.\textsuperscript{68}

Among the various figures forming part of the group excavated in the Vigna Tommasini was a reclining nude remarkably similar to the Maffei-Mocenigo-Bevilacqua
Endymion (Fig. 15), as testified in an engraving published by Francois Perrier in 1638 (Fig. 16). In the period it resided in the Medici garden, the sculpture was also illustrated by Giovanni Battista Cavalieri in the third and fourth books of his Antiquarum statuarum urbis Romae (1594) (Fig. 17). Carlo and Ferdinando Gregori represented the object after it had arrived at the Uffizi in Angelo Fabroni’s Dissertation sur les statues appartenante a la fable de Niobe dédiée a son Altesse Royale Monsignore l’Archiduc Pierre Leopold Grand Duc de Toscane (1779) (Fig. 18). The Uffizi sculpture possesses two prominent holes in the chest, which are not present – and indeed have never been recorded – in the Munich version. Furthermore, in the Florentine example, the musculature of the figure seems more tense and nervous, especially on the right side of the torso, hips and knees. These features are reflected in the plates published by Cavalieri (where the sculpture appears in reverse) and Fabroni. The right arm, both in the sculpture and in its representations, is detached from the head, as if in a spasm. The sculpture in Munich, in contrast, presents a clear indication in the head suggesting that the right hand or some form of support might have originally touched it, in what could appear as a more relaxed pose.

*Endymion reinterpreted*

The 1583 discovery meant that our reclining nude, until then considered an individual piece in the Maffei, Mocenigo, and Bevilacqua collections, was consequently reinterpreted as another replica of one of the sons of Niobe, forming part of the original group of Greek sculptures. Yet notwithstanding the near instant fame of the group, Endymion kept his original name for a long time, as testified by Valesi’s engraving of 1753. (Fig. 12).
A possible explanation for this resistance to correction is that no previous sources suggest that the sculpture contained any clear interpretative key to redefine it as a mortally injured man. In the Uffizi version, the spear wound – the cause of death – is instead clearly evident: the two holes in the chest were likely intended to house a metallic pole piercing the right side of the rib cage. This is clearly represented in the plate published by Fabroni in 1779 (Fig. 18). Although we are uncertain whether these holes formed part of the original sculpture or were introduced later, the Munich version presents no hint of this. Moreover, the facial expression of the latter figure looks serene, not showing any signs of pain. The eyes are almost closed and the musculature generally seems quite relaxed and not contracted in a spasm; indeed, the young man seems convincingly asleep. Probably for these reasons, in addition to the fact that the object did not form part of a group but constituted an isolated piece, in the sixteenth century he was regarded as a dormant Endymion and not as a dying Niobid.

The early representations of the Maffei-Mocenigo-Bevilacqua version reflect this interpretation: the sculpture is almost always illustrated as a serene and relaxed figure. In contrast, the woodcut by Cavalieri and the engraving published by Fabroni, instead represent indeed a body writhing in pain. The interpretation of the subject as a dying son of Niobe eventually prevailed, and this is the name currently applied to all the different versions.

Two other copies from Rome to Dresden and Turin – and another offer to the Medici

Two other examples of the same subject, very similar to the Munich and Uffizi versions – and likewise considered copies of a Hellenistic original – are currently preserved in Dresden and Turin. The one now in the Skulpturensammlung in the Staatliche
Kunstsammlungen in Dresden (Fig. 19) was acquired in 1728 in Rome from the Albani collection. This had been created at the behest of Cardinal Gian Francesco Albani (1649–1721), elected Pope Clement XI in 1700 and – especially – his nephew, Cardinal Alessandro Albani (1692–1779). A lover of the arts and a connoisseur, the latter helped found an antiquarian academy, entrusting its direction to Francesco Bianchini (1662–1729). At the same time Albani initiated vast campaigns of excavations and established a rich collection of antique statues, without excessive scruples in obtaining them. In 1728 he sold thirty statues, among the most valuable of his collection, to the king of Poland. In its current location the sculpture was engraved by Johann Balthasar Probst (1673–before 1750), and published as “Un Fils de Niobe” in 1733 by Raymond Le Plat in his Recueil des marbres antiques qui se trouvent dans la galerie du Roy de Pologne a Dresden (Fig. 20). The object has been heavily restored: the right forearm and hand, the left hand, the left leg below the knee and the right leg below the upper thigh have all been reconstructed. The plate published by Le Plat records these restorations. It is interesting to note the position of the right hand, resting on the head, which recalls the characteristics observed in the Munich version, while the pose of the restored left hand, as illustrated by Le Plat, differs significantly from the sculpture at the Uffizi.

The version in Turin, now heavily incomplete – lacking the lower half of the face, including the nose and mouth, both arms, pelvis and legs – came from the Altoviti collection (Fig. 21). The sculpture was probably excavated in the early 1550s at Hadrian’s Villa in Tivoli, then largely owned by the famous banker and collector Bindo Altoviti (1491–1557). Ulisse Adrovandi did not refer to the sculpture in his account of 1549–50, while the object probably formed part of the much enlarged collection of statues recorded in the 1591 inventory of Altoviti’s possessions, which unfortunately, with rare exceptions, does not name individual items. The sculpture was sold in 1612
to the duke of Savoy as an “Idimeone [in later documents corrected in “Endimione”] lying naked”. Interestingly this sculpture too was still interpreted as Endymion in the early seventeenth century.

The summary of a letter from Cosimo I de’ Medici to Lodovico Ciregiuola, dated 17 May 1567, refers to a “model of the statue of Endymion”, which was offered to the former. Cosimo refused the offer, saying that at the moment he was not in need of statuary. Considering the documented offers of objects from the Altoviti collection to the Medici in exchange for political favours in the years 1565–7, this letter may well refer to the statue now in Turin, and not to the Maffei Endymion, as has been suggested by Brown and Lorenzoni.

**Conclusion**

The sculpture currently in Munich and portrayed in the upper part of the recto of the sheet attributed to Maarten van Heemskerck now at Te Papa had attracted the interest of artists and art lovers since the late fifteenth century. They repeatedly reproduced it in their sketchbooks and appraised it in their textual descriptions. Originally considered an individual masterpiece in the Maffei collection, following the discovery in 1583 of a group of Niobids, the object has been reinterpreted as a figure forming part of a broader narrative scheme. The success that the model enjoyed in Roman times is confirmed by two other replicas, also excavated in Rome during the Renaissance and now located in Dresden and Turin. The material and iconographic characteristics of the subject implied that in the sixteenth century it was read and illustrated as a dormant Endymion, and was only later reinterpreted as a dying Niobid. However, the earlier interpretation lasted over time, particularly when applied to the versions in Munich and Turin. The reasons for this resistance to iconographic ‘correction’ perhaps lie in the specific
characteristics of these individual copies, particularly that depicted in the Te Papa sheet. The facial expression, the apparent muscular relaxation of the body, and the absence of visible wounds all explain this. It is possible that the artists of these replicas intentionally executed these features to distinguish their figures from the original group, thus transforming them into individual works, with their intrinsic and independent narrative value. Certainly, this was how the sculpture was perceived by sixteenth-century viewers and the author of the drawing now in Wellington.
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83 Brown and Lorenzoni, ‘Cavaliero Mozzanico’, 62 n. 17. The date provided in this source (1 May 1567) is incorrect, as the letter is dated May 17.

84 Archivio di Stato, Florence, Mediceo del Principato, b. 225, c. 90: “Habbiamo visto il modello [i.e. drawing] della statua di Endimion [sic] mandataci con la vostra de’ x et inteso la bellezza et il pregio di essa, non havendo per hora bisogno di statue, ci risolviamo di non ci voler’ attende’ [...].” I thank Francesca Fantappiè for providing a photograph of the document.

85 Pegazzano, ‘Bindo Altoviti’s ancient sculpture’, 353 and 358 n. 18.
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