The Myth and the Mattress:

Replications and Installations of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*

Caroline Harvey

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

University of Washington

2020

Committee:

Estelle Lingo

Stuart Lingo

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Art, Art History and Design

University of Washington

Abstract

The Myth and the Mattress:

Replications and Installations of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*

Caroline Harvey

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Estelle Lingo

Department of Art History

The Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* largely exists in art historical scholarship within Gian Lorenzo Bernini's career because of the hyper realistic marble mattress and pillow he created for the intersexual deity to rest upon. Bernini's additions to the work reimagined the ancient figure in a domestic setting and amplified tactile nature of the work. The subsequent replications of the sculpture continued to maintain this collaboration between the early modern and ancient sculptors, while adjusting and reframing the iconography to accommodate its increasingly conservative audience throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Examining the evolvement in the display of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* and tracing its replications provides an opportunity to unpack perceptions of gender and nudity in early modern Europe, and how the result influences contemporary curation and artistic practices.

The Myth and the Mattress:
Replications and Installations of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*

[1]As told in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Hermaphroditus, the son of Hermes and Aphrodite, was pursued by the nymph Salmacis, in an encounter that would ultimately lead to a violent transformation and a new hybrid form.[2] After being rejected by Hermaphroditus, she came upon him bathing in a spring and attacked him. As he struggled to free himself, Salmacis prayed to the gods to unite them, her prayers were answered and the two were united in a single form, both male and female. In Ovid's telling, Salmacis's narrative ends here, while Hermaphroditus is still quite conscious; disturbed by his new dual form he prays for justice, "Father and mother, grant this gift to your son, who bears both your names: whoever comes to these fountains as a man, let him leave them half a man, and weaken suddenly at the touch of these waters!"[3]

Both Salmacis and Hermaphroditus exhibit non-normative gender roles, Salmacis being the pursuer and the aggressor, and Hermaphroditus the object of desire and voyeurism. He laments at becoming effeminate or "half a man" in his transformation. In this context, the term effeminate refers to sexual roles and a literal, physical feminization, as his limbs were "softened."[4] This definition of effeminate was common during the ancient Greco-Roman period, in reference to active and passive sexual roles, the male typically maintaining the active role and here, Hermaphroditus is ashamed of his role as the pursued and embarrassed by his resulting form.[5] This

[1] This thesis was completed during the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic with limited access to proper resources. It is my plan to continue to develop this into an article and deepen my research as the world recovers from the pandemic.
[2] I would like to acknowledge the different representations of Hermaphroditus during antiquity as the winged child of Hermes and Aphrodite who was born as a intersexual, rather than transformed, but since I am analyzing early modern representations, I will work with Ovid's telling because it would have been well known and was widely represented in the period, see Jennifer Trimble, "Beyond Surprise: Looking Again at the Sleeping Hermaphrodite in the Palazzo Massimo,"in *Roman Artists, Patrons, and Public Consumption: Familiar Works Reconsidered*, ed. Brenda Longfellow and Ellen Perry (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2017), 22.
[3] Ovid, *The Metamorphoses, Book IV*, trans. A.S. Kline (University of Virginia, 2000), https://ovid.lib.virginia.edu/trans/Ovhome.htm.
[4] Ibid..
[5] M. Robinson, "Salmacis and Hermaphroditus: When Two Become One: (Ovid, Met. 4.285-388)," *Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (1999), 213-4.

treatment of gender found in elite Greco-Roman societies recalls pederastic relationships and figures the development of the male sexual role. Pederastic relationships are believed to have been common during antiquity and would have consisted of a temporary relationship between a young man, the *eromenos*, still steeped in the world of women from childhood and about to enter society, and an older, established man. This relationship served both intellectual and sexual purposes and while it was socially accepted, once the *eromenos* became of age, he was expected to marry a woman.[6] Hermaphroditus's "softened" body and union with Salmacis prevented him from becoming a fully realized man by ancient standards as the breasts and softened form physically tied him to the female sphere from which he was meant to mature.

One of the most famous representations of this form is found in the ancient sculpture known as the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, which features a nude resting figure possessing both breasts and a phallus. The ethereal nude stretches in their sleep, their toe catches and pulls the linen that they rest upon, creating a physical tension within the sculpture. Jennifer Trimble relates the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* to other images from antiquity that depict slender musculature and curvaceous bodies of prepubescent boys that would have been an ideal and sexualized feature in an *eromenos*.[7] Trimble also points out that from the nineteenth-century onward, many scholars have referred to the backside of the sculpture as the feminine side, even though an ancient audience might have viewed both sides of the work as sexually ambiguous. The backside of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* is often read as the feminine side likely because of early modern standards for beauty and the representations of curvaceous women across European paintings. The nineteenth-century Scottish

[6] See Andrew Lear and Eva Cantarella, *Images of Ancient Greek Pederasty: Boys Were Their Gods* (London: Routledge, 2008).
[7] Jennifer Trimble, "Beyond Surprise," 23-4.

painter Hugh William Williams once described the 'eel-like form' of the Uffizi *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*'s undulating back view.[8]

Various versions of the Hermaphrodite exist in Greco-Roman sculpture, though the function of the deity during antiquity remains unclear and the iconography of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* has no literary source.[9] Alternative ancient representations include depictions of the Hermaphrodite wrestling with a satyr and another called the *anasyromenos*, in which the Hermaphrodite lifts their garment to reveal an erect phallus. Both of these examples perform a more active role, one more intense than the other, and curiously, the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* exhibits both passivity and activity. Perhaps both the rest and tension embody the sexual limbo in which the Hermaphrodite exists in relation to Greco-Roman sexual practices.[10] The drapery clearly activates the figure, creating a point of pressure and tension with the foot and leg, while the upper part of the body rests. This movement is not necessarily clear and could be interpreted as stretching, active dreaming, or orgasm.[11] The activity of the lower half of the Hermaphrodite and the passivity of the upper half adds another layer to the engaging viewership that would evolve in the early modern period.

Considered to be one of many ancient Roman copies of a lost Greek original, the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* (fig. 1), discovered circa 1608 and today in the Louvre, is a product of multiple eras because of its seventeenth-century additions.[12] The plush marble mattress and pillow

---

[8] Chloe Chard, "Nakedness and Tourism: Classical Sculpture and the Imaginative Geography of the Grand Tour," *Oxford Art Journal*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (1995), 18.

[9] For text on the function of the deity see Aileen Ajootian, "The Only Happy Couple: Hermaphroditos and Gender," in *Naked Truths: Women, sexuality, and gender in classical art and archaeology,* ed. Ann Olga Koloski-Ostrow and Claire L. Lyons (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), 234-5; For commentary on the lack of literary sources see Trimble, "Beyond Surpise," 22-3.

[10] Ajootian, "The Only Happy Couple," 221-2, 231-2.

[11] Ajootian, "The Only Happle Couple," 220-1.

[12] The supposed original is referenced by Pliny the Elder in his *Natural History*, 34.80, as a work by the ancient Greek sculptor Polykles, though he does not describe the work, so the identity as the original referent for the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* is uncertain, so I will use the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* as an original despite its existence as a copy. Anna Coliva, Sebastian Schütze, Galleria Borghese, and Bibliotheca Hertziana, Max-Planck-Institut. *Bernini Scultore: La Nascita Del Barocco in Casa Borghese* (Rome: Edizioni De Luca, 1998), 131.

created by the sculptor Gian Lorenzo Bernini and commissioned by Cardinal Scipione Borghese in 1620, which enhances the eroticism of the resting nude, would ultimately define the work and be reinterpreted by artistic replications executed in subsequent centuries. There is little known surrounding the reasoning for the adding of the mattress, outside of a short commission document and records of payment, but it is clear that the commission refigured the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* in a domestic setting, rather than a garden, which would have likely been the figure's original ancient resting place.[13] The shift in the imagined context for the figure through an artistic addition represents the first point in the early modern period at which the Hermaphrodite was conceptually reframed.

Altering ancient works of art to fit the needs of a collection was not an uncommon practice, though it would become more popular in the eighteenth century, and in some cases alterations would function as a form of censorship. An ancient version of a *Standing Hermaphrodite* (fig. 2) discovered around the turn of the seventeenth century was quickly censored and converted into a representation of Venus upon its arrival at the Villa Ludovisi.[14] Bernini's additions to the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* do not change the identity or attempt to hide the presence of both breasts and a phallus from the viewer. Rather, his conception of the work physically elevates the figure and heightens the eroticism. Bernini adds to the figure without removing anything and uses his artistic skill to make the figure even more engaging.

It is important to distinguish between simple restorations and modern artistic additions that make bold changes to the ancient iconography and affect the character of the figure. Bernini's

[13] For details on commission, see Coliva, *Bernini Scultore*, 130; For ancient context, see Trimble, "Beyond Surprise," 29-30.
[14] For literature on early modern restoration practices, see Janet Burnett Grossman, Jerry Podany, and Marion True, *History of Restoration of Ancient Stone Sculptures* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2003); For details on the conversion of the *Standing Hermaphrodite*, see Genevieve S. Gessert, "A Giant Corrupt Body: The Gendering of Renaissance Roma" in *Receptions of Antiquity, Constructions of Gender in European Art, 1300-1600*, ed. Marice Rose and Alison C. Poe (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2015), 108.

mattress and pillow are an entirely separate entity from the ancient figure, not only in its style, but one can see the literal physical divide between the modern and the ancient. This treatment goes beyond simple repairs and surface work. Bernini also restored an ancient sculpture of Ares for the Ludovisi (fig. 3), which required him to restore a putto's head and the pummel for Ares's sword. Miranda Marvin called this restoration an aggressive approach and a collaboration between the ancient and the modern sculptors, as Bernini thoroughly animated both the pummel and the face of the putto, making for very expressive and "scene-stealing" elements that surround the stoic Ares.[15] The collaborations in the Ludovisi *Ares* and the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* means that neither can be identified as wholly ancient as they were transformed by the aesthetics of the seventeenth century.

The goal of this project is to use the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* as a lens to investigate the ways in which antiquity, gender, and the nude form were interpreted in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Through receptions of the Borghese sculpture itself and the nature of its artistic replicas, I will ascertain how a conservative public grappled with the lure of the antique. Using Scipione's and Bernini's reframing of the work and the viewing practices of Grand Tourists, I will unpack the pleasure and unease found in the viewing of a single work and related evolution of its derivations. The artistic tactics found in the reproductions of the Borghese work and changing methods of displaying the figure accommodated and reflected the development of viewing practices and the increased tension found in interactions with the nude intersexual sculpture from the seventeenth century on.

[15] Miranda Marvin, "Possessions of Princes: The Ludovisi Collection," in *History of Restoration of Ancient Stone Sculptures*, ed. Janet Burnett Grossman, Jerry Podany, and Marion True (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2003), 226-7.

Domesticating the Hermaphrodite

In 1447 Lorenzo Ghiberti described a now lost version of the ancient hybrid figure of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* stating: "The eye perceived nothing if the hand not found it by touch."[16] Ghiberti's account registers the early tactile fascination with the intersexual deity that would be capitalized on by Bernini and Scipione. As can be understood from Ghiberti's fifteenth-century account, the figure of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* was not at all unfamiliar by the time the Borghese version was discovered near the church of Santa Maria della Vittoria. Without a clear textual source for the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*'s iconography, the action of the figure and its purpose was open for interpretation by early modern artists and patrons, resulting in many different readings of the figure in the period, including associations with marriage, Adam and Eve, Christ, and even the unification of the nation-state.[17] The refiguration of the Borghese work in a domestic space competes with the natural setting previously preferred for the mythological tale.

As previously mentioned, the ancient Romans likely displayed the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* in a garden context, making the seventeenth-century additions all the more conspicuous. The original ancient display has been interpreted a few different ways by contemporary scholarship, though since the function of the Hermaphrodite as a deity is unclear, these theories are mainly based on context and conjecture. In both Greco-Roman and early modern European cultures, an intersexual person would have certainly been treated negatively, however, as a cult figure, it is believed that the Hermaphrodite was viewed as a protective figure.[18] Aileen

[16] For details about original discovery, see Phyllis Pray Bober and Ruth Rubinstein, *Renaissance Artists & Antique Sculpture: A Handbook of Sources* (London: Harvey Miller Publishers; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 130; For Ghiberti translation, see Leonard Barkan, *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Making of Renaissance Culture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), 164.
[17] See Karl Enekel, "Salmacis, Hermaphrodite, and the Inversion of Gender: Allegorical Interpretations and Pictorial Representations of an Ovidian Myth, ca. 1300–1770" in *The Figure of the Nymph in Early Modern Culture*, ed. Karl Enekel and Anita Taninger (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2018); Liz Oakley-Brown, *Ovid and Culture Politics of Translation in Early Modern England* (Burlington, VT:Ashgate, 2006), 87-9.
[18] Ajootian, "The Only Happy Couple," 229.

Ajootian compares the figure with the use of large disembodied phalluses often recognized as protection symbols during antiquity, arguing that in the case of the Hermaphrodite both aspects of the dual sex would have been used as symbols of protection. In her reading, the female breast served as a talisman of fertility and children, and the male phallus for protection in vulnerable moments, perhaps at the gymnasium or in the bath when one would have been nude and exposed, as Hermaphroditus was abducted by Salmacis while bathing.[19] Was the seventeenth-century audience aware of these ancient functions? It is certainly possible they were aware of them in some respect, though, these theories rely in part on later discoveries of ancient replicas of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*. Early modern knowledge of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*'s outdoor installation by the ancient Romans, if there was any, would have been limited.[20] However, Ovid's telling of the story was very well-known and by the seventeenth century had been artistically depicted many times, so the association with nature would have been inescapable.

Paintings depicting the union of Salmacis and Hermaphroditus prior to the seventeenth century largely refer to Ovid's narrative, specifically through depiction of the spring where Salmacis attacked Hermaphroditus. This can be seen in sixteenth-century works such as Bartholomäus Spranger's painting (fig. 4) and one by Scarsellino in the collection of the Galleria Borghese (fig. 5). Representations of the myth in nature would continue into the seventeenth century through artists like Francesco Albani (fig. 6) and in Francois Perrier's print of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* (fig. 7), which brings the figure into the Borghese gardens with Bernini's pillow. The connection to nature would have been widely understood both intellectually and artistically.[21] So, why was the choice made to recontextualize the Borghese version in a luxurious

[19] Ajootian, "The Only Happy Couple," 230.
[20] Trimble, "Beyond Surprise," 28-9.
[21] See Enekel, "Salmacis, Hermaphroditus."

domestic state? In comparison, the Uffizi *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* (fig. 8) discovered around the same time was kept within the context of nature by sculptor Ippolito Buzzi, who heavily restored the ancient figure and maintained the rocky base.[22] As will be discussed below, Bernini's domestic version would become widely replicated, which prompts one to ask, what was appealing about the context of the mattress?

The early modern additions to the work exist outside of antiquity as it does not recall the original natural environment established by Ovid and recreated by Bernini's contemporaries, and yet the domestic setting would become synonymous with the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* as a kind of "collaboration" between the ancient and the modern.[23] Placing a sleeping figure atop a bed is entirely logical, but given Scipione's promotion of Bernini's talents, was there more to his choice? Clearly, there is not a concern regarding the *historia* of the Hermaphrodite, but the mattress could serve as a display of artistic virtuosity. This might recall the story of the sixteenth-century sculptor Giambologna and his *Rape of the Sabine*, which was created as an experiment in skill. Without an intended narrative, Raffaello Borghini saw the sculpture as a way "only to show the excellence of art, and without intending an *historia*."[24] Giambologna himself wrote that the work could be identified as either a depiction of the *Abduction of Helen* or *Pluto and Propserpina*.[25] A relief was later added to the base of the work that was meant to serve as a kind of visual label, but without any use of text it engendered only further interpretation.[26] The *historia* was a secondary concern for Giambologna; he instead favored the artistic form and invested in a study of the technical challenges of sculpture.[27] Bernini's conception of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* can be seen as

[22] Coliva, *Bernini Scultore*, 131.
[23] Marvin, "Possessions of Princes," 227.
[24] Michael Cole, "Giambologna and the Sculpture with No Name," *Oxford Art Journal*, Vol. 31, No. 3 (2009): 330.
[25] Cole, "Giambologna," 339.
[26] Cole, "Giambologna," 347-9.
[27] Cole, "Giambologna," 342.

analogous to Giambologna's experiment in the balance of three figures in a single life-size marble work, in that Bernini is also displaying a skill for which he would become famous, his ability to mimic a soft object out of marble.

This choice recalls both Ghiberti's reference to tactility in his discussion of a Hermaphrodite sculpture and the broader seventeenth-century experimentation in the manipulation of media to emphasize tangibility. One can observe the impressions made in the marble mattress and pillow as the Hermaphrodite's weight seems to pull on the fabric, creating folds and indentations. The seam wrapped around the edges of the fictive mattress is tightly sealed as the fabric is pulled taut, while allowing for natural dents, curves, and imperfections to occur in the mattress. As a part of Bernini's oeuvre, the tufted mattress works well with his manipulation of marble, as one can observe in his *Pluto and Proserpina* (fig. 9), sculpted around the same time, in which the god of the underworld's hand penetrates Proserpina's thigh as she attempts to escape his clutches. This sort of manipulation can also be seen in the way the Hermaphrodite sinks into the bed and the pillow, which is almost improved upon in the *Pluto and Proserpina* since it was created out of a single block of marble, making for a more unified appearance. Comparatively, Bernini had to carve out a space for the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* to lay, so the figure is actually resting in the mattress, rather than on top of it, as it may seem at first. The choice to create an addition that manipulates marble to produce a hyper realistic object, one in which stone mimics softness and encourages touch, anticipates the approach to sculpture that would become so iconic for the seventeenth century.

Cardinal Scipione Borghese did not keep the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* on regular display. Instead, the work was housed in a decoratively carved walnut chest, which enabled Scipione to control how visitors would experience the work and reveal the mixed sex for them. It seems the

chest could be completely opened to reveal the figure in the round or Scipione could open the top of it for an even more intimate view as one peaked at the resting figure.[28] Given his artistic taste for the mythological and his support of such controversial artists as Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio, his aim was likely playful as opposed to simply a concern for modesty, which was certainly one of the chest's functions.[29] When displayed in the round the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* seems to have been commonly used as a surprise to viewers; starting with the backside, which is usually assumed to be the proper way to approach the work, one would eventually make their way to the other side, where the hybrid figure is revealed.[30] The figure's bilateral state, as the head faces away from the breast and phallus, along with the circular direction of the twisted fabric, naturally lends itself to a circular viewing by way of the form, even without an innovative display. Through clever curating, Scipione could ensure a similar, perhaps more elaborate performance and control the viewing of the controversial figure. He capitalized on the existing state of the work and heightened the experience of the sculpture through a layered unveiling of both the work and the mixed sex. Keeping the sculpture inside a lavishly decorated chest increases the intrigue for the viewer and the layered revelation makes the surprise even more exciting and jarring.

The restoration by Scipione and Bernini places the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* firmly in the interior sphere, which given Ovid's telling of Hermaphroditus's transformation in nature, raises the question of how Scipione wanted the work to be perceived. Not only did he manipulate the viewer's experience by revealing the work twice over, through the opening of the decorative chest and the discovery of the mixed sex, but he brought the figure inside, perhaps for further control of the viewing, but certainly to complement his extravagant and erotic tastes. Scipione and Bernini

[28] Anna Coliva, *Bernini Scultore: La Tecnica Esecutiva* (Rome: De Luca Editori d'Arte, 2002), 133-4.
[29] Genevieve Warwick, *Bernini: Art as Theatre* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2012), 93-4.
[30] Trimble notes how the surprise viewing recalls ancient depictions of the satyr Pan sneaking up on the sleeping Hermaphrodite and repelling at the sight of their penis, Trimble, "Beyond Surprise," 17-8.

established a kind of retelling of the myth that would be solidified in the artistic replicas of the work and the Hermaphrodite's association with nature would subsequently become less important. The 1652 life-size bronze replica commissioned by Diego Velázquez (fig. 10) on behalf of King Philip IV and executed by Matteo Bonuccelli for the Alcázar Palace was one of many modern and ancient works Velázquez sought out for the Spanish monarch on his second trip to Rome.[31] Matteo more closely linked the ancient drapery with the interior space, which without the mattress and pillow has an ambiguous identity, as it could be either a garment or some kind of bedding. He matches the gilded hem of the fabric with the border and tassels of the contemporary pillow securely indicating it as bedding.[32] Matteo Bonuccelli, also known as Buonarelli, was one of Bernini's studio sculptors whose wife was Costanza Buonarelli, Bernini's famous mistress.[33] Despite the dramatic affair with his wife, Matteo continued to have a professional relationship with Bernini throughout his entire career and even though Bernini's name does not appear on the payment records for the replica, he would have likely been consulted. From the commission documents, it is known that a wax mold was made from the original sculpture and any imperfections were smoothed out and fixed, including replacing the missing hand of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, making it a thoroughly modern impression of an ancient work.[34] The commission of a full-scale replica for the Spanish monarch speaks to the influence and popularity of Bernini's conception of the work only a few decades after it was put on display. By replicating both the antique work along with the contemporary additions, the associations with the modern design, sensuality, and the interior would be maintained.

[31] Enriqueta Harris, *Velazquez* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1982), 208-12.
[32] I would like to credit Hayley Watson for pointing out the significance of the gilded decoration in connection to the domestic setting.
[33] Sarah McPhee discusses the inconsistency of his last name in her book on Costanza's life. Sarah McPhee, *Bernini's Beloved: A Portrait of Costanza Piccolomini* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 63.
[34] McPhee, *Bernini's Beloved*, 77-80.

In the centuries following its restoration, multiple copies of the sculpture were produced that depict the famous ancient sculpture paired with Bernini's addition of the mattress, with either an exact copy or a variation of his marble mattress.[35] One of these is a small bronze sculpture (fig. 11) by Giovanni Francesco Susini, cast in 1639. Susini came out of the bronze casting tradition of Giambologna, having inherited the studio of his uncle, Antonio Susini, one of Giambologna's most well-known assistants.[36] A Latin inscription appears on Susini's work, "Behold a double form in one body, wonder at its beauty, you will often find a double heart in one breast, beware of treachery," providing a moral framework for the mysterious figure.[37] The narrator warns the viewer of the "double heart," clearly in reference to the "double form" or the dual sex, acknowledging the lure and justifying the presence of the controversial figure. Susini was not a known poet and to my knowledge, there are no such inscriptions on his other works, so it was likely requested by the patron.[38] In fact, there exists a second bronze copy produced by Susini's studio of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* (fig. 12), currently in a private collection, which lacks any such inscription. The unknown patron may have sought to justify the possession and display of the figure through the inscription, which is elaborately framed upon the center of the bronze's base, so no viewer can overlook it. The inscription works to justify the presence of the figure without compromising the form.

The verse provides a textual interpretation of the piece similar to those done for the *Pluto and Proserpina* and the *Apollo and Daphne*, also sculpted by Bernini and commissioned by the

[35] For details on other replicas see Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500-1900* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981), 234-6.
[36] *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, 1632, Purchases - Authorized - Sculpture - Susini, Giovanni Francesco (1977), Office of the Secretary records, The Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives, New York.
[37] "Hermaphrodite, Giovanni Francesco Susini," The Metropolitan Museum of Art, accessed July 8, 2020, https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/206698.
[38] The original ownership is unknown and the known provenance only extends as far as the early twentieth-century according to the Metropolitan Museum of Art's acquisition report. *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, 1632, Purchases - Authorized - Sculpture - Susini, Giovanni Francesco (1977), Office of the Secretary records, The Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives, New York.

Cardinal Borghese around the same time as the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*. These inscriptions written by the future Pope Urban VIII, Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, have been seen to function as a way to justify the presence of full-scale female nudes.[39] The inscription for the *Apollo and Daphne*, "The lover, who would fleeting beauty clasp, finds bitter fruit, dry leaves are all he'll grasp,"[40] and the one originally found on the now lost base of the *Pluto and Proserpina*, "Oh you who are bending over the earth to gather flowers, look at me as I'm being taken away to the kingdom of the cruel Dis!", both provide a similar moral justification.[41] It has been conjectured that the inscription found on Susini's work may also be by Barberini and was perhaps originally found on the walnut chest in which Scipione housed the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, though there is no period evidence known to support this claim.[42]

To compare the Susini inscription with these two, each provides a moral warning for the viewer, though each differs in its perspective. Those on Bernini's original sculptures serve as a commentary on vanity and the consumption of worldly pleasures, addressing the viewer and their own sins, while the Susini inscription seems to warn the viewer of sinful temptations. The inscriptions for the *Pluto and Proserpina* and for the Susini work both address the viewer, making for a more personal engagement.[43] The *Apollo and Daphne* uses an omniscient voice and refers to "the lover," which could refer to Apollo or to a generic lover caught up in their own desires. The Susini inscription also uses an omniscient voice, unlike Proserpina who speaks directly to the viewer. The speaker in the inscription on Susini's work is trying to create a viewing experience

[39] Genevieve Warwick, "Speaking Statues: Bernini's *Apollo and Daphne* at the Villa Borghese," *Art History* Vol. 27, No. 3 (June 2004): 360.
[40] "Quisquis amans sequitur fugitivae gaudia formae, Fronde manus implet, baccas seu carpit amaras," trans. Warwick, "Speaking Statues," 359.
[41] "Quisquis humi pronus flores legis, inspice, saevi/ me Ditis ad domum rapi," trans. Christina Strunck, "The Poisoned Present: A New Reading of Gianlorenzo Bernini's *Rape of Proserpina*," in *Critical Perspectives on Roman Baroque Sculpture*, ed. Anthony Colantuono and Steven F. Ostrow (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2014), 191.
[42] Coliva, *Bernini Scultore: La Tecnica*, 133.
[43] It has been theorized that the inscription for the Pluto and Proserpina was meant to address the Cardinal Ludovisi, which could account for why it very closely addresses the viewer. Strunck, "Poisoned Present," 2014.

that is both pleasurable and uncomfortable, drawing the viewer in with "beauty" and "wonder" and shaming them as they realize the double form. Given the similar moralizing tone between all three and since they were all commissioned around the same time, it is plausible that the Susini inscription was originally written by Barberini. If the poem had been etched into the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*'s walnut chest, this would have made for an even more intriguing and mysterious unboxing experience for Scipione's guests.

The first two lines are inscribed on the backside of the Susini sculpture, which identifies the figure and encourages the viewer to engage with the small work as one "wonders at its beauty." From the beginning, the viewer is cued to the "double form," though it has yet to be revealed. The second two lines inscribed on the front side of the sculpture, the side of the breasts and genitals, warn the viewer of the "double heart" within the dual figure, underlining the most socially sensitive aspects of the piece. This is likely meant to play on the viewer's anticipation, while making them uncomfortable, should they choose to observe the work closely enough to read the inscription. A close viewing prompts a personal engagement with the nude intersexual figure, especially given the perspective of the narrator that speaks to the viewer. Depending on the sculpture's display, it can also prompt the viewer to recreate the same circular viewing practices previously described. Here, Scipione's whimsical and elaborate display is not found, however; Susini and/or the unknown commissioner utilized literary tactics to artfully and morally frame the work, while acknowledging the controversy that exists within the "beauty" of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*.

The seventeenth-century replicas of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* eventually worked to establish this inseparability between the early modern additions and the ancient figure that is still maintained to this day. Very quickly after the restorations, Bernini and Scipione's domestication of the Hermaphrodite became the most popular model for replications of the famous

ancient figure. Despite the unease with the figure described in the inscription on Susini's bronze, both his and Matteo's reproductions work with the whole figure by treating it as a sculpture meant to be viewed in the round. The gilding Matteo added to the hem of the bedding can be found on both sides of the work, though the two tassels originally on the front side of the sculpture are now missing. Susini certainly could have inscribed the verse on one side of the bronze, so his choice was clearly meant to promote a circular viewing. While viewers may have been uncomfortable with the intersexual nature of the figure, these replicas exhibit a seventeenth-century appreciation for both sides of the work amongst collectors and artists. However, by the eighteenth century, the controversy of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* would be shielded from its audience as a singular viewpoint would become the preference.

The Grand Tour Unease

As the Italian peninsula increased in popularity for British tourists to marvel at the plethora of antiquities, a gap between intrigue and anxiety in the viewing of ancient nude works eventually formed, causing a need for further iconographical solutions. This anxiety would be exemplified by viewings of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* that caused both pleasure and unease. An engagement with the unfamiliar allowed for new kinds of social interaction, one that encouraged passion and wonder. It would seem that the primary goal for the Grand Tour was to expose oneself to the foreign, whether through unfamiliar topography or through art, and it seems the foreign at some level was meant to make the visitors uncomfortable as the reactions to their experiences were often quite visceral.[44] Chloe Chard writes that while travelers were encouraged to wonder at the ancient

[44] Chloe Chard, *Pleasure and Guilt on the Grand Tour: Travel Writing and Imaginative Geography, 1600-1830*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 3-4.

sites and artifacts, "At the same time, travelers register a sense of the dangers of hyperbole."[45] This type of dangerous hyperbole can be seen in such anecdotes as the nineteenth-century English poet Samuel Rogers's fixation on the Uffizi *Venus*, in which period commentary likens him to Pygmalion.[46] This fear of and obsession with nude sculptural antiquities is documented in much travel writing of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries referring to experiences of viewing ancient works as a loss of "'heart… and reason'" or "indescribable" and "baffling."[47] This type of reaction could easily be quelled for Grand Tourists by viewing nude works with a sense of intellect by marveling at the history or the structure and design of the form, rather than the erotic aspects.[48]

The eighteenth-century Scottish poet Tobias Smollett published letters from his travels through France and Italy, in which he described his encounter with the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* both in the Uffizi and in the Borghese. On the Uffizi sculpture he wrote:

> As for the celebrated statue of the hermaphrodite, which we find in another room, I give the sculptor credit for his ingenuity in mingling the sexes in the composition; but it is, at best, no other than a monster in nature, which I never had any pleasure in viewing: nor, indeed, do I think there was much talent required in representing a figure with the head and breasts of a woman, and all the other parts of the body masculine.[49]

And on the Borghese work he wrote:

> And the famous hermaphrodite, which vies with that of Florence: though the most curious circumstance of this article, is the mattress executed and placed by Bernini, with such art and dexterity, that to the view, it rivals the softness of wool, and seems to retain the marks of pressure, according to the figure of the superincumbent statue.[50]

---

[45] Chloe Chard, "Antique Sculptures as Sights and Wonders: The Unease of Viewing and Commenting," *Ricerche Di Storia Dell'arte / Ed. De La Nuova Italia Scientifica Con Il Contributo Del Consiglio Nazionale Delle Ricerche,* 2001, 11-12. The fascination with the Sleeping Hermaphrodite is also exemplified through the nineteenth-century romantic poem by Charles Algernon Swinburne written as a tribute to the Borghese version. *Swinburne's Collected Poetical Works*, (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1924).
[46] Chard, "Antique Sculptures," 9-10.
[47] Chard, "Antique Sculptures," 11.
[48] Chard, "Nakedness and Tourism," 17-20.
[49] Tobias Smollett, *Travels through France and Italy: Containing Observations on Character, Customs, Religion, Government, Police, Commerce, Arts, and Antiquities. With a Particular Description of the Town, Territory, and Climate of Nice: To Which Is Added, a Register of the Weather, Kept during a Residence of Eighteen Months in That City*, London: MDCCLXVI, 1766, Eighteenth Century Collections Online, Gale, 238.
[50] Smollett, *Travels through France and Italy*, 263.

In Florence, Smollett breaks down the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* using his moral standards and claims he did not experience "any pleasure in viewing." He describes the face and breasts as the feminine aspects, identifying the backside as female. However, he avoids detailing the phallus, instead he speaks quite vaguely of it, calling it the "other parts of the body masculine." At the Galleria Borghese, Smollett was able to focus on Bernini's skill in the creation of his mattress and evades discussing the elements in the Uffizi sculpture that he described as monstrous. Using Bernini's mattress, he is able to exhibit some pleasure in his viewing experience while completely avoiding the unease felt at the Uffizi. It is entirely possible that Bernini's additions served a similar purpose for other traveler's, as their eye could travel along creases and indents of the impossibly plush mattress and sidestep a close engagement with the controversial details of the ancient sculpture.

The viewing of an original ancient sculpture, particularly one that was anticipated by tourists through travel literature like Smollett's, or engagement with copies, could cause an exciting and tense experience. The eighteenth-century French sculptor Charles Dupaty warned visitors of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* in the Uffizi: "Never enter the cabinet of the hermaphrodite if you do not wish to blush for pleasure and shame at the same instant."[51] Dupaty's comment points to the ambivalent responses and inherent tensions the Hermaphrodite embodied for the tourist. The pleasure and shame clearly referenced the surprise viewing, as the shame is meant to be experienced upon realizing the mixed sex. This increased tension between the lure of the antique and maintaining an intellectual comportment is where iconographical changes were made in service of its audience. Susini's replica of the Borghese work does not hide or avoid the mixed sex, but rather he highlights it and encourages the viewer to engage both visually and intellectually.

[51] Chard, *Pleasure and Guilt*, 100.

Outside of the elaborate bed frame and tassels added to the pillow, the figure stays true to the original form while the inscription frames the work and guides the viewer as they observe. Susini's bronze allows the viewer to observe the sculpture and interpret the inscription as they see fit, but further control of the image by hiding the breasts and phallus would establish a boundary around controversial aspects of a nude work and avoid the shame Dupaty described.

One example of such control, Louis-Gabriel Blanchet's painting of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, 1765, (fig. 13) is a part of a larger series of eight paintings imitating famous antique sculptures and reconceiving of them in different environments, including the *Apollo Belvedere* and the *Borghese Warrior*. The details of the original commission are unknown, though the series was likely commissioned by John Parker, who owned the Saltram estate where the paintings are still kept. The series may have been commissioned to complement the work of the Neoclassical architect Robert Adam, who was renovating Saltram at the time.[52] Blanchet resided at the French Academy in Rome for most of his career and often worked for the Stuart Court, which allowed him to cross paths with prominent English tourists.[53]

Parker's souvenir from his Grand Tour allowed him to bring some of the most famous ancient statues to his new estate, but Blanchet's conception of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* stands out in the series for its inclusion of the modern additions and contextualization of the sculpture. The work limits the viewer's knowledge by hiding the mixed sex and showing only the backside, while using Bernini's mattress to identify the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* to the educated viewer who must thus imagine the dual sex. The fictive sculpture is depicted at what appears to be an excavation site, despite the inclusion of the early modern additions. The genitalia and breasts are

[52] Olivier Michel, "Un pittore francese a Roma, Louis-Gabriel Blanchet," *Strenna dei Romanisiti*, Vol. 57 (1996): 481.
[53] Edward Corp, "The Stuart Court and the Patronage of Portrait-Painters in Rome, 1717-57," in *Roma Britannica: Art Patronage and Cultural Exchange in 18th Century Rome*, ed. David R. Marshall, Susan Russell, and Karin Wolfe, (London: British School at Rome, 2011), 44-5.

turned away and the mattress tilts the figure toward the viewer. Here, Bernini's additions appear even more soft and plush, particularly in the treatment of the pillow, which echoes Blanchet's treatment of the Hermaphrodite's skin. He adds more texture and the skin appears more supple than its stone or metal counterparts. In fact, the body appears to be more muscular and Rubenesque than the ancient versions of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* and the other paintings in Blanchet's series, which more closely mimic their stone models.

Blanchet's depiction of the *Dying Gaul* (fig. 14) is the only other work in the series that clearly manipulates the stone body, giving the originally slender warrior a more muscular appearance. However, the *Gaul* is not given the same supple skin as the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* and his musculature could easily be found in other marble antique sculptures, like the *Farnese Hercules* (also reproduced in this series) or the *Laocoön*. Stylistically the difference between the painting and the original sculpture is thus not as noticeable as the treatment of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*. This aesthetic similarity is likely because the two paintings were meant to be paired together in their display, which is apparent in the similar setting of a fictive excavation site.[54] The sensuality of Blanchet's *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* is more activated through his painting and the socially troubling parts are completely avoided. Even though the series includes multiple nude figures, the *Hermaphrodite* is the only one given such a significant alteration, and it is one of only two instances in which Blanchet manipulated the medium to the extent that the original figure differs in structure and texture.

After over one hundred years of display and replication, it is reasonable to assume that most educated viewers could easily identify the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* from this angle. With the

[54] Due to complications from the COVID-19 pandemic, I was unable to view the series myself and I have been unsuccessful in my attempts to receive installation shots, so I am not certain about the current or original display of the series. Although, the whole series of eight clearly encourages pairs within the display in terms of Blanchet's choices of style and fictive environments.

help of Bernini's additions the figure's identity is secured, permitting viewers to imagine the mixed sex or to avoid it all together and simply admire the back side. Given the amount of artistic license taken with the figure, especially in comparison to the other paintings in this series, Blanchet's focus on the back view of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* and his soft depiction of the skin were clearly deliberate, whether or not one can confidently understand the intention. Take for example his depiction of the *Apollo Belvedere* (fig. 15), which does not steer far away from the original figure and it is clearly meant to mimic stone. Conversely, his *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* teeters somewhere between a painting of a sculpture and one of an actual person, which puts more emphasis on the skin and potential eroticism rather than any kind of surprise viewing of the mixed sex. As a three-dimensional work that is most optimally viewed in the round, a two-dimensional replication of the figure can only accommodate one viewpoint, so whether Blanchet's depiction is a form of censorship or an aesthetic choice, his decision was clearly purposeful and likely reflected the preferences of the patron. This delimited viewpoint would eventually be adopted for the display of the original work.

As with Blanchet's interpretation, the Borghese sculpture was eventually taken out of Scipione's box and turned away from the viewer. The eighteenth-century renovations of the Borghese galleries saw a major shift in the way the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* was displayed. By the early nineteenth century, along with many other antiquities from the collection, the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* was purchased by Napoleon Bonaparte and moved to Paris, where it remains today. A second ancient copy of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* was moved from the Palazzo Borghese and replaced Bernini's version at the villa (fig. 16). Its exact discovery date is unknown, for this version is not as well documented. However, it is known that eighteenth-century sculptor Andrea Bergondi was responsible for the restoration of the work and the additions, so it was likely

discovered around the mid-eighteenth century in Rome.[55] Bergondi's version did not see the same fanciful display as Scipione's original, but he does echo the seventeenth-century conception. Like Bernini, Bergondi placed the ancient figure in a domestic setting on a bed of sculpted sheets, though, as opposed to Bernini's tufted mattress, which makes a clear distinction between the original and the additions, there is less contrast between the early modern accessories and the ancient figure. Bergondi's sheets mimic the ancient ones, so that they blend together and appear seamlessly unified.

It is unclear how the figure was originally installed, but since at least the mid-nineteenth century and possibly from the late eighteenth century, it seems the work has been mainly displayed with the dual-sex facing away from the viewer. Given Blanchet's chosen angle, as well as Francois Perrier's previously described print, there was an apparent trend forming. This angle was also reproduced in a drawing by Filippo Castelli for Richard Topham's early eighteenth-century collection (fig. 17). The drawing was for Topham's paper museum of antiquities, commissioned from England, for Topham had never actually seen the sculptures in person. A drawing of the other side of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* does not exist in his collection.[56] From these examples it is clear that the backside of the figure had become the preferred viewpoint, certainly for two-dimensional works. Additionally, the previously mentioned full-scale replica for the Spanish monarchy may have also been eventually presented from the backside, similar to Bergondi's version. Today, exhibited in the Prado, viewers can interact with the work in the round, which reveals a curious difference between the two sides of the sculpture. As has already been mentioned, Matteo's version follows the original very closely, but adds gilding to the trim of the drapery and

[55] Carole Paul, *The Borghese Collections and the Display of Art in the Age of the Grand Tour* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008), 269.
[56] See Louisa M. Connor Bulman, "The Florentine Draughtsmen in Richard Topham's Paper Museum," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Lettere e Filosofia*, Serie IV, Vol. 7, No. 2 (2002): 343-357.

gilded tassels to the pillow, making for a more luxurious domestic environment. However, the opposite side of the work (fig. 18) is missing the tassels leaving only holes where they would have originally been. It is possible that like Bergondi's version, the work was also turned away from the viewers given that the tassels likely were taken off and never replaced.[57]

Michael Cole points out the investment in multiple viewpoints in Giambologna's *Rape of the Sabine*, which like the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, is most optimally viewed in the round. As Cole suggests, the narrative of the sculpture changes from different angles, just as the perception of gender evolves in viewing the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*. He adduces prints of the *Rape of the Sabine*, using Bartolomeo Sermartelli's prints (fig. 19) of the sculpture as an example in which more than one angle is reproduced showing the value of three-dimensionality in a two-dimensional reproduction.[58] By contrast, the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* is largely recreated in prints and paintings from a single angle.[59] An engraving from Ennio Quirino Visconti's late eighteenth-century description of the newly renovated Villa Borghese (fig. 20) depicts Bernini's version of the sculpture after it was re-installed in the Stanza dell'Ermafrodito. The print illustrates the new base created for the work, complete with elaborate sphinxes on the legs. The sculpture is shown facing away from the viewer, which presumably was Visconti's viewpoint as well, as he describes it as being placed before a small niche. Thus it seems likely that Bernini's work received the same treatment that Bergondi's version maintains today.[60]

[57] Further evidence would need to be done when I have access to more materials after the pandemic to securely make this claim as this sculpture is not widely researched in anglophone scholarship.
[58] Cole, "Giambologna," 345-7.
[59] There are some examples of reproductions of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* from an aerial viewpoint, like in Paolo Alessandro Maffei's 1704 engraving, but I have yet to find a two-dimensional reproduction that depicts the side with the breasts and phallus from the period.
[60] Ennio Quirino Visconti, *Sculture del Palazzo della Villa Borghese detta Pinciana: brevemente descritte* (Rome: Nella Stamperia Pagliarini, 1796), 44.

Bergondi's *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* was, and still is, placed up against a lateral wall in front of the same shallow painted niche described by Visconti in the Galleria Borghese, with the backside to the viewer, and an ancient mosaic occupies the center of the floor.[61] Today the room is mostly roped off to keep visitors off the mosaic, so there can be no close interaction with the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*. In fact, one cannot even crane one's head over the figure to view the breasts or phallus, so as in Blanchet's painting, the intersexual nature of the figure is completely censored and instead must be imagined. From a mid-nineteenth-century photograph (fig. 21), it can be deduced that Bergondi's *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* has been in its current position for at least two hundred years. Given the renovations of the villa in the late eighteenth century and the subsequent rearrangement of the collection after the purchase by Napoleon, it is likely that Bergondi's version was installed as it is displayed today.[62] Considering how common the singular viewpoint had become by the eighteenth century and the angle of Visconti's engraving, which was created before Napoleon's purchase of the Borghese collection, Bernini's version would have very likely been subject to a censored display as well.

Certainly, censorship was not the only goal in the presentation of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite,* and the evolving displays of the sculpture were likely a consequence of a fascination with the work. This has been suggested by the previously mentioned comment by sculptor Charles Dupaty, who was clearly uncomfortable with the mixed sex as he describes the pleasure and shame experienced in his viewing of the Uffizi *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*.[63] His pleasure was perhaps found in the sensuality of the *Hermaphrodite*'s 'eel-like form' that the

[61] From recreations of the decoration after the Galleria Borghese renovations, this appears to be the same niche Visconti illustrated. Visconti, *Sculture del Palazzo della Villa Borghese,* 44-5.
[62] See Carole Paul and Alberta Campitelli, *Making a Prince's Museum: Drawings for the Late-eighteenth-century Redecoration of the Villa Borghese*, (Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 2000).
[63] Ref. page 15.

painter Hugh William Williams described.[64] The attractions of tactility and sensuality, which were complicated by the mixed sex and homosexual implications that might cause the shame about which Dupaty warned his fellow viewers, can be easily reconciled by turning the sculpture around.[65] A possible visual response to the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, Antonio Canova's *Sleeping Nymph* (fig. 22) closely follows the pose and base of the Uffizi version (fig. 8) to the point where it could almost be considered a replica. Unlike other ancient versions of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, the Uffizi sculpture does not exhibit a stretching figure, but a more passive one as both feet rest on the base. Canova's nymph mimics this pose and the rocky terrain that the Uffizi Hermaphrodite rests upon. However, the nymph is more censored as her arm comes down to cover her breast, which is more exposed in the ancient work. The representation of a female figure and reproduction of the pose castrates the Hermaphrodite, which could provide a more pleasurable figure for someone like Dupaty to desire. Dupaty clearly enjoyed the ancient work given the pleasure he described, but his pleasure was interrupted, likely by the exposed genitals, so being able to avoid the shame, in a work like Canova's *Sleeping Nymph*, could allow viewers to maintain their pleasure.

An alternative to castration was the refiguration of the narrative of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* to match the social ideals of English tourists. Lady Dorothy Townshend commented on a replica of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* commissioned by her nephew Horace Walpole, calling it "the only happy married couple she ever saw."[66] In fact, there is a history of the story of Salmacis and Hermaphroditus being treated as an ideal example of a marriage and the

[64] Ref. note 11.
[65] For a discussion of homosexual implications in the period, see Victoria Donnellan, "Ethics and Erotics: Receptions of an Ancient Statue of a Nymph and Satyr," in *Sculpture, Sexuality and History: Encounters in Literature, Culture and the Arts from the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, ed. Jana Funke and Jen Grove (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 145-67.
[66] Horace Walpole, Volume 18, *The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, ed. W.S. Lewis (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1954), 342.

values of chastity.[67] Carole Paul's analysis of the interior decoration of the Villa Borghese notes the redecoration of the Stanza dell'Ermafrodito that took place during the renovations of the galleries. The ceiling frescos painted by Nicola Buonvicini of the Ovidian tale (fig. 23) depict the son of Hermes and Aphrodite resisting the advances of the water nymph in an elegant Neoclassical style; this narrative context perhaps supplied a key for eighteenth-century viewers to justify the viewing of the sculpture under the guise of chaste love.[68]

The evolution of reproduction and display of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* fused the work with the modern interior context and eventually led to a single viewpoint display. Even though, in the Galleria Borghese, the sculpture was eventually turned away from its audience, there is still an evident effort to preserve the integrity of the figure, while hiding the controversial aspects of the work. Restoration trends through the eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries would see more invasive physical changes made to ancient sculptures. The restorations made to the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* were simple and surface based.[69] Bernini's additions work with the sleeping nature of the figure and his mattress could be interpreted as a very elaborate support. The trends in the restoration of ancient sculptures would become increasingly more radical. As early as the seventeenth century, as can be seen in the censorship of the previously illustrated *Standing Hermaphrodite/Venus* (fig. 2) that was originally owned by the Ludovisi, interventions made to reidentify ancient sculptures were becoming more common. By the early nineteenth century, such reidentifications would become more frequent and extreme to fit the needs of collectors.

[67] Enenkel, "Salmacis, Hermaphrodite," 78-9.
[68] Carole Paul, *The Borghese Collections,* 192-3.
[69] For further documentation on the restorations of the sculpture, see Coliva, *Bernini Scultore: La Tecnica*, 136.

Hermaphrodite Turned Venus

The common practice of restoring ancient sculptures grew into a more elaborate one by the eighteenth century. Unlike the additions to the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* that enhance the figure's actions and frame the intersexual figure in a luxurious setting, some features of antique sculptures were completely removed, thereby changing the identity of the figure. An ancient work could experience several different identity changes to fit a collector's needs or desires.[70] In 1809, eight years after its purchase from Lord Bessborough's Roehampton estate, Henry Blundell of Ince described the transformation of his *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* into a *Sleeping Venus* (fig. 24):

> When bought, it was in the character of an Hermaphrodite, with three little brats crawling about its breast. The figure was unnatural and very disgusting to the sight; but by means of a little castration and cutting away the little brats, it became a sleeping Venus, and as pleasing a figure as any in this Collection.[71]

Although it shares a similar identity and restful state with the Borghese sculpture, the presence of the children evidently hindered the eighteenth-century male viewer's ability to find the figure desirable. A drawing depicting the original form prior to Blundell's interventions (fig. 25) shows three infant figures, one suckling the Hermaphrodite's breast. The children or "brats" were the obvious source of Blundell's disgust. Prior to Blundell's purchase the sculpture had experienced heavy restorations to most of its limbs, as well as the face, so it was likely in a very acceptable state upon its purchase. His restorations were evidently not motivated by an effort to preserve the sculpture. [72]

There would have been less visual play possible with this *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*. The mixed gender and the children would have been prominent for every viewer as the Blundell

[70] Seymour Howard, *Antiquity Restored: Essays on the Afterlife of the Antique* (Vienna: IRSA, 1990), 129.
[71] Howard, *Antiquity Restored*, 117.
[72] Elizabeth Bartman, *The Ince Blundell Collection of Classical Sculputre: Volume III – The Ideal Sculpture* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2017), 35.

sculpture is not designed to be viewed in the round.[73] Unlike the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, all of the elements of Blundell's *Hermaphrodite* would have been accessible from one angle as the figure does not lay on their stomach, so there is no surprise viewing with this work. Blundell's sculpture sleeps in a similar pose to a *Sleeping Ariadne* and in relation to the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, the figure is flipped over, openly displaying the nude figure and the now removed phallus. The figure's arched back allows the breasts to be immediately seen by the viewer and the extreme passivity of the limp body allows a pleasurable, voyeuristic viewing to naturally occur. However, the phallus, too, would have been prominent, perhaps causing even more unease with the intersexual figure than with the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*.

This particular type of the Hermaphrodite is not completely unique, but the iconography is rare, especially in a life-sized sculpture. There exists only one other report of an ancient Hermaphrodite accompanied by infant children in a sculptural form, a work which was purchased by the Earl of Shelbourne from Gavin Hamilton in the mid-eighteenth century (fig. 26). There is less known about the original state of this work than the Blundell piece; the infant figures were also removed, though unlike Blundell's, it has retained its intersexual identity.[74] In a survey of the Blundell collection, Elizabeth Bartman discusses the implications of this particular type, as well as the popularity of nude sleeping images for collectors of antiquities. Bartman compares the infants found with the Hermaphrodite to the child figures found in depictions of Priapus and Bacchus. She notes another incident in which the Farnese *Dead Amazon* also had a child removed from its breast in the late eighteenth century, which raises the possibility that it is the act of breastfeeding that is objectionable.[75] As Bartman states, "Although he substituted one subject for

[73] Howard, *Antiquity Restored*, 120.
[74] Bartman, *Ince Blundell*, 37. For a list of other ancient depictions of the Hermaphrodite, see *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*, (Zürich: Artemis, 1981).
[75] Bartman, *Ince Blundell*, 38.

another, Blundell did not sacrifice the eroticism of the female figure."[76] Blundell's decision stems from a desire for the female nude form that was interrupted, not only by the presence of a phallus, but it seems, even more objectionably, by the display of a feminine body used as a source of nurturing rather than voyeuristic pleasure.

Seymour Howard has discussed Blundell's decision to refigure the work as a female as an effort to neutralize the image. Ovid's interpretation of Hermaphroditus's transformation depicts a kind of vasectomy as he becomes impotent.[77] In fact, the term hermaphrodite has been used since antiquity as a derogatory term, often in reference to a man becoming effeminate with the coming of spring.[78] While on the Grand Tour, the Irish politician and philosopher Edmund Burke noted the "dangerously alluring forces of effemination" and stated that beauty, which he directly associated with femininity, "acts by relaxing the solids of the whole system," similarly to Hermaphroditus's softened form, thereby giving the viewer pleasure and putting them at risk of being seduced.[79] Blundell thus removed any such threatening implications for the male viewer and retained the eroticism, the viewer's source of pleasure. Like the replicas and the eighteenth-century changes to the display of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, Blundell's restorations and re-identification were used as a way to control the image in order to achieve a desired viewing. However, unlike Scipione and Bernini, Blundell did not value the original state of the sculpture and instead radically adapted the work for insertion into his collection, which seems to have been motivated more by quantity than quality.[80]

---

[76] Ibid..
[77] Howard, *Antiquity Restored*, 122.
[78] Robinson, "Salmacis and Hermaphroditus," 213-4.
[79] Chard, *Pleasure and Guilt*, 117-9.
[80] Edmund Southworth, "The Role of the Collector: Henry Blundell of Ince," in *History of Restoration of Ancient Stone Sculptures*, ed. Janet Burnett Grossman, Jerry Podany, and Marion True (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2003), 105-14.

Thinking through Replication

What then does two centuries of viewing, display, and reproduction bring to our understanding of original object of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*? The objects discussed here, separated in historical time and place, served to recast the original Borghese work by means of shifts in context and display without altering the iconography. George Kubler's *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things* lays a foundation for understanding the unfolding of what he calls "series," that originate from a "prime object," which according to Kubler, like a prime number, cannot be deconstructed for it has no antecedent.[81] The Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* is not strictly an original because of the many ancient Roman copies that exist; however, Bernini's additions to the ancient statue launched a new strand of the series that had been previously established by the lost Greek original and its Roman copies. This version could have easily remained a novel augmentation of an antique and a minor work in Bernini's career, but the changes made became even more significant than Bernini or Scipione could have anticipated. One reason for the Borghese sculpture's popularity could be the appeal of the familiar setting for the ancient figure, the modern mattress. The extremely realistic representation pairs this familiar life-size object with the mysterious sculpture of the Hermaphrodite, a work centuries removed from the early modern audience whose function during antiquity would have been even more perplexing than it is for contemporary scholars. Through Bernini's additions, the Hermaphrodite was brought into a particularly intimate space, allowing the audience to associate the figure with their everyday lives. The artists who created the replicas of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* maintain this odd pairing of modern furniture and an ancient figure, making it synonymous with the figure and shaping the continued unfolding of the series.

[81] George Kubler, *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1962), 35.

Kubler discussed the augmentations of replications, though the particularities of artistic replications that take creative license with their referent are not directly addressed in his text; he uses the term "augment" to distinguish artistic replicas from generic copies meant for mass consumption, stating that such replicas "may be described as motions towards and away from quality."[82] The replicas I have examined do not borrow from or echo the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, rather they directly recreate the form, acknowledging themselves as replicas while maintaining a creative quality and some form of originality. In contrast to these is Canova's *Venus Victrix* (fig. 27), a portrait of Pauline Bonaparte in mythological guise, which was sculpted around the same time that her brother purchased and transported much of the Borghese antiquities collection to Paris. Considering the departure of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* at this time, Canova's work was in clear dialog with Bernini's additions and the ancient sculpture, since it features a nude figure reclining on a mattress. Canova's treatment of the mattress and pillow was clearly aimed to be even more luxurious and Pauline is more erect and alert than the Hermaphrodite. One could consider it a modern response and an indirect replacement for the ancient work, especially given the Neoclassical style of the body and hair. The Borghese replicas discussed in this project fall somewhere between a generic copy and an original work that echoes a referent, as seen in Canova's *Venus Victrix* or in his previously mentioned *Sleeping Nymph*, while still taking creative liberties. The embellishments made to works like Susini's and Blanchet's distinguish themselves as creative as opposed to generic and are significant as a visual response to their referent, which, as has been argued, seeks to reframe the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite.*

Whitney Davis's *Replications: Archaeology, Art History, Psychoanalysis* examines the function of replicating and how the study of artistic traditions from the paleolithic through the

[82] Kubler, *The Shape of Time*, 69.

modern era has developed. At the core of his book, Davis attempts to link the three disciplines, using art history as the bridge between archaeology and psychoanalysis. Davis engages Kubler's theories in relation to the art historical development of style as seen through a sequential development of form from a mythic original. While he agrees that visual representation is shaped through sequences similar to Kubler's series, Davis uses him and other scholars to critique art history's dependence on a singular object as proof for the autonomous origin of these sequences or styles.[83] According to Davis, these sequences are formed, in part, by the intentionality found in creating, referencing, and even viewing a representation, intentionality being one of the psychological elements he argues is used by art historians.[84] At a basic level, the commissions of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* replicas were certainly intentional, as they show how much patrons wanted both the ancient and early modern elements to be recreated. It can be safely said that the existence of so many replicas speaks to the popularity of the sculpture. The mere reproduction of the sculpture can be attributed to the motivations of collectors like King Philip IV or John Parker, but the changes made to the original iconography raise questions beyond simple supply and demand that presumably motivated the production of generic, mass-produced copies. As I have argued, the changes made to the original iconography in the replications by Susini and Blanchet are perhaps products of a society that was uncomfortable with viewing the controversial intersexual figure. The value of ancient sculptures promoted by the Grand Tour is a clear reason for the reproduction of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, but what is the significance of including Bernini's additions, especially given how quickly his popularity diminished by the eighteenth

[83] Whitney Davis, *Replications: Archaeology, Art History, Psychoanalysis*, ed. Whitney Davis and Richard W. Quinn (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996), 42.
[84] Davis, *Replications*, 42, 120-1.

century? Had the seventeenth-century additions and the domestic iconography become inseparable from the ancient form?

Davis considers a form of intentionality in representation that may be seen in additions by an artist and viewer to an image whose original intentions are unknown. This type of sequential development of form speaks to the alterations to the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* by Bernini and the changes made in its reproductions. Davis notes how in prehistoric art "preexisting marks might be turned into depictions," meaning something unintentional could later be assigned meaning.[85] Likewise, Bernini's additions did not anticipate the effects of later replications or displays of the work; rather the meaning of the work changed over time to fit either the style of the artist or the perspective of the audience or patron. The way in which his iconography is used by Blanchet to artfully allow for censorship or mystery could not have been predicted by Bernini or Scipione. They deliberately altered the work and removed it from a purely ancient context; their original unknown intention developed with changing perspectives of viewing and new intentions. In this case, do the changes made to the replicas ultimately have more effect on how the sculpture is viewed and curated than Bernini's original work alone?

Davis discusses the historical collapse created through the study of replication through comparison: "by eliminating the gap between the artworks, since they are 'in' one another, comparative art history must somehow reinstitute the gap at the absolute limit of all artworks: if art historicity is a whole, then it is, of course, separate from non-art historicity."[86] A replication cannot stand outside of its referent for they are inherently connected, which is again where Davis critiques art historians for their dependence on the original, or as he calls it "Figure 1," treating

[85] Davis, *Replications*, 168.
[86] Davis, *Replications*, 141.

objects as a whole and complete, outside of art historicity.[87] When observing the replicas of the Borghese sculpture, can the original referent escape the effect of its reproductions? In Davis's application of his theories to more modern works, he analyzes the classic "compare and contrast" tactic used in art history.

Davis utilizes the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* in his examination of art history's use of juxtaposition in studying style, but fails to acknowledge the nature of the Borghese work and therefore the intention behind its citation. In his analysis of comparison, he denounces the idea that art is autonomous by claiming that repeated representations do not exist separately, but rather as a part of their referent. In one example, he compares the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* with the contemporary painter Eric Fischl's *The Sheer Weight of History* (fig. 28), writing "the Hellenistic sculpture placed on the left side of the depicted space and thus to a degree literally 'in' the painting… It does not stand apart from, completely outside and before, *Sheer Weight of History* but, instead, is the weight of history."[88] While I agree that the replica is inseparable from its referent, Davis does not acknowledge the Hellenistic sculpture's existence as a replica itself, citing the Borghese version as the definitive point of reference. Secondly, given the iconographic details, the sculpture recreated in this painting cannot be comfortably identified with the Borghese work. Rather, the sculpture Fischl depicted is closer to the lesser known Uffizi *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*. Bernini's mattress is not recreated in the painting and the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*'s toe does not catch the fabric, which is found in the Borghese sculpture and other ancient versions. Like the Uffizi sculpture, Fischl's painting features a much more limp and passive figure. This could very well have been a deliberate choice to more clearly symbolize the heavy "weight of history," adding an arm that hangs with dead weight, making the marble figure seem even heavier. Additionally,

[87] Davis, *Replications*, 142-44.
[88] Davis, *Replications*, 139.

the exclusion of Bernini's tufted mattress eliminates this as a reference, as Fischl's Hermaphrodite lays atop a rocky base that closely resembles the one in the Uffizi. The glaring inconsistencies in Davis's comparison demonstrates the inseparable link between the modern and the antique. At this point, no one could claim to cite the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* without Bernini's mattress.

Davis ignores the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*'s identity as a replica of a supposed lost original, instead, he refers to it as if it is an autonomous work itself, which seems to contradict exactly what he argues. It is not my intention to strictly argue that Fischl was directly referencing the Uffizi *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, it could be a generic reference to the Hellenistic replicas, meant to encompass this symbolic "weight." For Fischl's purposes, a specific point of reference does not seem necessary and unlike the replications previously outlined in this project, this kind of citation, like Canova's *Sleeping Nymph*, is open to interpretation. But what if Fischl is directly referring to the Uffizi sculpture? Does that change Davis's interpretation that the ancient referent exists within the contemporary painting? The clear symbolism of the work and the title allows for this kind of narrative. Could he possibly be trying to represent the institutional space of a museum like the Uffizi? Considering these options, Davis's analysis missed multiple opportunities to analyze a layered referent, which the Borghese and Uffizi versions constitute as they are both simultaneously ancient and modern.

The echoes of Bernini's creation still continue today in the work of the Brooklyn-based sculptor Barry X Ball, who has created multiple life-size versions of the Borghese sculpture in various materials including black Belgian marble, white Iranian marble, and pink onyx, utilizing the assistance of the new technique of robotic sculpting (fig. 29). The material changes the texture of the piece; in particular, the black marble version appears more stark in its mix of a glossy finish of the nude figure and matte finish of the pillow, mattress, and fabric; again, this contrast recalls

the tactility Lorenzo Ghiberti observed centuries prior. In fact, the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, like many ancient sculptures, was very likely painted in antiquity, which might have resulted in a starker contrast between the body and the drapery in the original work.[89] Not only does Ball build upon the piece through new materials and processes, but he even adjusts the iconography by enhancing the size of the phallus, which situates its aesthetics within contemporary beauty standards as opposed to the small phalluses favored during antiquity.[90] Ball's enhancement of the phallus also seems to embrace the intersexual figure, which works well to reflect our society's increasingly progressive views on the transgender and queer population.[91] However, outside of Ball's artistic innovation, the viewing practices of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* experienced by the general public still reflect those established by the early modern period.

Today visitors to the Louvre are still prompted by teachers, parents, guides, and the curatorial display to engage in the surprise viewing of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*. The sculpture is exhibited in the round, although the side with the breasts and phallus faces a wall, so even without a guide, the surprise viewing can be achieved, even by chance. Interested, educated, or guided viewers will explore the other side and recreate the performance; others may only observe the back view and move on. In my own observations, most viewers at the Louvre seek the front of the sculpture and typically do not linger, perhaps satisfied that they completed the expected performance. Contemporary artist Mark Lewis shot a film called *Nude* in 2015, which featured the sculpture and recreates the precise revelation traditionally experienced. The film was shot after hours at the Louvre and utilizes a darker lighting to create a more intimate moment in the empty museum, which Elsje van Kessel says "befits a private engagement with this tantalizing stone

[89] Trimble, "Beyond Surpise," 14.
[90] Barry X Ball, "Remaking Sculpture: Artist Barry X Ball," interview by Jed Morse, *360 Speaker Series*, Nasher Sculpture Center, January 30, 2020, video, 1:33:21, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JnsluUxpH4Y&t=2412s.
[91] Daniel McDermon, "What the Sleeping Hermaphrodite Tells Us About Art, Sex and Good Taste," *The New York Times*, June 24, 2016, https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/06/27/arts/design/statue-hermaphrodite.html.

body."[92] Even amongst contemporary artists, observations of the work reflect some of the early modern viewing practices. Ball's pink onyx version of the *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* is currently on display at the Nasher Sculpture Center in Dallas and is exhibited facing a freestanding wall, again, prompting a similar viewing experience. Given Scipione's playful curating, the textual additions to Susini's sculpture that warn the viewer of the "double heart" found in the mixed sex, and the way Blanchet hid the genitalia of the Hermaphrodite, the struggle to view this figure clearly shapes its artistic replicas and exemplifies the contradiction of the troubling and seductive fascination with the figure. The early modern iconography of the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* shifted the status of this particular antique and became an important referent for artistic replications, which reflected the tensions of its viewing public. Whether or not these tensions still hold sway today, the evolution of display and viewing the Borghese *Sleeping Hermaphrodite* clearly continues to affect the curatorial choices for the work and maintain a prescribed viewing.

[92] Elsje van Kessel, "Longing for the Past: Eichendorff's *Marmorbild*, Historical Experience, and the Sexuality of the Masterpieces Room," in *Sculpture, Sexuality and History: Encounters in Literature, Culture and the Arts from the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, ed. Jana Funke and Jen Grove (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 57-8.

Image Appendix:

Fig 1: Unknown, *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, 2nd Century CE, marble; Gianlorenzo Bernini, mattress/pillow, 1620, marble, Louvre Museum, Paris. Image source: Wikimedia Commons

Fig. 2: Unknown, *Standing Hermaphrodite*, 1st-2nd century CE, marble, converted into *Venus* in the 17th century, Galleria Doria Pamphili, Rome. Photo by author.

Fig. 3: Unknown, *Ludovisi Ares*, 2nd century CE, marble; Gianlorenzo Bernini, restorations, 1622, Museo Nazionale Romano, Palazzo Altemps, Rome. Image source: Wikimedia Commons.

Fig. 4: Bartholomäus Spranger, *Hermaphroditus and Salmacis*, 1580-2, oil on canvas, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. Image source: Enekel, "Salmacis, Hermaphrodite," 106.

Fig. 5: Scarsellino, *Salmacis and Hermaphroditus*, between 1580-95, oil on panel, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Image source: Enekel, "Salmacis, Hermaphrodite," 93.

Fig. 6: Francesco Albani, *Salmacis and Hermaphroditus*, c. 1645, oil on canvas, Galleria Sabauda, Turin. Image source: Enekel, "Salmacis, Hermaphrodite," 89.

Fig. 7: Francois Perrier, *Sleeping Hermaphrodite in the Borghese Gardens*, 1638, copper engraving, private collection. Image source: Anna Coliva, *Bernini Scultore*, 132.

Fig. 8: Unknown, *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, c. 2nd century CE, marble; Ippolito Buzzi, restoration, 1621-23, Uffizi Galleries. Image source: Natalie Watson, Wonderful Things.

Fig. 9: Gianlorenzo Bernini, *Pluto and Prosperina*, 1621-22, marble, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Image source: Artsy.

Fig. 10: Matteo Bonuccelli, *Hermaphrodite*, 1652, bronze, Museo del Prado. Image source: Museo del Prado.

Fig. 11: Giovanni Francesco Susini, *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, 1639, bronze, Metropolitan Museum of Art. Image source: Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Fig. 12: Giovanni Francesco Susini, *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, c. 1625-1646, bronze, private collection. Image source: Christie's Auction House.

Fig. 13: Louis Gabriel Blanchet, *Borghese Hermaphrodite*, 1765, oil on canvas, Saltram, Devon. Image source: Wikimedia commons.

Fig. 14: Louis Gabriel Blanchet, *Dying Gaul*, 1765, oil on canvas, Saltram, Devon. Image source: Art UK.

Fig. 15: Louis Gabriel Blanchet, *Apollo Belvedere*, 1765, oil on canvas, Saltram, Devon. Image source: Art UK.

Fig. 16: Unknown, *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, 2nd Century CE, marble; Andrea Bergondi, mattress/restorations, c. 1721-1789, Galleria Borghese. Image source: Getty Images.

Fig. 17: After Filippo Castelli, *Study of the Borghese Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, c. 1710-30, red chalk on paper, Eaton College Library. Image source: British Museum.

Fig. 18: Matteo Bonuccelli, *Hermaphrodite*, 1652, bronze, Museo del Prado. Image source: Artnet News.

Fig. 19: Bartolomeo Sermartelli, *Giambologna's Rape of the Sabine*, 1583, woodcut, Beinecke Library, Yale University. Image source: Web Gallery of Art.

Fig. 20: E.Q. Visconti, *Sleeping Hermaphrodite,* 1796, engraving, from E.Q. Visconti *Sculture del Palazzo della Villa Borghese detta Pinciana: brevemente descritte*, vol. 11. Image source: Anna Coliva, *Bernini Scultore: La Tecnica Esecutiva* (Rome: De Luca Editori d'Arte, 2002), 134.

Fig. 21: Unknown, *Hermaphrodite in Villa Borghese*, 1859, albumen silver print, The J. Paul Getty Museum. Image source: The J. Paul Getty Museum.

Fig. 22: Antonio Canova, *Sleeping Nymph*, c. 1820-24, marble; finished by Canova workshop after death, The Victoria & Albert Museum. Image source: The Victoria & Albert Museum.

Fig. 23: Nicola Buonvicini, *Ceiling of the Stanza dell'Ermafrodito*, 1781-2, fesco, Galleria Borghese. Image source: Carole Paul, *The Borghese Collections and the Display of Art in the Age of the Grand Tour* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008), 193.

Fig. 24: Unknown, *Sleeping Venus/Hermaphrodite*, c. 1st-2nd Century CE, marble, National Museums Liverpool, World Museum. Image source: National Museums Liverpool.

Fig. 25: Unknown, *Sleeping Hermaphrodite with three infants*, c. late 18th century CE, drawing, Charles Townley collection, British Museum. Image source: British Museum.

Fig. 26: Unknown, *Hermaphroditus*, c. 2nd century CE, marble, private collection. Image source: Christie's.

Fig. 27: Antonio Canova, *Venus Victrix*, 1805-8, marble, Galleria Borghese. Image source: Encyclopedia Britannica.

Fig. 28: Eric Fischl, *The Sheer Weight of History*, 1982, oil on canvas. Image source: WikiArt.

Fig. 29: Barry X Ball, *Sleeping Hermaphrodite*, 2008-10, Belgian marble, private collection. Image source: New York Times.

Bibliography:

Ajootian, Aileen. "The Only Happy Couple: Hermaphroditos and Gender." In *Naked Truths: Women, sexuality, and gender in classical art and archaeology*, edited by Ann Olga Koloski-Ostrow and Claire L. Lyons, 220-242. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Ball, Barry X. "Remaking Sculpture: Artist Barry X Ball." Interview by Jed Morse, *360 Speaker Series*, Nasher Sculpture Center, January 30, 2020. Video, 1:33:21. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JnsluUxpH4Y&t=2412s.

Barkan, Leonard. *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Making of Renaissance Culture*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999.

Bartman, Elizabeth. *The Ince Blundell Collection of Classical Sculputre: Volume III – The Ideal Sculpture*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2017.

Bober, Phyllis Pray and Ruth Rubinstein. *Renaissance Artists & Antique Sculpture: A Handbook of Sources*. London: Harvey Miller Publishers; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Bulman, Louisa M. Connor. "The Florentine Draughtsmen in Richard Topham's Paper Museum." *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Lettere e Filosofia*, Serie IV, Vol. 7, No. 2 (2002): 343-357.

Chard, Chloe. "Antique Sculptures as Sights and Wonders: The Unease of Viewing and Commenting." *Ricerche Di Storia Dell'arte / Ed. De La Nuova Italia Scientifica Con Il Contributo Del Consiglio Nazionale Delle Ricerche*, 2001, 9-20.

Chard, Chloe. "Nakedness and Tourism: Classical Sculpture and the Imaginative Geography of the Grand Tour." *Oxford Art Journal*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (1995), 14-28.

Chard, Chloe. *Pleasure and Guilt on the Grand Tour: Travel Writing and Imaginative Geography, 1600-1830*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.

Cole, Michael. "Giambologna and the Sculpture with No Name." *Oxford Art Journal*, Vol. 31, No. 3 (2009): 337-60.

Coliva, Anna. *Bernini Scultore: La Tecnica Esecutiva*. Rome: De Luca Editori d'Arte, 2002.

Coliva, Anna, Sebastian Schütze, Galleria Borghese, and Bibliotheca Hertziana, Max-Planck-Institut. *Bernini Scultore: La Nascita Del Barocco in Casa Borghese*. Rome: Edizioni De Luca, 1998.

Corp, Edward. "The Stuart Court and the Patronage of Portrait-Painters in Rome, 1717-57." In *Roma Britannica: Art Patronage and Cultural Exchange in 18th Century Rome*, edited by David R. Marshall, Susan Russell, and Karin Wolfe, 39-51. London: British School at Rome, 2011.

Davis, Whitney. *Replications: Archaeology, Art History, Psychoanalysis*, edited by Whitney Davis and Richard W. Quinn. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.

Donnellan, Victoria. "Ethics and Erotics: Receptions of an Ancient Statue of a Nymph and Satyr." In *Sculpture, Sexuality and History: Encounters in Literature, Culture and the Arts from the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, edited by Jana Funke and Jen Grove, 145-67. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

Enekel, Karl. "Salmacis, Hermaphrodite, and the Inversion of Gender: Allegorical Interpretations and Pictorial Representations of an Ovidian Myth, ca. 1300–1770." In *The Figure of the Nymph in Early Modern Culture*, edited by Karl Enekel and Anita Taninger. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2018.

Gessert, Genevieve S. "A Giant Corrupt Body: The Gendering of Renaissance Roma." In *Receptions of Antiquity, Constructions of Gender in European Art, 1300-1600*, edited by Marice Rose and Alison C. Poe, 98-130. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2015.

Grossman, Janet Burnett, Jerry Podany, and Marion True. *History of Restoration of Ancient Stone Sculptures*. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2003.

Harris, Enriqueta. *Velazquez.* Oxford: Phaidon, 1982.

Haskell, Francis and Nicholas Penny. *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500-1900*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981.

Howard, Seymour. *Antiquity Restored: Essays on the Afterlife of the Antique*. Vienna: IRSA, 1990.

Kessel, Elsje van. "Longing for the Past: Eichendorff's *Marmorbild*, Historical Experience, and

the Sexuality of the Masterpieces Room." In *Sculpture, Sexuality and History: Encounters in Literature, Culture and the Arts from the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, edited by Jana Funke and Jen Grove, 57-79. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

Kubler, George. *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1962.

Lear, Andrew and Eva Cantarella. *Images of Ancient Greek Pederasty: Boys Were Their Gods*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC). Zürich: Artemis, 1981.

Marvin, Miranda. "Possessions of Princes: The Ludovisi Collection." In *History of Restoration of Ancient Stone Sculptures*, edited by Janet Burnett Grossman, Jerry Podany, and Marion True, 225-38. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2003.

McDermon, Daniel. "What the Sleeping Hermaphrodite Tells Us About Art, Sex and Good Taste." *The New York Times*, June 24, 2016. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/06/27/arts/design/statue-hermaphrodite.html.

McPhee, Sarah. *Bernini's Beloved: A Portrait of Costanza Piccolomini*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art. "Hermaphrodite, Giovanni Francesco Susini." Accessed July 8, 2020. https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/206698.

Michel, Olivier. "Un pittore francese a Roma, Louis-Gabriel Blanchet." *Strenna dei Romanisiti*, Vol. 57 (1996), 467-486.

Oakley-Brown, Liz. *Ovid and Culture Politics of Translation in Early Modern England.* Burlington, VT:Ashgate, 2006.

Paul, Carole and Alberta Campitelli. *Making a Prince's Museum: Drawings for the Late-eighteenth-century Redecoration of the Villa Borghese*. Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 2000.

Paul, Carole. *The Borghese Collections and the Display of Art in the Age of the Grand Tour*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008.

Robinson, M. "Salmacis and Hermaphroditus: When Two Become One: (Ovid, Met. 4.285-388)." *Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (1999), 212-223.

Smollett, Tobias. *Travels through France and Italy: Containing Observations on Character, Customs, Religion, Government, Police, Commerce, Arts, and Antiquities. With a Particular Description of the Town, Territory, and Climate of Nice: To Which Is Added,*

a Register of the Weather, Kept during a Residence of Eighteen Months in That City. London: MDCCLXVI, 1766. Eighteenth Century Collections Online. Gale.

Southworth, Edmund. "The Role of the Collector: Henry Blundell of Ince." In *History of Restoration of Ancient Stone Sculptures*, edited by Janet Burnett Grossman, Jerry Podany, and Marion True, 105-14. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2003.

Strunck, Christina. "The Poisoned Present: A New Reading of Gianlorenzo Bernini's *Rape of Proserpina*." In *Critical Perspectives on Roman Baroque Sculpture*, edited by Anthony Colantuono and Steven F. Ostrow. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2014.

Swinburne, Algernon Charles. *Swinburne's Collected Poetical Works*. London: William Heinemann Limited, 1924.

Trimble, Jennifer. "Beyond Surprise: Looking Again at the Sleeping Hermaphrodite in the Palazzo Massimo." In *Roman Artists, Patrons, and Public Consumption: Familiar Works Reconsidered*, edited by Brenda Longfellow and Ellen Perry, 13-37. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2017.

Visconti, Ennio Quirino. *Sculture del Palazzo della Villa Borghese detta Pinciana: brevemente descritte*. Rome: Nella Stamperia Pagliarini, 1796.

Warwick, Genevieve. *Bernini: Art as Theatre.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2012.

Warwick, Genevieve. "Speaking Statues: Bernini's *Apollo and Daphne* at the Villa Borghese." *Art History* Vol. 27, No. 3 (June 2004): 353-381.

Walpole, Horace. Volume 18. *The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, edited by W.S. Lewis. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1954.