
Paweł Gołyźniak
Krakow

THE IMPACT OF THE PONIATOWSKI GEMS ON LATER GEM ENGRAVING

Abstract: *In the first half of the 19th century, the Prince Stanislas Poniatowski (1754–1833) collection of engraved gems was considered to be one of the most outstanding known assemblages. However, its sale at Christie's in 1839 was a disaster, as the cabinet turned out to include almost only neo-classical specimens and, thus, half of the gems did not go under the hammer. But these intaglios and cameos, and especially the themes they bear, portray in their beauty an effort to re-create a lost neo-classical world as reflected in the texts of Homer, Vergil, and other ancient authors. In contrary to other works on the Poniatowski gems, this paper focuses not on the collection itself, but on its impact on the later gem engraving. It presents two intaglios from the collection of the National Museum in Krakow. The first presents a scene of Hebe pouring out nectar for Jupiter (with an eagle behind him). The second depicts a crowned snake-god with the incorrect Latin inscription: VOT•SOL•CER. They are faithful copies of two Poniatowski gems. In fact, the first gem testifies to the great contribution of the Poniatowski collection to the reception of Classical culture, while the other is a falsification of the original which reflects a later collector's aim to possess a 'Poniatowski gem'.*

Keywords: *Gems; intaglios; neo-classical; Poniatowski; reception*

Introduction

Edmund Bulanda (1882–1951) is said to be the first person to have found some famous Poniatowski gems amongst the extensive collection

of intaglios and cameos housed in the National Museum in Krakow (Bulanda 1947, 38–39). He suggested they might have come to Krakow within the extraordinary cabinet of Constantine Schmidt-Ciążyński (Śliwa 1989, 2014; Gołyźniak *et al.* 2016; Gołyźniak forthcoming a). In fact, new research has proved only one Poniatowski intaglio having been kept in Krakow. Indeed, it once belonged to Schmidt-Ciążyński, but was not sold with his other gems in 1886 as Bulanda presumed (Gołyźniak forthcoming b). However, two other objects can be found which, at first glance, appear to be the lost Poniatowski gems. There was little knowledge about them because they were catalogued in the late 19th century and nobody was interested in them in the end. According to the museum's documentation, they both were considered to be ancient works of Greek or Roman engravers, but for the author, it was all too clear that they were in fact neo-classical intaglios and that they conceal an intriguing history.

An intaglio of Jupiter and Hebe

The first specimen to be presented here is an intaglio made of double-layered agate, brown on white (27.1 x 19.7 x 4.5mm), representing a scene of a young woman standing in front of an old, bearded man and pouring a liquid into his cup (Pl. 1: 1).¹ This gem entered the collection of the National Museum in Krakow in 1886 when the museum purchased a magnificent group of engraved stones from Constantine Schmidt-Ciążyński (1818–1889) (Fredro-Boniecka 1939, 278–292; Fredro-Boniecka 1949, 53–84; Kaim-Małecka 1993, 59–95; Myśliński 2001, 49–54; Myśliński 2006, 229–233; Gołyźniak 2013, 217–226; Gołyźniak 2013, 191–202; Śliwa 2014, 17–44; Gołyźniak *et al.* 2016; Gołyźniak forthcoming a).

The woman, dressed in a long chiton and short himation tied at her waist, is Hebe. The folds of her robe are flowing behind her. She has a calm, idealized face and her hair is tied in a bun at the top of her head. In her right, raised hand, she is holding an oinochoe – a Greek wine jug. The old man is Jupiter. He is half-naked with only a mantle or short tunic wrapped around his loins and covering his legs. The god has an aquiline nose and a curly beard. His hair is corrugated around the head across which is a fillet. In his left outstretched hand he is holding a cup, and his right hand is resting on the head of an eagle standing beside him. The whole scene is set among clouds engraved beneath the figures. Hebe, the daughter of Zeus and Hera, was a cupbearer for the gods and goddesses of Mount Olympus,

¹ Inv. no. MNK-Ew-IV-Zł-2038.

serving them with nectar and ambrosia, until she was married to Heracles. The clouds beneath the figures on this intaglio suggest that the scene is arranged on a mountaintop.

The composition of the scene is dynamic and vivid. Hebe's robe is flowing in the blowing wind. It is so thick that the slender body of the goddess, her long legs, and female attributes can be admired. This corresponds very well with her calm facial expression, highlighted by the smooth engraving of the cheek, slightly upturned nose and small lips. In contrast, Jupiter is depicted as a majestic figure with a broad chest and strong arms, and the coiffure is similar to that in his portrait on ancient gems (Furtwängler 1896, 197, no. 4952, pl. 36; Boardman and Scarisbrick 1977, 37, no. 65; Pannuti 1983, 6, no. 4; Maaskant-Kleibrink 1978, 162, no. 300, pl. 58; Spier 1992, 107, no. 267; Platz-Horster 1994, 112, no. 111, pl. 20; Weiß 1996, 71–72, no. 88, pl. 12; Gesztelyi 2001, 36, 69, no. 5; Henig and McGregor 2004, 105, no. 10.26). However, it is impossible to label this gem a genuine ancient piece. The head of Jupiter should be decorated with a laurel wreath, not a diadem. The mantle or robe he is wearing is undulating and flowing behind, similarly to Hebe's. The presence of clouds under the figures' feet is puzzling, because in ancient times ground level was usually indicated simply with a single line. As well, the large dimensions of the stone, which is perfectly sanded, and the style indicate that the intaglio is a neo-classical work.

The Poniatowski gems

Prince Stanislas Poniatowski (1754–1833) was a nephew of the last king and grand-duke of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Stanislas August Poniatowski (1732–1798) (Korzeniowski 1895, 481–535; Busiri Vici 1971; Michalski 1983, 481–487; Mikocki 1988, 68–70; Brandys 2009; Kagan 2010, 227). An avid collector of art, he was once considered the richest man in Europe. He found himself driven into a passion for engraved gems, 2,601 of which he assembled and published (Poniatowski 1830; Poniatowski 1830–1833). However, from the very beginning, his astonishing collection, including 1,737 specimens signed with the names of 'ancient' engravers, aroused many controversies. Shortly after the publication of the collection's catalogue, some scholars pointed out that the vast majority of the Prince's gems were neo-classical works, and such a great number of signed specimens could not possibly exist (Raoul-Rochette 1831, 338; Raoul-Rochette 1834, 148–149; Toelken 1832, 309–320). The gems were auctioned at Christie's

in 1839, and it was a fiasco, as half of the objects remained unsold (Auction, Christie and Manson 29 April – 21 May 1839). However, the 5th Lord Monson did purchase many of the Poniatowski gems (although they were later dispersed in 1851), and Colonel John Tyrrell acquired 1,140 objects, still having faith in the prince's honesty, or more likely, hoping to make a profit in the future (Reinach 1895, 154; Kagan 2010, 228; Wagner 2013, 148). He desperately tried to maintain his great esteem for the collection by publishing catalogues illustrated with early photographs of the gems' impressions (early catalogues: Prendeville 1841; Prendeville and Maginn 1841 republished with 471 pieces illustrated in Prendeville and Maginn 1857 and Prendeville and Maginn 1859), and managed to resell a greater part of his assemblage to Colonel Rickerts, but eventually failed in maintaining a good reputation for the Poniatowski gems (Kagan 2010, 228–229).

Over the next few years, the great Poniatowski collection was dispersed. Interest in the Poniatowski gems dropped dramatically, along with their value (King 1885, 193–197; Reinach 1895, 151–155; Bulanda 1913, 181–184; Neverov 1981, 47–78; Kolendo 1981, 81–99; Laska 2001a, 109). The scandal surrounding the collection had even worse consequences for the entire gem trade. It is believed to have had a hand in the considerable decrease in gem production, and in the number of auctions: collectors became much warier of new acquisitions and less interested in investing in such a risky business (Osborne 1912, VI–VII; Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, 302–304; Gołyźniak *et al.* 2016, 10). Recently, the Prince Poniatowski collection of engraved gems has raised newfound interest, which has led to an effort to completely reconstruct the set and resolve some problems.²

The collection of Prince Stanislas Poniatowski was full of extraordinary objects, and we wonder if the intaglio described above – so obviously neo-classical – might not have previously belonged to it. At present, almost half of the collection is thought to be lost. The famous Poniatowski gems seem to have vanished among the vast number of other neo-classical pieces (Laska 2001a, 109). However, it has been observed that a plethora of them may be

² Dr. Claudia Wagner from the Beazley Archive in Oxford has been conducting a project aimed at reconstructing the entire Poniatowski collection. The preliminary results can be found in: Wagner 2008, 565–572 and Wagner 2013, 145–150 and on the website: <http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/gems/poniatowski/default.htm> (status as of June 23rd, 2015). Hadrien Rambach has just published an important article about two rediscovered Poniatowski intaglios from the American Numismatic Society collection, which also touches some of the interesting issues related to the history of the collection. He also mentions work on a more extensive study of the Prince Poniatowski set, which we look forward to reading see: Rambach 2014, 35–49.

distinguished, thanks to a few particular features. They are usually made of stones that were perfectly prepared beforehand, with highly polished surfaces. They have large dimensions, fitting very well in the exceedingly elaborated mounts, of the ‘medallion type’ (many of which survived). The final distinguishable features are found in the subject matter: scenes from Vergil’s *Aeneid* and Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are common, as are figures depicted in the midst of a violent action or another dynamic composition (King 1885, 193–197; Osborne 1912, VI–VII; Rudoe 1993, 25; Seidmann 1999, 267; Wagner 2013, 145–148; Rambach 2014, 35). Both of these features are evident in our intaglio.

Is it a Poniatowski gem?

Is the intaglio with Jupiter and Hebe from Krakow really a lost Poniatowski gem? The subject of Jupiter and Hebe/Zeus and Nemesis was widely popular in 19th-century glyptic art (Tassinari 1996, 162–163). A number of gems were carved: at least three by Giuseppe Girometti (1780–1851) (Pl. 1: 2, 3) (Rambach forthcoming), and one by Giovanni Settari (1773–1833?) (Lippold 1922, 183, pl. CI.5). According to the Poniatowski catalogues, there were three intaglios presenting Hebe pouring nectar for Jupiter in the collection: one was executed in *Cornaline orientale*, signed ARGÉE and set in a ring (Poniatowski 1830, 1830–1833, no. I.41 [with erroneous cat. no. 31]); the second was made of *Sardoine orientale*, signed ΚΡΩΜΟΥ, and set in a mount (Poniatowski 1830, 1830–1833, no. I.42; Predeville 1841, 14, no. 28; Predeville and Maginn 1841; Predeville and Maginn 1857, 14, no. 28); and the third was cut in *Cornaline orientale*, signed CHROMIOS (or rather ΚΡΩΜΟΥ), and set in a mount (Poniatowski 1830, 1830–1833, no. I.43).³ The description of the second gem appears to best fit the intaglio from Krakow and one might have wished to identify it with the lost Poniatowski intaglio. However, thanks to the photograph of the impression of the original Poniatowski gem in the book by Predeville and Maginn (1857, 14, no. 28) and the plaster-impression from the Beazley Archive in Oxford (Pl. 2: 1), one precisely knows what it looked like and one can make comparisons.

When carefully compared, the intaglio from the Krakow collection and the impression from the Beazley Archive exhibit some differences. First of

³ Actually, in the Prince Poniatowski collection, there were 268 pieces with this signature. It originates from a true ancient, famous Greek gem-engraver named Cronius (ΚΡΩΜΟΥ). He is mentioned by Pliny (*NH* 37.4), see also Forrer 1907, 225.

all, there is no artist's signature on the gem from Krakow. There are much fewer clouds (only on the bottom part) than on the impression, where they cover almost half the field. There are also some differences in the figures. The Hebe on our intaglio is too tall and too slim. In comparison to the figure from the impression, she is much more stiff and static. The body of Hebe from the impression seems to be fuller and her gestures are more gentle. The Jupiter of the impression is lying more horizontally on the throne and his mantle is wrapped not only around his hips and legs, but also around his left arm. The eagle from the impression seems to be better engraved as well. In conclusion, these two gems were certainly executed by different engravers and the intaglio from Krakow is only a later copy of the original Poniatowski gem, without the high quality of engraving. Thus, one wonders what is the explanation for its existence?

Gertrud Seidmann (1999, 263–270) published a paper on an unusual Poniatowski intaglio engraved, perhaps, by the hand of Giovanni Calandrelli (1784–1852), bearing the figure of the Greek hero Jason modelled after the sculpture by Bertel Thorvaldsen (1770–1844). She suggested that some gems which surely once belonged to Prince Poniatowski were not included in his catalogue (Seidmann 1999, 268). Following this intriguing observation, it would be tempting to claim that our intaglio might be one of those specimens that ‘got away’ from the collection, maybe handed out as gifts. However, as the analysis above revealed, the object from Krakow is not characterised by the superb quality so typical of Poniatowski gems. Besides, it is not just a repetition of the same subject or its reinterpretation: it is clearly a copy of one of the gems already existing in the cabinet.

Therefore, the intentions of the maker of the Krakow gem, or potentially his commissioner, are intriguing. The material used may speak badly of him. The maker used the same type of stone as the original gem, with similar dimensions, and imitated the style of the original engraver, indicating that the object was intended to be taken as one of the original Poniatowski gems. Taking those points into consideration, is it possible this gem is a fake? Maybe even Prince Stanislas Poniatowski himself commissioned this intaglio? In order to understand the purpose of our piece properly, one should first examine the intentions of Prince Poniatowski himself in creating such an extensive collection of neo-classical gems and whether or not it should be regarded as one of the greatest frauds in gem engraving history.

Seidmann (1999, 269) suspected that the prince commissioned these great many gems from contemporary artists on purpose. In order to raise their

value, he may have decided to add signatures of both historical and fictional engravers. He might have done so out of concern for his family, wanting to leave his descendants a real treasure. Moreover, Andrzej Laska (2001a, 108–112) analysed the names of the engravers appearing on a majority of the Poniatowski gems. He concluded the prince had been unaware of the effect which the introduction of such a vast number of signed pieces could have had on the market. As such, he blames him for the whole mess and the fraud, but there is some evidence suggesting a different view.

It appears that the prince was completely fascinated by Classical culture and this passion drove him to create one of the most comprehensive collections of Classical legacy illustrations. Thus, among the subjects carved on his stones, various mythological themes dominate, alongside some historical events and a number of portraits of Greek and Roman historical figures (Wagner 2008; Wagner 2013). There is usually no ancient equivalent for the subject-matter, as if the devices are products of the imaginations of the prince and his engravers. For instance, the study of Giovanni Caladrelli's (1784–1852) amazing collection of sketches from Berlin conducted by Gertrud Platz-Horster (2003; 2005) revealed that the works of this engraver are illustrations for Karl Philip Moritz's *Götterlehre*. Another issue is that some of the Poniatowski gems were based on other works of neo-classical art. Regarding only the gems with the scene of Hebe and Jupiter, they were directly inspired by two reliefs by Bertel Thorvaldsen, of 1808 (bearing Hercules and Hebe) and 1810 (presenting Zeus and Nemesis), both preserved at the Thorvaldsen Museum (inv. no. A317, see: Grandesso 2010, 95, fig. 108, and inv. no. A324, see Hartmann 1979, pl. 107.2). The idea of falsification in terms of glyptic art is often exaggerated and, thus, misleading. Not all the neo-classical gems bearing motifs related to ancient Greece and Rome were intended to be sold or considered genuine ancient pieces by their makers. Like the Poniatowski gems, they were a result of great admiration and appreciation of Classical art and culture. Overall, this would be a perfect explanation, but the fact that the prince decided to put so many false signatures on his gems shows how blurred the definition of forgery is when it comes to glyptic art.

With regards to the gem from the Krakow collection, it proves the Poniatowski gems to be quite influential. Although they quickly lost their value on the market, they had a major impact on contemporary gem engraving. The motif on our gem of Hebe pouring nectar for Jupiter must have been copied from the plaster impression, as it is a mirror image of the original. The object could not have been intended to imitate the

real Poniatowski gem to gain more value on the art market. The first sale of Poniatowski gems in 1839 had already ended in an unfortunate manner. As Charles William King (1885, 270) wrote, even the famous, truly ancient cornelian with bust of Io by Dioscurides was affected by the scandal and sold for a song. John Tyrrell spent a fortune on promoting the bulk of the Poniatowski gems that he acquired, but could not improve their general reputation.⁴ Still, the high level of artistic value of these remarkably beautiful stones and the themes with original interpretations of Classical mythology moved other engravers to obtain some of them as a source of inspiration. This is exactly the reason why our gem was created. The artist was attempting to reach the same level of Classical spirit and artistic virtuosity that he found on the original Poniatowski gem with Hebe and Jupiter. As already observed, the cutter of the gem from Krakow must have used a plaster impression of the original. Some of them had already been made in the early 1830s and sent to Frederick William III (1797–1840), king of Prussia (Toelken 1832, 309–320). This dactyliotheca did not include the impression of the intaglio with Hebe pouring nectar for Jupiter. However, there were other sets of impressions available, so the engraver must have had access to one of them (Wagner 2013, 148–149). Judging from the style of the intaglio from Krakow, it can be dated *c.* the middle of the 19th century.

Surprisingly, there is more evidence that the Poniatowski gems were quite influential. A late 19th century cameo, made of shell and once registered on eBay, bears an exact copy of the original motif of Hebe pouring nectar for Jupiter, in imitation of the original style (Pl. 2: 2). In fact, it is even more similar to the original than the intaglio from Krakow. Many years after the scandal related to the Poniatowski collection, the prince's gems remained a source of inspiration for the next generations of gem engravers.

Another Poniatowski gem?

The National Museum in Krakow preserves another interesting piece related to the Poniatowski gems, also once belonging to the Constantine

⁴ However, he managed to resell many of his Poniatowski gems to Colonel Rickerts (Kagan 2010, 228–229). Regarding Tyrrell's efforts see the publications including the gems he had purchased: Prendeville 1841; Prendeville and Maginn 1841 republished with 471 pieces illustrated in Prendeville and Maginn 1857 and Prendeville and Maginn 1859. Concerning the others, see the sale catalogues where the Poniatowski gems appear, for instance: Sotheby, Wilkinson and Hodge 1883 where they are described as '(...) selected medallions, from the celebrated cabinet of the Prince Poniatowski'. Seidmann (1999, 269) noticed that these catalogue titles have been less and less elaborated in the course of time.

Schmidt-Ciążyński collection. It is a bronze ring (bezel 10.5 x 7.5mm; hoop 18.6 x 18.9mm; weight: 2.25g) with a magical gem made of red jasper (10.5 x 7.5 x 1.6mm) showing a lion-headed snake to the right with three rays around the head and the letters: VOT•SOL• above it and CER beneath (Pl 3. 1, 2).⁵ The lion-headed serpent creature with rays is Chnoubis, an Egyptian Gnostic solar icon, found most often on magical/gnostic gems and amulets for protection against poison and disease as well as to facilitate digestion and prevent stomach problems (Śliwa 1999, 25–30). The gems with its depictions were usually made of chalcedony, chromium bearing chalcedony, moss agate, serpentine and only occasionally jaspers (usually red-spotted green jasper, known as ‘bloodstone’) (Bonner 1950, 54–60, nos. 81–97; Delatte and Derchain 1964, 54–72, nos. 52–81; Scherf *et al.* 1970, 237–240, nos. 162–171, pls. 106–108; Philipp 1986, 88–92, nos. 126–135; Kiss 1986, 272–273; Henig *et al.* 1994, 227–228, no. 501; Śliwa 1999, 25–30; Śliwa 2014, 85–87, nos. 53–55).

In all certainty, the gem and the ring are not ancient. Firstly, the red jasper is a rather unusual material for a magical gem of this kind. Green jasper was commonly used for magical gems presenting solar deities instead. Secondly, the serpent is engraved schematically and in an awkward position; usually the creature is much bigger and it has a larger lion’s head surrounded by seven rays. Moreover, inscriptions in Latin may occur on ancient magical gems, but rarely. The abbreviations incised on this intaglio are incorrect, as a Roman would not have inscribed VOT•SOL•CER but V•S•L•M• (*Votum Solvit Libens Merito*).⁶

Out of habit, even though the style of this intaglio is quite different from that of the very attractive Poniatowski gems, we checked the plaster casts preserved in Oxford at the Beazley Archive. And there it was: an identical gem – depicting the same crowned serpent with the Latin inscription VOT•SOL•CER – which belonged to Prince Poniatowski (Pl. 3: 3). It was sold at the 1839 auction, as lot no. 1935, and had never been traced since. At first, we had hoped that the gem in Krakow was the lost Poniatowski stone. In the Poniatowski catalogue, the gem is reported to be in hyacinth, but the gemological meaning of this vague term is uncertain, and it happens that the catalogue is mistaken about materials (Poniatowski 1830, 1830–1833, no. XIII.6). But then, we realised that the device is engraved in the wrong direction, with the letters facing the same way as the impression

⁵ Inv. no. MNK-Ew-IV-Z-69/zl-2239.

⁶ Here I would like to thank Dr. Claudia Wagner, who drew my attention to this Latin inscription and helped me to understand it correctly.

of the Poniatowski stone, which was engraved in negative. The device from the intaglio from Krakow was, therefore, copied from an impression of the original Poniatowski gem.

The original Poniatowski gem with such a motif was unusual amongst the corpus of stones belonging to the Prince. Rather than an elegant neo-classical iconography, the type is indeed a real imitation of an ancient piece, a real forgery. This, however, cannot prove Stanislas Poniatowski had ill intentions while creating his vast assemblage. He inherited a small collection of engraved gems from his uncle, Stanislas August Poniatowski (1732–1798), the last king of Poland (Visconti 1829; Reinach 1895, 151–152; Laska 2001a, 105–108; Laska 2001b, 235–242; Rambach 2014, 38). Perhaps this stone originally belonged to this set and as one cannot judge it on any terms, the Prince cannot be blamed for possessing it. Besides, this item could have entered his collection at the very beginning of his gem-fascination when he had little knowledge about the genuine ancient gems and their later copies (Laska 2001a, 108–109).

Another issue is that if Schmidt-Ciążyński was actually deceived and purchased the ring with a fake gem, since his connoisseurship in glyptic art, especially in terms of magical gems and amulets (Śliwa 2014) was considerable? Perhaps it is just a coincidence, but one might suspect that this intaglio in red jasper was deliberately commissioned by Schmidt-Ciążyński or any other collector to copy a real Poniatowski gem after its plaster impression. This is difficult to judge. In his brief inventory of the gems presented to the National Museum in Krakow in 1886, Schmidt-Ciążyński informs that he considered the ring and the intaglio to be ancient (Śliwa 2014, 30–31; Gołyźniak forthcoming a).⁷ This suggests that he was not aware of its real poor value, but maybe, he just wanted to make a camouflage.

In any case, this gem cutter's intentions were far different than those of the one who executed the intaglio with Hebe and Jupiter (see above). Here, we are dealing with a standard forgery with the purpose of imitating an ancient gem or perhaps even the Poniatowski one exactly. The plaster impression from one of the dactyliothecae of the Prince's objects was just the source of inspiration for the engraver.

⁷ The inventory book of the Constantine Schmidt-Ciążyński is now kept at the Archive of the National Museum in Krakow.

Conclusions

Although Constantine Schmidt-Ciążyński acquired one authentic Poniatowski gem (an intaglio bearing the motif of Euryclea recognising Ulysses by the scar on his knee), there seems to have been no patriotic incentives in the research of his compatriot's gems (Gołyźniak forthcoming b). The two objects from the National Museum in Krakow collection of engraved gems presented here illustrate the impact of the Prince Stanislas Poniatowski collection on later gem engraving. Simultaneously, they touch on an important and very complex problem of 19th century glyptic art: the falsification of originals. In terms of glyptics, this issue has many facets. Based on this research, one sees that on the one hand, the Poniatowski gems clearly were a source of inspiration for later gem-engravers. This is evidenced by both the intaglio from the Krakow collection representing Hebe pouring out nectar to Jupiter and the shell cameo discussed above. Both are examples of great appreciation of the Poniatowski collection and the masterfully cut stone that belonged to it. On the other hand, creating fakes that were meant to be taken as ancient pieces was a highly common phenomenon in those days (Kagan 2010, 229–230). The second object from the Krakow collection discussed here is a good example of this practice. But the forgers were not only focused on imitating ancient objects and putting them on the art market. Faking of objects executed by the most prominent neo-classical artists was also common. A good example of this are copies of the works of Giovanni Pichler (1734–1791) (Tassinari 2013, 456–531). Sometimes, the researcher may be misled by the impression that one or more gems are copies of another, while they are all simply based on the very same source outside of the glyptic art, like the ancient wall paintings from Herculaneum or works of famous sculptors such as Bertel Thorvaldsen (Pirzio Biroli Stefanelli 1991; Tassinari 1993, 243–272; Tassinari 1996, 147–176; Seidmann 1999, 263; Tassinari 2015). Regarding the Poniatowski gems, as one sees, the scandal caused the loss of much of their value on the market, but they were influential and appreciated for their absolutely finest compositions and exceptional style. As they were created by the best artists of the day, they stimulated the next generations of gem-engravers who tried to approach the earlier masters.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude to the Management of the National Museum in Krakow for allowing me to see these objects and publish them, but in particular Alicja Kiljańska and Maria Wałach are acknowledged for giving me access to their documentation. I am thankful to Dr. Claudia Wagner from The Beazley Archive in Oxford who was so kind to provide me with the photographs of the impressions of the original Poniatowski gems and discuss some matters. I am very much indebted to Hadrien J. Rambach, who made suggestions after reading a preliminary version of this paper. Anonymous reviewers are greatly acknowledged as well. Thanks their kind help, remarks and advice this article has been improved significantly.

References

- Scherf V., Gercke P. and Zazoff P. 1970.** *Die Antiken Gemmen in deutschen Sammlungen 3. Herzog Anton-Urlich Museum Braunschweig, Sammlung in Arch. Inst. Der Universitat Göttingen, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Kassel.* Wiesbaden.
- Auction, Christie and Manson 1839.** *A Catalogue of the Very Celebrated Collection of Antique Gems of the Prince Poniatowski*, London, 29 April–21 May 1839.
- Auction, Sotheby, Wilkinson and Hodge 1883.** *A Catalogue of Gems, the Property of the Late Samuel Sharp, Esq. F.S.A. F.G.S. Of Great Harrowden Hall, Near Wellingborough, Being Selected Medallions, from the Celebrated Cabinet of the Prince Poniatowski*, London, April 5th 1883.
- Boardman J. and Scarisbrick D. 1977.** *The Ralph Harari Collection of Finger Rings.* London.
- Bonner C. 1950.** *Studies in Magical Amulets Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian.* London, Oxford.
- Brandys M. 2009.** *Nieznany księżę Poniatowski.* Warsaw.
- Bulanda E. 1913.** Przyczynek do historii zbioru gemm Stanisława Augusta. *Wiadomości Numizmatyczno-Archeologiczne*, 181–184.
- Bulanda E. 1947.** Archeologia klasyczna. *Archeologia* 1, 38–39.
- Busiri Vici A. 1971.** *I Poniatowski e Roma.* Florence.

- Delatte A. and Derchain Ph. 1964.** *Les intailles magiques gréco-égyptiennes*. Paris.
- Forrer L. 1907.** *Biographical Dictionary of Medallists, Coin-, Gem- and Seal-Engravers, Mint-Masters, &c. Ancient to Modern with References to their Works B.C. 500–A.D. 1900*, vol. 3 (I–Maz). London.
- Fredro-Boniecka M. 1939.** Gemmy z podpisami artystów w Muzeum Narodowym w Krakowie. Cz. 1: Gemmy Pilcherów. *Wiadomości Numizmatyczno-Archeologiczne* 20 (1938–1939), 278–292.
- Fredro-Boniecka M. 1949.** Gemmy z podpisami artystów w Muzeum Narodowym w Krakowie. Cz. 2: *Wiadomości Numizmatyczno-Archeologiczne* 21 (1940–1948), 53–84.
- Furtwängler A. 1896.** *Beschreibung der Geschnittenen Steine im Antiquarium*. Berlin.
- Gesztelyi T. 2001.** *Gemstones and Finger Rings from Brigetio, Collection of the Kuny Domokos Museum of Tata* 6. Tata.
- Golyźniak P. 2013.** A problematic cameo with a portrait of Augustus from the collection of Constantine Schmidt-Ciążyński. *Notae Numismaticae–Zapiski Numizmatyczne* 8, 217–226.
- Golyźniak P. 2013.** Monsters, chimeras, masks or gods? *SAAC* 17, 191–202.
- Golyźniak P., Natkaniec-Nowak L. and Dumańska-Słowik M. 2016.** A nineteenth-century glyptic collection in the National Museum in Cracow. The cabinet of Constantine Schmidt-Ciążyński. *Journal of the History of Collections* 28/1 (March 2016), 85–96.
- Golyźniak P. forthcoming a.** *Ancient Engraved Gems in the National Museum in Krakow*.
- Golyźniak P. forthcoming b.** A re-discovered Poniatowski gem in the National Museum in Krakow. *Jewellery Studies Online*, Spring 2017.
- Grandesso S. 2010.** *Berthel Thorvaldsen (1770 – 1884)*. Milan.
- Hartmann J. B. 1979.** *Antike Motive bei Thorvaldsen. Studien zur Antikenrezeption des Klassizismus*. Tübingen.
- Henig M., Scarisbrick D. and Whiting M. 1994.** *Classical Gems: Ancient and Modern Intaglios and Cameos in the Fitzwilliam Museum*. Cambridge.
- Kagan J. 2010.** *Gem Engraving in Britain from Antiquity to the Present with a Catalogue of the British Engraved Gems in The State Hermitage Museum*. Oxford.
- Kaim-Malecka B. 1993.** Catalogue des intailles orientales des musées Polonais. *Acta Archaeologica Lovaniensia* 32, 59–91.

- King C. W. 1885.** *The Handbook of Engraved Gems*. London (2nd ed.).
- Kiss Z. 1986.** S.v. Atherion-Eros. In J. Pouilloux and N. Yalouris (eds.), *LIMC*, vol. 3, 272–273. Zurich, Munich.
- Kolendo J. 1981.** Największy skandal w dziejach badań nad gliktyką antyczną. Kolekcja gemm ks. Stanisława Poniatowskiego. *Studia Archeologiczne* 1, 81–99.
- Korzeniowski J. 1895.** Souvenirs du Prince Stanislas Poniatowski. *Revue d'histoire diplomatique* 9/4, 481–535.
- Laska A. 2001a.** Gemmy księcia Stanisława Poniatowskiego. *Opuscula Musealia* 11, 105–121.
- Laska A. 2001b.** Dwie daktylioteki króla Stanisława Poniatowskiego. In E. Papuci-Władyka and J. Śliwa (eds.), *Studia Archaeologica. Prace dedykowane profesorowi Januszowi A. Ostrowskiemu w sześćdziesięciolecie urodzin*, 235–242. Krakow.
- Maaskant-Kleibrink M. 1978.** *Catalogue of the Engraved Gems in the Royal Coin Cabinet The Hague. The Greek, Etruscan and Roman Collections*. Wiesbaden.
- Heing M. and McGregor A. 2004.** *Catalogue of the Engraved Gems and Finger Rings in the Ashmolean Museum*. Vol. 2: Roman. Oxford.
- Michalski J. 1983.** S.v. Poniatowski Stanisław h. Ciołek (1754–1833). In E. Rostworowski (ed.), *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* 27/3, 481–487.
- Mikocki T. 1988.** *À la recherche de l'art antique les voyageurs polonais et Italie dans les années 1750–1830*. Wrocław, Warsaw, Krakow, Gdańsk, Łódź.
- Myśliński M. 2001.** Sceny gonitw rydwanów na hipodromie w Konstantynopolu – dwie gemmy w zbiorach Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie. In W. Bulsza and L. Sadko (eds.), *Ars Graeca – Ars Latina. Studia dedykowane Profesor Annie Różyckiej Bryzek*, 49–54. Krakow.
- Myśliński M. 2006.** Gemmy późnoantyczne i bizantyńskie w polskich kolekcjach muzealnych. *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki* 68/2, 229–233.
- Neverov O. 1981.** Kolekcje dzieł sztuki dwóch Poniatowskich. *Archeologia* 32, 47–78.
- Osborne D. 1912.** *Engraved Gems, Signets, Talismans and Ornamental Intaglios: Ancient and Modern*. New York.
- Pannuti U. 1983.** *Catalogo della Collezione Glittica Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli*, vol. 1. Rome.
- Philipp H. 1986.** *Mira et Magica: Gemmen im Ägyptischen Museum der Staatlichen Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz Berlin-Charlottenburg*. Mainz.

- Pirzio Biroli Stefanelli L. 1991.** Le opere di Thorvaldsen nella glittica romana dell'Ottocento. In M. Nykajær and P. Kragelund (eds.), *Thorvaldsen, L'ambiente, l'influsso, il mito*, 91–100. (*Analecta Romana Instituti Danici Supplementum* 18). Rome.
- Platz-Horster G. 1994.** *Die Antiken Gemmen aus Xanten*. Band 2: *im Besitz des Archäologischen Parks/Regionalmuseums Xanten, der Katholischen Kirchengemeinde St. Mariae Himmelfahrt Marienbaum sowie in Privatbesitz*. Bonn, Cologne.
- Platz-Horster G. 2003.** Zeichnungen und Gemmen des Giovanni Callandrelli. In D. Willers and L. Raselli-Nydegger (eds.), *Im Glanz der Götter und Heroen. Meisterwerke antiker Glyptik aus der Stiftung Leo Merz*, 49–62. Mainz.
- Platz-Horster G. 2005.** *L'antica maniera. Zeichnungen und Gemmen des Giovanni Calandrelli in der Antikensammlung Berlin*. Berlin.
- Poniatowski S. A. 1830.** *Catalogue des pierres gravées antiques de S.A. le Prince Stanislas Poniatowski*. Florence.
- Poniatowski S. A. 1830–1833.** *Catalogue des Pierres Gravées Antiques de S.A. le Prince Stanislas Poniatowski*, vols. 1–3. Florence.
- Prendeville J. 1841.** *Explanatory Catalogue of the Proof-impressions of the Antique Gems Possessed by the Late Prince Poniatowski, and Now in the Possession of John Tyrrell, Esq: Accompanied with Descriptions ... and Preceded by an Essay on Ancient Gems and Gem-engraving*. London.
- Prendeville J. and Maginn W. 1841.** *An Historical and Descriptive Account of the Famous Collection of Antique Gems Possessed by the Late Prince Poniatowski: Accompanied by Poetical Illustrations of the Subjects, from Classical Authors, with an Essay on Ancient Gems and Gem-engraving*. London.
- Prendeville J. and Maginn W. 1857.** *Photographic Facsimiles of the Antique Gems Formerly Possessed by the Late Prince Poniatowski, Accompanied by a Description and Poetical Illustrations of Each Subject, Carefully Selected from Classical Authors, Together with an Essay on Ancient Gems and Gem-Engraving*. London (1st series).
- Prendeville J. and Maginn W. 1859.** *Photographic Facsimiles of the Antique Gems Formerly Possessed by the Late Prince Poniatowski, Accompanied by a Description and Poetical Illustrations of Each Subject, Carefully Selected from Classical Authors, Together with an Essay on Ancient Gems and Gem-Engraving*. London (2nd series).

- Rambach H. J. 2014.** The gem collection of Prince Stanislas Poniatowski. *American Numismatic Society Magazine* 13/2, 35–49.
- Rambach H. J. forthcoming.** The sources of Girometti: the case of a masterwork – his Hebe and Jupiter cameo.
- Raoul-Rochette D. 1831.** Oeuvres diverses italiennes et françaises d'E.Q. Visconti vol. I, II, III. *Journal des Savants*, 329–341.
- Raoul-Rochette D. 1834.** Lettre de M. Raoul-Rochette à M. Schorn, sur quelques noms d'artistes omis ou insérés à tort dans le Catalogue de M. Le Dr Sillig. *Bulletin des Sciences Historiques, Antiquités Philologie* 18, 148–149.
- Reinach S. 1895.** *Pierres gravées des collections Marlborough et d'Orleans, des recueils d'Eckhel, Gori, Levesque de Gravelle, Mariette, Millin, Stosch, reunites et rééditées avec un texte nouveau.* Paris.
- Rudoe J. 1993.** The faking of gems in the eighteenth century. In M. Jones (ed.), *Why Fakes Matter. Essays on Problems of Authenticity*, 23–31. London.
- Seidmann G. 1999.** A genuine fake Poniatowski gem? *BABesch* 74, 263–270.
- Spier J. 1992.** *Ancient Gems and Finger Rings: Catalogue of the Collection J. Paul Getty Museum.* Malibu, California.
- Śliwa J. (1989).** *Egyptian Scarabs and Magical Gems from the Collection of Constantine Schmidt-Ciążyński.* Warsaw, Krakow.
- Śliwa J. 1999.** Three magical gems with representations of Chnoubis from the Collection of Konstanty Schmidt-Ciążyński. *Notae Numismaticae–Zapiski Numizmatyczne* 3/4, 25–30.
- Śliwa J. 2014.** *Magical Gems from the Collection of Constantine Schmidt-Ciążyński and from other Polish Collections.* Krakow.
- Tassinari G. 1993.** Aspetti della glittica dell'Ottocento. Successo di un bassorilievo del Thorvaldsen, La Fucina di Vulcano. *AnalRom* 21, 243–272.
- Tassinari G. 1996.** Un bassorilievo del Thorvaldsen: Minerva e Prometeo. La sua presenza nella glittica dell'Ottocento e la collezione Poniatowski. *AnalRom* 23, 147–176.
- Tassinari G. 2013.** La figurazione glittica di Leda e il cigno e un cammeo di Giovanni Pichler. *Sibrium* 27, 456–531.
- Tassinari G. 2015.** *Le pitture delle Antichità di Ercolano nelle gemme del XVIII e XIX secolo/The Paintings of the Antichità di Ercolano in 18th and 19th century Gem-Carving.* Naples.

- Toelken E. H. 1832.** Catalogue des pierres gravées de Son Altesse le Prince Stanislas Poniatowski. *Jahrbüher für wissenschaftliche Kritik* 2 (39–40), 309–320.
- Visconti E. Q. 1829.** Osservazioni sul catalogo degli antichi incisori in gemme. Esposizione dell'impronte di antiche gemme raccolte per uso di Sua Eccellenza il Sig. Principe D. Agostino Chigi, Catalogo delle gemme antiche di S. A. il Sig. Principe Stanislao Poniatowski. In G. Labus (ed.), *Opere varie. Italiane e francesi*, vol. 2, 115–134, 141–333, 372–386, pls. I–XIV.
- Wagner C. 2008.** A picture-book of antiquity: the neo-classical gem Collection of Prince Poniatowski. In P. Castillo (ed.), *Congreso Internacional: Imágenes. La Antigüedad en las Artes Escénicas y Visuales*, 565–572. Logroño.
- Wagner C. 2013.** Fable and history: Prince Poniatowski's neo-classical gem collection. In H. Wiegel and M. Vickers (eds.), *Excalibur: Essays on Antiquity and the History of Collecting in Honour of Arthur McGregor*, 145–150. Oxford.
- Weiß C. 1996.** *Antike Gemmen in deutschen Sammlungen: die antiken Gemmen der Sammlung Friedrich Julius Rudolf Bergau im Germanischen Nationalmuseum Nürnberg*. Nuremberg.
- Zwierlein-Diehl E. 2007.** *Antike Gemmen und ihr Nachleben*. Berlin, New York.

Paweł Gołyźniak
c/o Institute of Archaeology
Jagiellonian University
pawel.golyzniak@gmail.com



Pl. 1. 1 – Intaglio, a copy of the original Prince Poniatowski gem, chalcedony (agate), 27.1 x 19.7 x 4.5mm. Hebe pouring out nectar to Jupiter (the eagle behind him). The National Museum, Krakow, inv. no. MNK-Ew-IV-zł-2038. Photo by the Photographic Studio of the National Museum, Krakow; 2 – Cameo by Giuseppe Girometti (1780–1851), set in an 18th-century gold box. Photo: courtesy of H. J. Rambach; 3 – The same as Pl. 1: 2, but focused on the cameo. Photo: courtesy of H. J. Rambach



1



2

Pl. 2. 1 – Impression of the original, lost intaglio from the collection of Prince Poniatowski, the Beazley Archive (the Classical Art Research Centre), Oxford University. Photo by C. Wagner; 2 – Cameo, a copy after the original Prince Poniatowski gem. Found on eBay, source: <http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/XDB/ASP/recordDetailsLarge.asp?recordCount=13&id={35A646E9-EB86-4CAE-AA8FCE2C1E5D04C3}&fileName=PONIATOWSKI%2FT28%2EA%2F&returnPage=&start=0> (status as of June 23rd, 2015)



1



2



3

Pl. 3. 1 – Intaglio mounted in a bronze ring, a copy of the original Prince Poniatowski gem, red jasper, the ring: bezel 10.5 x 7.5mm; hoop 18.6 x 18.9mm; weight: 2.25g, the gem 10.5 x 7.5 x 1.6mm. A lion-headed snake to the right with three rays around the head (Chnoubis) and the letters: VOT · SOL · above it and CER beneath. The National Museum, Krakow, inv. no. MNK-Ew-IV-Z-69; 2 – As above, but in profile. Photos by Photographic Studio of the National Museum, Krakow; 3 – Impression of the original, lost intaglio from the collection of Prince Poniatowski, the Beazley Archive (the Classical Art Research Centre), Oxford University. Photo by C. Wagner