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Abstract

Henry, Prince of Wales’s interest in Italian art and architecture is well known. Most historians since the publication of Roy Strong’s landmark study, The Renaissance Garden in England (1979), have noted the presence of Italian ideas about landscape design in early modern England, though this remains a vexed issue in the historiography of the period. A prominent figure in the transmission of Italian influence was the mercurial Medici court architect Costantino de’ Servi, from whom Henry commissioned an important design for the garden at Richmond Palace (which survives in the Archivio di Stato di Firenze). This paper examines the contributions of the still- obscure de’ Servi to Richmond. It explores the direct quotations of de’ Servi’s design from Italian - especially Tuscan - sources, paying particular attention to the proposed figure of Neptune, which was to be three times the size of Giambologna’s Appennino (Apennines) in Pratolino near Florence. The paper suggests that the ‘colossal mode’ of de’ Servi’s Neptune is characteristic of late Renaissance design and that the figure of the giant has a neglected significance in gardens of the period.
In his treatise *Les Raisons des forces mouvantes avec diverses machines tant utiles que plaisantes ausquelles sont adjoits plusieurs desseings de grotes et fontaines* (1615; 2nd ed. 1624), Prince Henry's French engineer, Salomon de Caus noted that: 'Passing through Pratolino, five miles from Florence, among other grotto works with which that house is richly ornamented, I saw a figure of a great Cyclops in the body of which are some grottoes very artificially made'. De Caus would most likely have seen this figure sometime before 1598 when he was in Italy. The *Appennino* (1579) must have made a significant impression on him. He included two designs 'following the invention of the said figure' in *Les Raisons des forces mouvantes*.

De Caus's designs for giants, and de' Servi's ambitious Neptune have their sources in Italian landscape design. Gardens were arguably the most important sites for the *cinquecento* revival of what can be called the 'colossal mode' in sculpture. For this reason, the colossi of the Renaissance garden provide another example of the period's interest in the artistic genres and modes of the Classical world. Of equal importance, however, is the fact that in European literary and popular traditions, giants are often ambivalent, even antinomic figures. It seems relevant that de Caus, for instance, misidentified the *Appennino* as a 'great Cyclops' and that a colossal Cyclops by one of Giambologna’s students does actually appear in a Florentine garden not far from Pratolino - Novelli’s *Polyphemus* (1640-52) in the Orti Oricellari - though it is not well known. In Greek mythology, of course, the Cyclops were a race of one-eyed, cannibalistic giants.

De’ Servi’s proposal for Richmond brought the ‘colossal mode’ of Italian Renaissance landscape design to England for the first time. In fact, Henry’s garden, as envisaged by de’ Servi, would not have been out of place on the Arno or the Tiber. All three of Henry’s principal designers - de’ Servi, de Caus and Inigo Jones - were influenced by Italian precedents. As a Florentine *ideatore* (inventor) in the tradition of Bernardo Buontalenti, whom he consciously emulated, de’ Servi’s appeal to the Prince would have been strong. De Caus’s demonstrable knowledge of Italian motifs and methods would
likewise have significantly enhanced his authority at a time when the Italian style of garden design was highly desirable, even de rigueur, at courts all over Europe. Jones - the only Englishman in the group - had also already spent an extended period in Italy. ⁶

In this paper, I will suggest some additional sources for Henry's garden to those already enumerated by Sabine Eiche. ⁷ I will then return to the figure of the giant in the garden, at Richmond but also in Italy, which I argue foregrounds a neglected theme in early modern landscape history - that of alterity or otherness. First, however, it is necessary to briefly sketch the development of Henry's plans for Richmond.

**Inigo Jones and Salomon de Caus**

Henry was formally granted Richmond by his father James I on 1 September 1610 and soon began work on the grounds. The earliest plan of the estate from this period is by Jones, who held the position of Prince's Surveyor. ⁸ It is dated 30 June 1611 and shows a partial outline of the ground plan of the Tudor palace erected by Henry VII. The drawing records the reclamation and straightening of the Thames riverbank, a cistern house, an 'Eighte' or island in the river itself and one or two other details. Jones's notes on the progress of the works, dated 17 May 1611, help to illuminate the sketch:

Besides the Levelling and Raising of those Islands higher with earth, Inlarging the wharfe on either side of the Howse and the wharfing betwixt the Islands and the Thames, Laying of the pipes from the Cesterne to those three Islands The making of Staires or Bridges to passe into ye Islands and the devices of the ffrenchman which cannot be valued because unknown.⁹

It seems, therefore, that in this first phase of the Richmond works, three small islands were incorporated into the grounds (in the vicinity of the ‘Fryars’).¹⁰ The plan may have been to turn them into mounts linked by bridges or to create more artificial, architectonic islands such as the one at the Villa Lante, Bagnaia (c.1568-1578) or the later Isolotto (1630-37) in the Boboli Gardens, Florence. The cistern must have been designed by de Caus, given his expertise in hydraulic technology and engineering as well as his appointment as the Prince's Engineer at twice the salary of Jones (£100 per annum rather than Jones's £50).¹¹ He was also responsible for a cistern (or ‘conserve d’eau’ as he referred to it) at Robert Cecil's Hatfield House at approximately the same time.¹²

The broken line in Jones’s sketch, which appears to connect de Caus’s cistern to the riverbank structure, is probably the old moat that the documents record as having been filled in. A Parliamentary Survey of 1653 noted that the building on the river was: ‘intended for a waterhouse called the Rockhouse but never finished, situate and being on the aforesaid parcel of ground called the Wharf, being raised with a brick wall one story high and not covered’.¹³ This structure, depicted in Wencelaus Hollar’s 1638 engraving of Richmond Palace, was almost certainly also designed by de Caus, and may be the first artificial grotto to be planned for an English garden, though work on it ceased after Henry's death.¹⁴

At this stage in the works there does not yet appear to have been a coordinating idea or concetto, on the Italian model, that informed and controlled the design of the garden. In his later dedication of Book II of *Les Raisons des forces mouvantes* to Henry's sister Elisabeth, de Caus states that some of the designs reproduced in the book were 'to ornament his [Henry's] house at Richmond, and others to satisfy his gentle curiosity', but there is no suggestion, as there is in his later *Hortus Palatinus* (1620), that he was responsible for the garden as a whole.¹⁵ The reclamation of land and the straightening of the Thames riverbank were major feats of engineering—most likely overseen by de Caus, whose carving of the terraces of the Palatine garden out of the slopes of the Königstuhl in Heidelberg was acknowledged as an impressive technical achievement—but they have a preparatory character.
Costantino de' Servi

Henry had requested that someone trained by Tommaso and Alessandro Francini - the Florentine hydraulic engineers and designers responsible for St Germaine-en-Laye and Fontainebleau near Paris - be sent to London to design ‘belli artifizi’ (beautiful artifices) for him as early as September 1610. Costantino de’ Servi was dispatched in response.

De’ Servi epitomizes a neglected figure in the history of early modern visual and material culture - the peripatetic designer who habitually crossed as many disciplinary as national boundaries. He was an architect, artist (originally apprenticed to the Mannerist painter Santo di Tito), as well as a stage and landscape designer. His travels took him all over Europe and as far afield as Persia where, from 1582-84, he is documented working for the Safavid dynasty.

De’ Servi arrived in London in late May 1611. By 9 June, Henry had called him to Richmond and a few days later (15 June) he was commissioned to make a design for fountains, summerhouses and galleries. By September 1611, de’ Servi’s design, which he referred to in a letter as his ‘proposal for the plan and compartments of the gardens, fountains and grottoes’ (‘resolutione della pianta e spartimenti de’ gardini fontane e grotte’), had received the imprimatur of the Prince. This is the plan that Eiche rediscovered in the Archivio di Stato di Firenze.

The plan includes variations on some of the key features of well-known Italian gardens such as the Villa Medici in Pratolino and the Villa d’Este in Tivoli as well as ‘the latest French fashion in garden parterres’, though it does not recapitulate or imitate any single site. De’ Servi, as one of the best-travelled designers of his period, would have been particularly well placed to incorporate a wide range of reference into his design. The rest of this paper will explore in greater detail the allusions to other Italian gardens implied by de’ Servi’s plan. (In a sense, his project for Richmond, like de Caus’s Hortus Palatinus, should be included in the history of the Italian Renaissance garden despite their geographical locations.)

De’ Servi’s Proposal

John Dixon Hunt has observed that ‘the constituent parts of a Renaissance garden are relatively few: fountains, statues, pergolas, arbors, grottoes, groves...and flowers.’ De’ Servi’s Richmond plan contains all these elements. There is a fountain in the west garden, statues in the water basins of the east garden, arbors or pergolas (gabinetti), grottoes and two groves - what he calls the salvatico. De’ Servi makes no reference to flowers, but he does include beds of simples. The most striking features of his design - the arena in front of the palace and the colossal figure of Neptune - do not appear on Hunt’s list, but they too have Italian precedents.

To begin with those structures that de’ Servi inherited: the ‘Rockhouse’ (grotta cominciata) by de Caus appears at the bottom left of the plan. At the top left is the cistern. Between the two earlier buildings there is a water basin and a ball court (guoco di corda). Adjacent to the basin and the court are two large garden compartments. A representation of Mount Parnassus is depicted at the centre of the compartment closest to the river and in the middle of the other, there is a fountain. The (now nearly illegible) heraldic motifs of this part of the garden probably celebrated the Tudor as well as the Stuart lines (given Henry’s esteem for the former). If so, then a design by de Caus for a fountain decorated with Tudor roses, reproduced in Les Raisons des forces mouvantes, may have been one of the ornaments that he claimed to have devised for Henry. Notably, de Caus’s design is an exact reproduction of the one that he published in his first treatise, La Perspective avec la raison des ombres et miroirs (1612), which was dedicated to Prince Henry and is the earliest book on perspective to be published in England.
Artificial mounts, often planted with laurel, the emblem of Apollo, and decorated with Pegasus fountains as well as statues of the muses, could be found in most major Italian gardens, from Pratolino to Tivoli. The d’Este version of the theme, for example, alludes to Cardinal Ippolito II d’Este’s patronage of the arts and implies that the hill town of Tivoli is a new Parnassus adorned by the scholars and poets of his circle. This is a common implication of the theme. In fifteenth and sixteenth-century poetry the imagery of Parnassus was closely connected with praise for the ruler as patron and protector of the arts and literature: Isabella d’Este was, for example, described as the ‘tenth Muse’ and her court at Mantua as ‘Parnassus’. Later in the sixteenth century the same themes were used in royal or princely triumphal entries, which associated the ruler with Apollo. At Richmond, they would have served to celebrate Henry as an enlightened patron and cultural figure. Indeed, Thomas Haywood wrote in his funeral elegy that the Muses had abandoned Parnassus altogether to take up residence with the Prince. It is possible that de Caus had a hand in the Richmond mount. He included two designs for mounts in *Les Raisons des forces mouvantes* and certainly designed one for Somerset House in 1612.

De’ Servi’s ‘piaza e teatro’ - a 250 by 150ft ovoid arena enclosed by steps intended to double as seating during festivals and other events (*scala che rigara intorno dove starà molta gente per veder le feste*) - also recalls Italian models. In a letter to Domitius Apollinaris (AD 100-105), which was known to the Renaissance, Pliny the Younger had referred to the hippodrome of his Tuscan villa. The seventeenth-century stone arena of the Boboli Gardens is related to Pliny’s hippodrome, but there are numerous examples from the previous century; from Francesco da Sangallo’s c.1525 design for the garden of the Villa Madama, or the botanical garden at Padua, where there was one outside the main circular garden, to the terrace of the harpies (more colossi) in the Orsini Sacro Bosco (Sacred Wood) at Bomarzo. De’ Servi’s arena provides provides additional evidence of the influence of Pliny’s description. Its potential use as a tiltyard further aligns it with its ancient prototype.

The east garden would have been larger and more elaborate. The main vertical and horizontal axes are lined with beds of simples (*semplice*) or herbs and decorated with pyramids. At the centre of the garden are four water basins containing two sculptures each of water birds (*uccelli daqua*). Bartolomeo Ammannati’s and Giambologna’s series of bronze birds for the grotto of the garden of the Villa Medici, Castello (now in the Bargello, Florence) may provide a source. The other compartments are all in the French style, containing *broderie* designs, which had been invented only a year earlier by Claude Mollet. Four gazebos (*Gabinetti*) appear at the intersections of the paths in this part of the garden. At the centre is a large, presumably hollow, column modeled on Trajan’s column in Rome (*Colonna che sarà come la Troiana di Roma*). This should, I think, be connected with de’ Servi’s 1588 commission to provide a bronze statue of St. Paul for the column of Marcus Aurelius (or Antonine Column) in Rome.

At the northernmost point a large oval pool (*peschiera*) is depicted in front of the giant figure of Neptune (*gigante Notuno*), in which appeared five sculptures of sea monsters (*mostri marini*). Two compartments planted with trees to evoke groves or forest (*salvatico*) flank the pool. These recall what Giorgio Vasari described as the ‘labyrinth’ at the centre of the Medici garden at Castello or the *bosco* of the Villa Lante, Bagnaia. Oddly enough, it does not seem to have been previously noticed that the two compartments are also suggestive of the Union Jack, the origins of which go back to 1603 when Henry’s father James I decided that a new flag was needed to symbolize his unification of the kingdoms of Scotland and England. Finally, de’ Servi has indicated at the bottom right corner that he planned another grotto (*un atra Grotta*), to mirror de Caus’s ‘Rockhouse’ in the west.

**The Giant Neptune**

This returns us, finally, to de’ Servi’s *gigante*. The figure of Neptune is, like the mount and the hippodrome a common motif in Italian gardens. De’ Servi’s version of the theme can also be associated with a specific text - Michael Drayton’s *Poly-Olbion* (1610) in which, as Strong and Eiche
have pointed out, Henry is likened to the god of water: ‘He like great Neptune on three seas shall rove’. I am less inclined than Eiche, however, to see the five sea monsters of the peschiera as the enemy vanquished (by Henry as Neptune). Instead, they seem to me to be extrapolations of the monstrous head pressed down upon by Giambologna’s Appennino. Notwithstanding this caveat, the topos of Neptune acquires, at Richmond as elsewhere, a local or regional significance and meaning through its association with a unique patron and place. It provides a good example of the flexibility of the language of Italian Renaissance landscape design despite its ostensibly limited lexicon.

De’ Servi’s Neptune is clearly indebted to the ‘colossal mode’ of the Renaissance garden. In fact de’ Servi may have intended a kind of amalgam or conflation of two, possibly three, over life-size figures by Giambologna: the Appennino, the Neptune Fountain in Bologna, and one of the seated river gods from the pedestal of the Boboli Oceanus (from which the Appennino itself is derived).

De’ Servi compared his colossus to the Appennino only - the most important single source. In addition to his claim that it would be three times the size of Giambologna’s figure, he noted that it was to have contained several rooms, two grottoes and a dovecote inside the head (‘dentrovi molti appartamenti per il Corpo con Una gran Columbaia nel Capo e da bbaso [sic] nella Cantina a dove soffia il Vento ci fo dua Grotte’). The Appennino also contained grottoes, fountains and a chamber (for a small orchestra) in the head. The interior of de’ Servi’s Neptune was, in other words, closely modeled on Giambologna’s hollow giant.

There are well-known Classical sources for the Appennino and de’ Servi’s Neptune, including the figure of Atlas in Virgil’s Aeneid, Dinocrates’s proposal to carve a colossal man out of Mt. Athos in honour of Alexander the Great, and Pliny the Elder’s description of the Colossus of Rhodes. However, a more immediate model may have been provided by Francesco Colonna’s description of the giant in the courtyard of the ‘Egyptian Pyramid’ in the antiquarian romance Hypnerotomachia Poliphili (1499). This colossus lay on its back, cast from metal with miraculous skill; it was of a middle-aged man, who held his head somewhat raised on a pillow. He seemed to be ill, with indications of sighing and groaning about his mouth, and his length was sixty paces. With the aid of his hair one could climb upon his chest, then reach his lamenting mouth by way of the dense, twisted hairs of his beard. The opening was completely empty; and so, urged on by curiosity, I proceeded without further consideration down the stairs that were in his throat, thence into his stomach, and so by intricate passageways, and in some terror, to all the other parts of his internal viscera...And when I came to the heart, I could read about how sighs are generated from love, and could see the place where love gravely hurts it. All this moved me deeply, so that I uttered a loud sigh from the bottom of my heart, invoking Polia - and instantly heard the whole machine resonating, to my considerable fright.

Colonna’s despondent colossus could be entered, like the later Appennino which Una Roman d’Elia has recently interpreted as a ‘figure of misery’. It also simulates corporeality, and even physical malaise, to an extraordinary extent, recalling Antonio Averlino Filarete’s fifteenth-century comparison of buildings to living men that must be ‘nourished and governed’ to avoid illness and death.

I have spent some time on these sources because they provoke two observations that I think are relevant to de’ Servi’s Neptune. First, the Hypnerotomachia Poliphili had recently become better known in England due to the publication of The Strife of Love in a Dream (1592), a partial translation of Colonna’s idiosyncratic text into English by a member of Henry’s circle - Robert Dallington. It is potentially, therefore, just as important a source for de’ Servi’s gigantic, penetrable figure of Neptune.
as it is for Giambologna’s *Appennino*. The striking image of an artificial giant whose innards could be explored would have been as familiar to de’ Servi’s audience as it was to Giambologna’s.

Second, these gargantuan hybrid structures - they are as much buildings as they are sculptures - seem to me to have been passed over too lightly by historians. As I suggested at the beginning of the paper, they may amount to more than a straightforward revival of a Classical mode of sculpture. I want to conclude, therefore, with a few comments about other hypothetical but unexplored meanings of the giant in the garden.

**The Giant in the Garden**

The poet Susan Stewart has argued that: ‘The gigantic becomes an explanation for the environment, a figure on the interface between the natural and human. Hence our words for the landscape are often projections of an enormous body upon it: the mouth of the river, the foot-hills, the fingers of the lake, the heartlands, the elbow of the stream’.40

If it was once believed that giants had formed the landscape, in the sixteenth-century garden the landscape was reimagined as inhabited by, or even composed of giants. (In his recent analysis of Giambologna’s *Appennino*, Michael W. Cole suggests, evocatively, that at Pratolino, ‘nature itself has generated a giant, using water that rose, fell, and congealed into its form’.41) The close association of the giant with nature would have made it an appealing motif to designers fascinated by the threshold and exchange between the natural and the artificial.

Stewart’s definition of the giant as ‘a figure on the interface between the natural and the human’ might also apply to what several sixteenth-century Italian writers called the ‘third nature’ of the garden (the garden being the outcome of a collaboration between art and nature).42 Giants and gardens both occupied the interstice between two categories. It is not surprising, then, that the garden was an important site for the sixteenth-century revival of the colossal mode. At least fifty colossal statues or sculptural groups were made in Italy between 1500 and 1600, many of which were intended for or ended up in gardens.43

This account does not, however, acknowledge the fact that in Renaissance thought the figure of the giant could be both benign and malign. In François Rabelais’s *Pantagruel*, for example, Alcofrybas travels for ‘two leagues’ across the giant’s tongue. He then enjoys four idyllic months among the ‘countless summer-houses in the Italian style scattered over fields full of delights’ - gardens in other words - that are located inside Pantagruel’s body.44

The giant may be Alcofrybas’s friend, but he is also responsible for catastrophic outbreaks of plague when his body emits deadly, noxious gases after he eats a meal smothered in garlic sauce. (Incidentally, Rabelais’s giant, like de’ Servi’s, has a dovecote in his head.) Pantagruel thus combines two traditional types of the giant: the giant as anthropomorphic hero and the giant as the embodiment of threatening alterity or otherness. Both appear in the Renaissance garden personified, respectively, as Neptune and as Polyphemus.

The latter is of particular interest. Polyphemus himself is, to my knowledge, depicted only twice: in the Oricellari as I have said and at the Villa Aldobrandini, Frascati. However, his predilection for anthropophagy is a major (albeit neglected) motif of the Renaissance garden. The colossal gaping mouths at Bomarzo, Verona and Frascati all recall Polyphemus and suggest that, as the landscape historian Hervé Brunon has recently claimed, the Renaissance garden may at times have appeared to its audience as a *topos antagoniste*.45
Hero or monster, I want to finish by suggesting that the idea of entering the body of a giant is a strange one, especially if - as may have been the case at Richmond - that body is the personification of a prince. A comment of Friedrich Nietzsche’s seems peculiarly appropriate here: ‘We wish to see ourselves translated into stone and plants, we want to take walks in ourselves when we stroll around these buildings and gardens’.46
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