A fountain by Gianlorenzo Bernini and Ercole Ferrata in Portugal*

OUTSIDE the precincts of the gardens of the Palácio Nacional de Queluz, situated at the end of a long avenue, beyond the canal and the Jardim das Medalhas, stands a fountain (Fig. 21). But for many years no water flowed from its jets, its basin was littered with stones, and its marble statues were weatherbeaten and broken.¹

The reason for the fountain’s ostracism and its long neglect is evident even at a casual glance: this is a work of the high baroque, its central feature a figure of Neptune (Fig. 22), reproducing Bernini’s Villa Montalto fountain of c. 1622,² but more upright in stance, and with dolphins instead of the triton between his legs; he stands on an open bivalve shell supported by dolphins (Fig. 23), copied in turn from Bernini’s Triton Fountain of 1642–43.³ The four tritons around the basin recall those set by Giacomo della Porta around what was to become Bernini’s Fountain of the Moor (and, as will be shown, possibly even the original basin was based on the shape of that fountain).⁴ Stylistically, this is far from the pretty rococo which characterises the palace of Queluz and the English lead statues that decorate its gardens.

A closer inspection reveals that two of the four tritons bear coats of arms (Fig. 24), and that these are the arms of the Meneses family (formerly written Menezes), the Condes da Ericeira.⁵ In fact, the only previous article devoted to the fountain, by Raul Lino, recognised that this was the famous ‘Bernini’ fountain which previously adorned the gardens of the Ericeira palace on the northern outskirts of Lisbon.⁶ The Ericeira palace, called ‘of Annunciada’, was destroyed in the

*Angela Delaforce became interested in this fountain when working on the gardens of Queluz in 1986; she recognised its origin, and studied its position in the Ericeira collection and its subsequent fame. Jennifer Montagu recognised it as Ferrata’s fountain for Portugal, mentioned in the sources. They planned a joint article, but, before it was written, Paulo Varela Gomes and Miguel Soromenho submitted a paper with newly discovered letters from D. Luís de Souza on the making of the fountain; further research has subsequently been carried out in the Lisbon archives by Delaforce.

See A. DELAFORCE: Palácio de Queluz – Jardins, Lisbon [1988], p. 18 and p. 36, note 20; M. INÉS FERRO: Queluz, The Palace and Garden, Lisbon [1997], pp. 119–20. Since this article was drafted, and the photographs taken, the fountain has been restored.

³ See C. D’ONOFRIO: Le fontane di Roma, Rome [1962], p. 67, figs. 51 and 52.
⁴ The quartering of the arms appears to be reversed: compare Fig. 25.
⁵ R. LINO: ‘Uma obra de Arte esquecida’, Boletim Arquivo Nacional de Belas Artes, ser. 2, X [1957], pp. 14–21. Lino was troubled by what he saw as a discrepancy in quality between the Neptune and the tritons; he accepted the latter as by Bernini, and, discounting ‘for obvious reasons’ the possible explanation that the original of the central group had been damaged by the great earthquake and fire of 1755 and replaced by an inferior imitation, he concluded that it must have been made by a lesser studio hand following Bernini’s drawings, and possibly after Bernini’s death.
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earthquake and subsequent fire of 1755, but the fountain survived; it was sold, presumably around 1770, and thus in the lifetime of Dom Henrique de Meneses, sixth Conde da Ericeira (1727–87), and was acquired by Dom António de Castelo Branco, fifth Conde de Pombeiro, who in 1770 began the restoration of the gardens of his Quinta do Senhor da Serra at Belas. There it remained, while in 1878 the Quinta was sold to José Borges de Almeida, whose heirs sold it in 1940 to Júlio Martins. It was he who sold the fountain to the state, and in 1945 it was installed at the former Royal Palace of Queluz, some ten kilometres from Lisbon. In the following pages we shall attempt to clarify its previous history: its commissioning, its authorship, and its enduring celebrity.

Dom Luís de Meneses (1632–90) was noted as a soldier, statesman, and man of letters, writing both poetry and history; his most famous publication being the História de Portugal Restaurado in two volumes (Lisbon, 1679–98). On the frontispiece (Fig.25) he appears in armour, his plumed helmet overshadowing the book he is writing. This martial image is appropriate, for he had had a distinguished military career, fighting in the campaign to maintain Portugal’s independence from Spain, becoming General of Artillery and of the region of Tráz os Montes, and it was for his military prowess that Cosimo III de’ Medici when in Lisbon in 1669 commissioned a portrait of him (now in the Uffizi). In 1666 he had married his niece, Joanna Josefa de Meneses, and through her acquired the title of third Conde da Ericeira. Following Spain’s recognition of Portuguese independence and the end

---

22. *Neptune* from the fountain in Fig.21.

23. *Neptune*’s dolphin base from the fountain in Fig.21.

24. One of the tritons from Fig.21, bearing a shield with the Ericeira coat of arms.

---

*It is likely that by 1945 the dolphins mentioned in all early descriptions – presumably the ‘fish with their shells’ listed as being sent from Italy in the letter of 18th January 1682 (see below notes 19 and 33; there is some confusion surrounding the number of these lost fish) – and which were probably placed in the water, had so deteriorated that they were not considered worth moving – if, indeed, they survived the earthquake.


*Glò Uffizi, catalogo generale, Florence [1979], p.723, inv.2697.
of the war in 1668, Dom Luís returned to the court in Lisbon, where he became a proponent of mercantilist development; his most notable appointment was as Superintendent of Finance, a post he held from 1675. It was with the restoration of peace that he was able to concentrate on the embellishment of his palace on the site of a previous nunnery of the Annunciation. This was to become renowned not only for its gallery of over two hundred paintings, including works ascribed to Titian, Correggio and Rubens, but particularly for its library of printed books and manuscripts, its cabinet of coins, and its collections of minerals and natural history. From the library a staircase descended to a parterre, laid out according to the principles of Le Nôtre. 10


11 His collections in Rome and Portugal will also be discussed by Delaforce (see note 10 above). It was presumably during the decoration of his palace in Rome that he learnt of recipes (e notas) for a method of treating furniture (besteiros ou lamina), or other pieces in stucco, so that they would resemble stone (which must have been scagliola), and a method of using heat to colour marble or stone red, so that the colour penetrated and did not remain on the surface (Lisbon, Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo, MS. da Livraria 1830, fol.66r–71v, 79r–80r); these may have served for the rebuilding and decoration undertaken by his brother at the family’s country residence, the Quinta de Calhariz.

It was for the centre of this parterre, where the extensive gardens adjoin the palace, that he commissioned a fountain from Italy. The intermediary who was to take responsibility for its execution was the Portuguese ambassador to Rome from 1676 to 1682, Dom Luís de Sousa, Archbishop and Primate of Braga (1637–90), a man of great culture with a deep interest in the arts, 11 and akinsman of the Conde de Ericeira. The conde may well have discussed this project with the archbishop before the latter left Portugal for Rome late in 1675, but soon after his arrival in the Holy City in February 1676 the ambassador must have begun to occupy himself with the negotiations, for by 14th June 1676 Ericeira wrote to the ambassador in Paris, Duarte Ribeiro de Macedo, saying that he had ordered a fountain for his garden from the ambassador in Rome, of which he had already received an excellent plan (planta). 12 The purpose of this letter was to ask Ribeiro de Macedo to send to Rome a portrait of Ericeira, which he apparently had with him in Paris, so that it could serve for the portrait of the conde as Mars, which was to crown the fountain.

This original design was therefore rather different from that which was to be finally executed, and there is no certainty as to whether Bernini was involved at this stage. But by 21st August 1677 he undoubtedly was, for a letter from the archbishop in Rome to his brother, Dom Francisco de Sousa, 13 in Lisbon, states that it was being made from a model (modello) by Bernini, with a statue of Neptune of Portuguese palmi high, on its shell of seven and a half palmi wide. 14 The most likely explanation is that the Conde de Ericeira, proud of his military reputation, had wanted the statue of Mars in order to symbolise his achievements in war (which he was to emphasise in the engraved frontispiece and its inscription [Fig.25]), and that it was Bernini who had persuaded the archbishop that this was not appropriate for a fountain. As Baldinucci records, Bernini believed that in designing fountains one should always give them some meaning (significato), either true, or alluding to some noble subject, true or legendary; 15 this precedes his description of the Triton fountain, for which he suggests no meaning beyond the self-evident water-related iconography (which, of course, has not prevented others from reading far more reconcile and elaborate symbolism into it), and Bernini might well have seen no way of relating a figure of Mars, traditionally associated with fire, to the water that was to flow around him, in a manner that would constitute a coherent and significant image.

By the summer of 1677 the change to a figure of Neptune had already been made and accepted, for in this letter the archbishop discussed at length the “controversa” over the hydraulics, involving both Bernini and Ferrata (who, as will be shown, was responsible for carving the figure), saying that he had wanted the water to cascade from the three prongs of
Neptune’s trident, but Bernini himself had pointed out that, given the size of the statue, it was impossible to insert into Neptune’s arm a pipe of sufficient bore to provide the required pressure, while maintaining the scale and proportion of the figure and arm. After various other proposals, in the end they evidently settled on dolphins between Neptune’s feet, but there was continuing uncertainty as to whether the water pressure would be sufficient to provide jets of adequate force for the tritons situated at the sides of the basin.

The archbishop’s close involvement with the project, and his strong aesthetic views, are further proved by the discussion in the same letter of the images to be carved on the four shields held by the accompanying tritons. He suggested that one should show the Erieece coat of arms, another the ‘ejfro’ which the conde was sending to him, the third a shoulder-length portrait of the conde, while for the fourth he was still uncertain, saying that he would decide on ‘alguma outra cousa’. In fact, only the first two subjects were taken up, for two of the shields bear the combined Meneses-Erieece arms, while the other two have a mysterious symbol composed of the letters IFL entwined as if with a continuous ribbon (Fig.29), which must be the ‘ejfro’ sent by the conde.\(^\text{16}\)

In conclusion, the letter justifies the cost, which was to be 2,000 escudos, and which must have been questioned by the conde: it is possible that he had suggested that it might be better to use a Genoese sculptor, for certainly most of the garden sculpture in Portugal was made in Genoa.\(^\text{17}\)In any case, the archbishop replied that the fountain could be made in Genoa for half the price; it would have the same number of figures, but be very different so far as the perfection of these figures was concerned. Here in Rome, he continued, all Genoese sculpture was ridiculed, and the fountain would be considered fit only for the poor (para o povo), and not for those who understood sculpture. In Rome people paid the weight of gold for a figure that had the most expressive form, a well-designed arm (em braço melhor lançado), and had a proper languishing (requerbro) movement. But though, in a light-hearted mood, the fountain could be considered a work which was merely decorative (huma obra que não ha mais que galanteria), the archbishop concludes decisively that it must last for eternity (que avia de durar Eternamente), and he, personally, would have it made in Rome not in Genoa. He tells his brother to advise Erieece to let his heart soar (que o Conde lance o coração a larga); but, if the count should hesitate over the cost, then the archbishop himself would take the fountain, change the arms, and set it up in the Sousa’s country residence, the Quinta de Calhariz.\(^\text{18}\)

This important letter emphasises Bernini’s personal responsibility for the fountain. It was being made from a modello approved by Bernini, who had prepared all the measurements. There could, the archbishop told his brother, be no argument (discussar) over the proportions of the work, because, as a sculptor, Bernini had no rival in the world. The fountain was being made by Ercule Ferrata, a renowned sculptor (Escultor insigne); however, Bernini would look at it and advise and correct the maker (ha de ver ... esrifrar e advertir o oficial) if there were grounds for this, but he doubted that there would be. In fact, four hundred escudos out of the total two thousand had already been paid to Ferrata and his assistant; he also stated that two men only were working on the project, Ercule Ferrata and another, because it was not regarded as advisable that others of less experience should do this work.

Further light is thrown on this collaboration of Bernini and Ferrata in another letter sent from the archbishop to the Conde da Erieece himself on 18th January 1682, announcing that the completed fountain was about to leave Leghorn;\(^\text{19}\)he assured Erieece that Ferrata was, after the death of Bernini, the greatest sculptor in Europe; however, ‘the fountain is not his alone but also Bernini’s, because he designed the model and measured everything and presided frequently over the making of the fountain with Ercule [sic] Ferrata of whom he was the master, because I asked him to give his advice and see that the work conformed to his design’.\(^\text{20}\)

But how true was this? There can be no doubting the honesty or veracity of the archbishop, but he may well have been misled by Bernini. One cannot now form an adequate judgment of the quality of the ruined sculpture of Queluz, but it is surely inconceivable that Bernini would have regarded seriously a work which is a pastiche of two sculptures which he had designed respectively some fifty and thirty years previously. It seems more likely that, taking little interest in the project, he did indeed suggest such a combination, possibly even making a rapid sketch-model to show how they would fit together (though, even for his own works, there is some doubt as to whether the bozzetti were necessarily all made by his own hand), and that he did establish the basic proportions, but then handed the whole thing over to Ferrata.

If one turns to Baldinucci’s Life of Ferrata, there is the clear statement that he ‘made for Portugal a Neptune with four Tritons, with several dolphins, and other fish, which was to serve as a fountain; and the Neptune is ten palmi high’,\(^\text{21}\)but there is no suggestion that this was not entirely his own work and invention. Moreover, there are several references in the inventory drawn up after his death in 1689 that suggest he also made the models. It is not always possible to be sure that these refer to the fountain for Portugal, since Ferrata also made the figure of Neptuno which, together with Domenico Guidi’s Cybele, was to complement Algardi’s firedogs of Jupiter and Juno for Spain; probably as early as 1662 these were incorporated in a fountain in the gardens of Aranjuez,\(^\text{22}\)but was Ferrata aware of this? The fact that neither his nor Guidi’s figures are suited to function as firedogs, and that it seems that from the beginning the seahorses of Neptune’s chariot were intended to spout water, suggests that he was.

So the ‘Nettuno di creta cotta’\(^\text{23}\)is dubious, but ‘Un bozzetto della fontana di creta cotta’;\(^\text{24}\)with its use of the definite article, suggest a more recent work, which would be well known to the compiler, rather than one made in the 1650s. Almost certainly related to the Queluz fountain is ‘Un Nettuno di cera, una tazza di creta con delfino sotto’: despite the frequent combination in the inventory of totally disparate works, the different materials,\(^\text{25}\)

\(^\text{18}\)Ibid., fol.136v.
\(^\text{19}\)V. BALDINUCCI, Notizie de’ professori del disegno da Cimabue in qua . . . , ed. F. RANALLI, Florence [1845–47], V, p.383; this is followed by a reference to the year 1677.
\(^\text{21}\)V. GOLZIO: Lo “Studio” di Ercule Ferrata’, Archivi, II [1935], p.66.
\(^\text{22}\)Ibid., p.73.
the definite article might suggest, at least to a modern reader, a copy of the famous Triton by Bernini. But there exists in the Museo Nazionale del Palazzo di Venezia in Rome a terracotta Triton, 39 cm. high (Figs. 27 and 28), made for the Queluz fountain. While it was catalogued by Santangelo as by Bernini,25 its relationship to our fountain is unmistakable (Figs. 26 and 29). The rough, rather dry modelling of the summary anatomy, and the lumpy fish-tail legs, tightly curled to fit in the meanly inadequate block of marble for which it was designed, should have been sufficient to rule out Bernini’s authorship, and it has now been reattributed to Ferrata.26

As enumerated in the letter of 18th January 1682,27 the fountain consisted of thirteen pieces: the Neptune, four tritons, four fishes with their shells (presumably to be placed in the water; they no longer exist) and four dolphins, which were presumably the base, manifestly carved in several pieces (although another possibility is considered below). They were packed in eleven cases, but this shipment did not include the pipes to be made in lead or bronze for the plumbing. The archbishop was greatly concerned about the handling of the pieces in transport and during installation, for though, as he said, marble will last for eternity, it is easy to break.

and the single dolphin (possibly an error?), this conjunction is too suggestive to be dismissed as mere chance. However, the only indisputable reference to our fountain is “Un bozzetto per il sasso di marmo grande de Pamflij della fontana di Portogallo,”24 but it is, alas, hard to interpret: is this the dolphin pedestal, which one would hardly describe as a rock? And what did the Pamphilj have to do with it—did the pieces of marble used for it perhaps come from their store?

All these works are listed without artist’s name (but many of the anonymous works in the inventory appear to be by Ferrata, or possibly made as models for his works by assistants in his studio), and so too is “Il Tritone di creta una figura”.28 Here, painter Simonetti, related it to Bernini’s Triton Fountain (s. Fraschetti: II Bernini, Milan [1900], p.124, withills.).

25Ibid., p.69.
26Ibid., p.70. Here again the inventory lists together two separate works.
27A. Santangelo: Museo di Palazzo Venezia. Catalogo delle sculture, Rome [1954], p.98; his fig.89 shows it with a restored arm holding the conch. He based his attribution on the assumption that it might be related to Bernini’s first project for what was to be the Fontana del Muro. Fraschetti, who knew the terracotta when it still belonged to the

27. Bozzetto for a triton, by Ercole Ferrata, without the modern arm seen in Fig 28. Terracotta, 39 cm. high (Museo Nazionale del Palazzo di Venezia, Rome).
He informed Ericeira that the arms and torso were reinforced with stone as the sculptor believed they would be stronger in that way; he informed him that such reinforcement (presumably the marble left between fragile projections and the basic mass, which could be cut off on arrival) was called a ‘funtello’ in Italian. As for their setting, he referred to a plan which would show how the tritons and fishes were to be set. This was no doubt the plan about which the archbishop had written to the conde on 10th March 1680, concerning a ‘planta da fonte de jardim’ he is to have made, that would enable the conde to design the surrounding basin and the setting for the pieces (Logo farei que se faça a planta da fonte da forma em que ha de ficar no Jardim); for, as he said, basins (tanques) are better made in ‘nossa terra’ in Portugal than in Italy, where little care is taken in their making and the result would be very ordinary.31

The gardens of the Ericeira palace of Annunciada were much admired, and this fountain, firmly ascribed to Bernini, was praised by those who visited them. But it was to have a wider and more public display. In August 1687, five years after the fountain’s arrival in Portugal, the Conde da Ericeira, in his rôle as Superintendent of Finance, was responsible for organising and overseeing the design for the spectacular wedding festivities for the second marriage of the king, Dom Pedro II, to Maria Sofia Isabel of Neuburg, daughter of Philip William, Elector-Palatine of the Rhine. In the evening of the second day, on the conclusion of the bull-fight, the waterfront square, the Terreiro do Paço in front of the Royal Palace, was cleared, and the by now famous garden of the Conde da Ericeira was recreated. The inclusion of a symbolic figure of Neptune stands in a tradition going back to the early days of the Portuguese voyages of exploration,

3For examples, see J. MONTAGU: Roman Baroque Sculpture: The Industry of Art, New Haven and London [1989], pp.44–45.

31Lisbon, Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo, MS. da Livraria, no.442, fols.11r–12r.
and over the course of three centuries the sea-god became a central part of the iconography that honoured her great maritime power.\(^8\) So the presence of such a statue here is not in itself surprising, but the decision to reproduce this fountain was surely made by the proud owner himself. It was, in any case, a fortunate decision for the historian, for it provides us not only with a description of the fountain written by António Rodrigues da Costa (Secretary to the embassy of the Marquês de Alegrete),\(^9\) but also with its only known graphic representation by Padre João dos Reis (Fig.30), inscribed ‘Prego Artificioso representado no Terreno do Passe [sic] em forma de hum jardim, a imitacao do grandioso que esta nas cazas dos Senhores Condes de Ereyceira’.\(^10\)

According to Rodrigues da Costa, the dimensions were 300 palmos (65 metres) in length and 280 (61.6 metres) wide. The enclosed garden had walls and pedimented entrances with twisted Salomonic columns and gilded capitals, all made in wood to imitate stone. The walls that surrounded the four formal parterres, from where the fireworks were launched, were ornamented with what were described as twenty elegant statues carved in stone, and in the centre was a replica of the Fountain of Neptune. Its material is not described, and it is hard to believe that it was carved in stone to match the statues. However, the account of these festivities does say that there were four tritons facing out towards the garden, from whom a stream of water spurted up with great force, and between them four dolphins (distinct from the four others swimming in the water), whose great jaws swallowed up the water from the tritons,\(^5\) all ‘com grande propriedade imitadas’. It may be noted that the drawing shows the basin as a somewhat simplified version of that by Giacomo della Porta which surrounds Bernini’s Fountain of the Moor in the Piazza Navona, so it is tempting to assume that this was the design sent by the archbishop in 1680. As Ericeira had played a leading rôle in these festivities, and would surely have given his approval to Rodrigues da Costa’s official account, he was no doubt responsible for the description of the fountain as the ‘última fabrica do insigne Estatuario Romano e cavallier Bernino’.

But Ericeira’s end was less happy. According to Barbosa Machado the third conde was suffering from ‘profunda melancolia’,\(^6\) as historians have subsequently suggested because of the failure to carry out his advanced economic reforms, when on the morning of 26th May 1690 he threw himself from the window of his palace and died in the ‘laborinhos tristes’ of the garden he had created.\(^7\)

The fame of his palace with its library and works of art, and these gardens, persisted, and Bernini’s fountain was mentioned in numerous descriptions. For Carvalho da Costa, writing in 1712, it was ‘held to be the best in Spain’,\(^8\) in 1752 Barbosa Machado, who moved in the same literary circles as the fourth Conde de Ericeira and knew the palace well, also wrote of the garden, in which ‘se admira a fonte de Neptuno obrazo pelo insigne Cavalleiro João Baptista Bernini’.\(^9\)

Nor did the fountain’s fame diminish after it was transferred to the Quinta at Belas. It was under Maria Rita de Castelo Branco, the daughter of its presumed purchaser, and her husband Dom José de Vasconcelos e Sousa, sixth Conde de Pombinho, that the Quinta knew one of its greatest periods of splendour. In July 1787 William Beckford visited the Quinta with his friend, the Marquês de Marialva: he thought himself entering the orchards of Alcinous, but though the Marialvas were related to the Menezes family, and the marquês would have known something of the history of the
fountain, Beckford took little notice of the sculpture. 'This villa', he wrote, 'boasts a grand artificial cascade, with tritons and dolphins vomiting torrents of water; but I paid it not half the attention its proprietor expected, and retiring under the shade of the fruit-trees, feasted on the golden apples and purple plums that were rolling about me in such profusion.' Assuming that Beckford's 'cascade' can be identified with our fountain, this is the first record of it in its new location.

Others, however, were prepared to pay more attention to the sculpture than the fruit, and in 1795 the visit of the Prince Regent, the future Dom João VI, and the Infanta Carlota Joaquina (which was to be commemorated by a neo-classical obelisk still standing in the garden) was described in a lengthy prose account by the poet Domingos Caldás Barbosa, published in 1799. This included a detailed rhetorical description of the Neptune, attributing it to the 'pasmoso Cavalheiro Bernini', not forgetting the dolphins and tritons that accompanied it, and comparing its setting to the celebrated Piazza Barberini in Rome with Bernini's Triton Fountain - though the writer does not mention the similarity of the bases. Nor was the fountain forgotten in the nineteenth century, when the first and most significant reference to it occurs in 1847, in the Diccionaire historico-artistique du Portugal by the Prussian Ambassador, Count Atanazy Raczyński, the collector, patron, writer and pioneer of Portuguese art history, who was in Portugal from 1842 to 1848, and who repeats the attribution to Bernini, relying on the information he obtained from the sculptor Francisco de Assis Rodrigues. In the last year of the century Francisco Marques de Sousa Viterbo, in his entry on 'Bernini' in his Dicionario historico e documental, gives a summary of the history of the fountain, and, though saying nothing of its commission from Rome, he repeats the attribution to Bernini.

Ironically, it may have been this very attribution to Bernini, which was so carefully preserved by the Portuguese, and which should have guaranteed the international fame of the fountain, that led to its neglect by historians of Italian Seicento sculpture. Optimistic attributions to Bernini are all too common, and there was no reliable Italian source to suggest that he had ever made such a work. Even those aware that Ferrata had made a Neptune fountain for Portugal, considering that so many works had been destroyed by the disaster of 1755, might well have thought it pointless to check out what must have sounded like a local myth about a fountain by Bernini.

---

**TREVOR BRIGHTON**

Samuel Watson, not Grinling Gibbons at Chatsworth

In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries England produced a number of highly competent carvers who drew inspiration from the genius of Grinling Gibbons and sometimes worked alongside him. In some instances their work has wrongly been attributed to Gibbons himself, as has been and still is the case with Samuel Watson (1662–1715) of Heanor, who worked in wood and stone, alabaster and marble at Chatsworth House between 1691 and 1711. Although Samuel Watson’s name occurs regularly in the payments made by the 1st and 2nd Dukes of Devonshire during these years, his work soon became associated with the name of Grinling Gibbons which appears nowhere in the Chatsworth accounts. It was not until the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries that Samuel’s son and grandson, Henry and White, both of whom worked as carvers and masons at Chatsworth, revealed Samuel’s drawings, accounts and contracts in a bid to honour his achievements.

The Earl of Egmont, writing in 1744, appears to have been the first to link Gibbons with the wood carving at Chatsworth (Figs. 31, 32 and 37). Thirty years after Watson’s death and twenty-five after Gibbons’s, he proclaimed after a visit to Chatsworth: ‘there is a handsome chapel in it painted by Vario and Laguare and there is a good deal of fine carving in wood by the late Grinlin Gibbons, a famous master that way’. Egmont at least seems to confuse Gibbons’s work to the chapel; Horace Walpole in 1760 implied he had done so.

---

1W. Beckford: Italy with sketches of Spain and Portugal, Paris [1834], pp.216–17, letter XVIII of 9th July 1787.
2D. Caldâes Barbosa: Descrição da grandiosa Quinta dos Sete Ídolos, Lisboa [1799], pp.71–73.
3A. Raczyński: Dictionnaire historico-artistique du Portugal, Paris [1847], p.28: ‘Il y avait à Bélas une fontaine qui doit être l'œuvre de Bernini.’
4F. Marques de Sousa Viterbo: Dicionario historico e documental dos arquitetos, engenheiros e constructores portugueses e a servizo de Portugal, Lisboa [1899–1904], I, pp.103–05.
5Italian art historians were less convinced: Emilio Lavagnino claimed that the earthquake had destroyed Bernini’s Anunciada fountain, and that, even if the seventy-seven-year-old sculptor had had it made by his assistants, ‘that does not mean that one can accept as issuing from the workshop of the master the other fountain, with Neptune surrounded by Tritons and Nereids [sic], preserved in the gardens of... Bélas’ (E. Lavagnino: L’opera del genio italiano all’estero. Gli artisti in Portogallo, Rome [1940], p.83). Ferrata does not figure in his index.

---
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Matlock.