



Zadaný cizojazyčný text:

"Figura Serpentinata": Becoming over Being in Michelangelo's Unfinished Works

Author: Paula Carabell

Source: *Artibus et Historiae*, 2014, Vol. 35, No. 69 (2014), pp. 79-96

The notion that Michelangelo left nearly three-fifths of his sculptural works unfinished has aroused the interest of artists and critics since the sixteenth century. It has led certain scholars to adopt a conflict-based theory while others have viewed the presence of the *non-finito* as an essential, and more importantly, intentional part of the artist's pictorial language. Perhaps one reason this view attained popularity is because by the end of the fifteenth century, the *intendenti* had already shown an appreciation for inchoate form, one undoubtedly prefigured by the Neoplatonic notion that man, himself, was protean in nature and by definition, a work in progress. This idea, that the emergent and even the incomplete could exist as desirable attributes, finds artistic expression early on in Michelangelo's own oeuvre, while the young sculptor was a resident in the Medici household. We know from contemporary sources that Angelo Poliziano, tutor and humanist scholar, had not only provided the burgeoning artist with the subject matter of one of his earliest works, the *Battle of the Centaurs*, but with it had offered a lesson gleaned from the ancients, that of the merits of a less than diligent level of finish. This work [...] embodied the notion that a high degree of polish was not always a desirable trait and that process was, in effect, an end in itself. However, should the emergent forms and visibly chiseled surface of the *Battle of the Centaurs* suggest an early and ineluctable predilection on the part of the young master for the aesthetics roughly hewn marble, we must also consider Condivi's account of the sculptor's life in which Michelangelo expressed his disapproval over one of his most illustrious predecessors, Donatello, whose works, he insisted, seemed admirable when viewed as a distance, but because they were not highly polished, lost their reputation when seen from up close. But despite Michelangelo's stated preference for works that had achieved an unequivocal state of resolution, he himself would be plagued throughout his life by an inability to finish and tormented by the schism he perceived between the realization of his *concetto* and the notion of art as continuing process. While the artist's struggle to bring a work to completion is more readily apparent both in

his later and sculptural works and can be considered a function of the master's increasingly complex compositional strategies, the issue of being over becoming, of finished versus open work nevertheless manifests itself in one of his earliest endeavors.

In August of 1498, Michelangelo received a commission from the French Cardinal, Jean Bilheres de Lagraulas, for a Pieta intended for Sta Petronilla, a chapel then attached to the south transept of Saint Peter's. The young artist has already won acclaim with the *Bacchus* he had made for Jacopo Galli, who, therefore, in turn was keen to give his assurance to the Cardinal that 'this will be the most beautiful work in marble that Rome has ever seen and that no master today would make it better'. Indeed, when the work was unveiled in 1499, it was to unprecedented accolades and today holds a special place in the master's oeuvre as his only signed work. His name, which is carved on the sash that transverses the Virgin's upper torso reads as follows: MICHEL AGELVS BONAROTVS FLORENT FACIEBA[T]. Such a prominent declaration was uncommon even within the competitive tradition of Florentine sculptors and for this reason, Giorgio Vasari must have felt compelled to address this anomaly in both the 1550 and 1568 editions of the *Lives*. In the earlier account, he suggests that the action occurred because Michelangelo had placed so much love into the carving of the work that 'here - something which he would not do in any other work - he left his name written across a strap that encircles the bosom of our Lady, as something with which he himself was satisfied and pleased'. By 1568, however, Vasari alters the account and tells us that the signature had instead grown out of a case of mistaken identity. According to the second edition, written after the master's death, Vasari recounts a tale in which Michelangelo had found himself amongst a group of admirers and had heard the remark made that the piece had been completed by 'Il Gobbo nostra da Milano'. Dismayed that his accomplishment had gone unnoticed by the crowd, he slipped back later that evening and added the inscription. It is not the intent of this discussion, however, to determine which, if either, these accounts is closer to the truth, but rather, it is to examine the context of Michelangelo's gesture in order to explore the significance of the *non-finito* in his later work. [...]

(Shrnutí: 0 až 10 bodů)

Otázky k textu:

1. Proč by i Michelangelovy nedokončené sochy mohly být, podle textu, uměleckým dílem?
(0 až 5 bodů)
2. S jakými podobnými a souvisejícími myšlenkami jste se již někdy setkali? *(0 až 5 bodů)*
3. Vyjmenujte pět knih z beletrie nebo humanitní vzdělanosti a pět filmů libovolného žánru, které jsou pro Vás významné *(odpověď na tuto otázku sama nebude bodovaná, ale pomůže nám porozumět Vaším odpovědím na předchozí otázky).*