

hortus imaginum

Essays in Western Art

*Edited by Robert Enggass
& Marilyn Stokstad*

Lawrence: University of Kansas, 1974

University of Kansas Publications
Humanistic Studies, 45

**hortus
imaginum**

hortus imaginum

Essays in Western Art

*Edited by Robert Enggass
& Marilyn Stokstad*

Lawrence: University of Kansas, 1974

Copyright 1974 by the University of Kansas
Printed in Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A. by the University of Kansas Printing Service
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 74-620191

Preface

These essays, covering a wide variety of fields in Western art, from early Medieval to late Baroque, are written by the friends, colleagues and students of a remarkable man—Professor Harold E. Wethey. That the range of these writings taken together is scarcely broader than the scholarly interests of Wethey himself gives some indication of the scope of his inquiring mind. Those who turn to Wethey's bibliography (which is included in this volume) will see that these interests embrace architecture, sculpture and painting, in Italy, Spain and Latin America, and extend in time from the late Middle Ages through the Renaissance to the Baroque. Few art historians now alive can claim more.

This volume has been several years in the making. For its completion we owe thanks to more people than we can name: not only those who contributed the results of the research that is published here, but also those who gave so generously of their time and effort to prepare this book for publication. Among these last our thanks go especially to Edward Ruhe, Editor of the University of Kansas Humanistic Studies; to Anthony Clark, Chairman, Department of European Paintings of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Dwight Miller of the Department of Art, Stanford University, who have read all these manuscripts and made many valuable suggestions about them; and to Frances D'Antoni, Eleanor Collins, and Alice Wethey for valuable assistance.

ROBERT ENGGASS

MARILYN STOKSTAD

Lawrence, Kansas, 20 August, 1974

Contents

James Snyder: THE MOSAIC IN SANTA MARIA NOVA AND THE ORIGINAL APSE DECORATION OF SANTA MARIA MAGGIORE	1
Suzanne Lewis: PROBLEMS OF ARCHITECTURAL STYLE AND THE AMBROSIAN IN LATE FOURTH-CENTURY MILAN	11
Carl D. Sheppard: THE BRONZE DOORS OF AUGSBURG CATHEDRAL	21
John Williams: <i>Marcialis Pincerna</i> AND THE PROVINCIAL IN SPANISH MEDIEVAL ART ...	29
Beatrice Gilman Proske: TWO IVORY MADONNAS	37
R. Steven Janke: THE VISION OF ST. BERNARD: A STUDY IN FLORENTINE ICONOGRAPHY	45
Marvin Eisenberg: AN ANTIPHONAL PAGE OF THE SIENESE QUATTROCENTO	51
Mójmir S. Frinta: A STATUE OF ST. CHRISTOPHER AT THE M. H. DE YOUNG MEMORIAL MUSEUM AT SAN FRANCISCO	57
Elizabeth R. Sunderland: THE SYSTEM OF PROPORTION OF FILIPPO BRUNELLESCHI	65
Robert L. Mode: ANCIENT PARAGONS IN A PICCOLOMINI SCHEME	73
Earl S. Rosenthal: <i>Plus Oultre: The Idea Imperial</i> OF CHARLES V IN HIS COLUMNAR DEVICE ON THE ALHAMBRA	85
Marilyn Stokstad: <i>Christ in Gethsemane: SCULPTURE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS MUSEUM OF ART</i>	95
Enriqueta Harris Frankfort: EL GRECO'S <i>Holy Family with the Sleeping Christ Child and the Infant Baptist: AN IMAGE OF SILENCE AND MYSTERY</i>	103
Ward Bissell: CONCERNING THE DATE OF CARAVAGGIO'S <i>Amore Vincitore</i>	113
Michael Stoughton: A LATE PAINTING BY GIOVANNI BATTISTA CARACCILO: <i>The Judgement of Solomon</i>	125
Jonathan Brown: PEN DRAWINGS BY HERRERA THE YOUNGER	129
John Varriano: DOMENICO CASTELLI'S FAÇADE FOR SAN GIROLAMO DELLA CARITÀ IN ROME	139
Geraldine E. Fowle: SÉBASTIEN BOURDON'S <i>Acts of Mercy: THEIR SIGNIFICANCE AS A SERIES</i>	147
D. T. Kinkead: AN IMPORTANT <i>Vanitas</i> BY JUAN DE VALDÉS LEAL	155
Francis H. Dowley: GIACINTO BRANDI'S PAINTINGS AT THE PALAZZO TAVERNA	165
Beverly F. Heisner: VISCARDI'S MARIAHILFKIRCHE AT FREYSTADT AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CENTRAL PLAN CHURCH IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY GERMANY	175
Robert Enggass: PAOLO CAMPI: AN INTRODUCTION	185
Fern Rusk Shapley: TIEPOLO'S ZENOBIA CYCLE	193
Adelaide A. Adams: A NOTE ON THE CAREER OF HAROLD E. WETHEY, WITH A LIST OF HIS PUBLICATIONS	199

Illustrations

(Following page 211)

1. Apse mosaic from the Basilica Eufrasiana, Parenzo (Photo: Alinari)
2. Apse fresco from Santa Maria Antiqua, Rome (Photo: Wilpert)
3. Apse mosaic from Santa Maria Nova (Santa Francesca Romana), Rome (Photo: Alinari)
4. Apse mosaic from Sant'Andrea Catabarbara, Rome (Photo: Ciampini)
5. Triumphal Arch mosaic from Santa Maria Maggiore, Rome (detail)
6. Triumphal Arch and Apse of Santa Maria Maggiore, Rome
7. Apse mosaic from Santi Stefano e Agata, Capua (Photo: Ciampini)
8. Map of late 4th century Milan (after Villa)
9. Plan of the Basilica Apostolorum, Milan (after Villa)
10. Isometric plan of the Basilica Apostolorum, Milan (after Villa)
11. Plan of the Basilica Ambrosiana, Milan
12. Plan of San Simpliciano (Basilica Virginum), Milan (after Borroni)
13. Plan of San Lorenzo, Milan (first project)
14. Plan of the Chapel of San Vittore, Milan (after Verzone)
15. Door of exterior portal, south aisle, Augsburg Cathedral, detail of left valve (Photo: Carl D. Sheppard)
16. Door of exterior portal, south aisle, Augsburg Cathedral, detail of left valve (Photo: Courtauld Institute of Art)
17. *Last Supper*. León, San Isidoro, on the vault of the Pantheon (Photo: Mas)
18. *Last Supper*, ivory plaque. Monastery of San Millán de la Cogolla (Photo: Mas)
19. *Entry into Jerusalem, Last Supper, Washing of Feet*, from the "Bible of Avila," Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, Cod. Vit. 15-1, fol. 349v (Photo: Mas)
20. *Last Supper*. León, San Isidoro, on the vault of the Pantheon (detail) (Photo: Mas)
21. Copy of *Last Supper* formerly in south tribune of the Cathedral of Le Puy (after Deschamps and Thibout, *Peinture murale en France*)
22. *Virgin and Child*, ivory, 13th century. New York, The Hispanic Society of America (Photo: The Hispanic Society of America)
23. *Virgin and Child*, ivory, 13th century. Zurich, Schweizerisches Landesmuseum (Photo: Schweiz. Landesmuseum, Zurich)
24. Profile view of Fig. 22 (Photo: The Hispanic Society of America)
25. Profile view of Fig. 23 (Photo: Schweiz. Landesmuseum, Zurich)
26. Under side of base, Fig. 22 (Photo: Schweiz. Landesmuseum, Zurich)
27. Under side of base, Fig. 23 (Photo: Schweiz. Landesmuseum, Zurich)
28. Master of the Rinuccini Chapel, *Vision of St. Bernard* (detail). Florence, Accademia (Photo: Alinari)
29. Filippino Lippi, *Vision of St. Bernard*. Florence, Badia (Photo: Alinari)
30. Fra Bartolommeo, *Vision of St. Bernard*. Florence, Accademia (Photo: Alinari)
31. Page from an antiphonal. Louisville, Kentucky, J. B. Speed Art Museum (Photo: J. B. Speed Art Museum)
32. Detail of Fig. 31: Initial M (with the *Annunciation*)
33. Initial S (with the Presentation in the Temple). Siena Cathedral, Piccolomini Library, Gradual 19, fol. 34v (Photo: Anderson, Rome)
34. Initial O (with the Nativity of St. John the Baptist). Siena Cathedral, Piccolomini Library, Gradual 19, fol. 103 (Photo: Anderson, Rome)
35. *The Virgin and Saints Appear to St. Peter Martyr* (detail). Rome, Pinacoteca Vaticana

36. *St. Christopher* (Bohemian or Franconian), linden wood, 79 cm., c. 1400. San Francisco, M. H. de Young Memorial Museum, no. 59.32. (Photo: de Young Museum)
37. Back view of Fig. 36
38. *Head of St. John the Baptist* (Bohemian), pen drawing, 23.2 × 16.5 cm., c. 1400-1410. Munich, State Library, Cod. germ. 7369
39. *Moses*, from the "Beautiful Well," stone, c. 100 cm., 1385-1392. Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum
40. Head of a Wild Man (?), stone, c. 25 cm., 1390-95. Prague, the Old Town Bridge Tower
41. Reliquary bust of St. Paul (Bohemian), gilt copper, 36.7 × 25.8 × 43.2 cm., 1413. Prague, Archbishop's palace (Photo: National Gallery, Prague)
42. *St. Andrew* (?), (Franconian or Thuringian), alabaster, 53 × 20 cm., c. 1420. Erfurt, Cathedral Museum (Photo: Archiv Bissinger, Erfurt)
43. *Prophet Joel*, from the Bohemian Bible of 1391. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M. 833, fol. 249v (Photo: Pierpont Morgan Library)
44. *Virgin and Child*, Salzburg (?), limestone, 73 × 41 cm., c. 1420. Munich, Collection of J. Böhler
45. Plan of the Old Sacristy of San Lorenzo, Florence
46. Neroccio de'Landi, *Claudia Quinta*. Washington, National Gallery of Art (Photo: Nat. Gal. of Art)
47. Master of the Griselda Legend, *Eunostos of Tanagra*. Washington, National Gallery of Art (Photo: Nat. Gal. of Art)
48. Matteo di Giovanni, *Judith*. Bloomington, Indiana University Art Museum (Kress Study Collection) (Photo: Indiana Univ. Art Mus.)
49. Francesco di Giorgio, *Scipio Africanus*. Florence, Bargello (Photo: Gab. Fot. Naz., Florence)
50. Bernardino Pinturicchio, *Putti with Piccolomini Escutcheon*. Siena Cathedral, Piccolomini Library
51. Guidoccio Cozzarelli, *Hippo, Camilla, Lucrezia*. Vicobello (Siena), Collection of the Marchesa Chigi-Zondadori Bonelli
52. Matteo di Giovanni, *Samian Sibyl* (pavement design). Siena Cathedral (Photo: Alinari)
53. Neroccio de'Landi, *Hellespontine Sibyl* (pavement design). Siena Cathedral (Photo: Alinari)
54. Pietro Perugino, *Horatio Cocles and Publius Scipio* (detail). Perugia, Collegio del Cambio, Sala delle Udienze (Photo: Alinari)
55. Master of the Griselda Legend, *Alexander the Great*. Birmingham, Barber Institute (Photo: Anderson, Rome)
56. Proposed reconstruction: *Famous Men*
57. Proposed reconstruction: *Famous Women*
58. Device of Charles V, c. 1531. Granada, Alhambra, "Rooms of Charles V"
59. Detail of Fig. 58
60. Device of Charles V, c. 1537. Granada, Alhambra, facade of the Palace of Charles V (Photo: Mas)
61. Silver medal of Charles V (Italian), 1552. Bologna, Museo Civico
62. Juan de Orea, *Triumph of Peace*, relief, c. 1551. Granada, Alhambra, west facade of the Palace of Charles V (Photo: Mas)
63. Juan de Orea, *Battle of Mühlberg*, relief, c. 1552. Granada, Alhambra, west facade of the Palace of Charles V (Photo: Mas)
64. Giovanni dal Cavino (?), silver medal of Charles V, reverse, 1556. Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung

65. *Christ in Gethsemane*, panel from a lost retablo. Lawrence (Kansas), University of Kansas Museum of Art (Photo: Thomas Feist)
66. *Christ in Gethsemane*, detail of Fig. 67
67. Miguel de Espinal and his shop, retablo of the High Altar, Ochagavía (Navarre), Parish Church, 1574-78
68. El Greco, *Holy Family with the Sleeping Christ Child and the Infant Baptist*, canvas, signed, 107 × 69 cm. Madrid, Prado Museum (Photo: Mas)
69. El Greco, *Holy Family with the Sleeping Christ Child and the Infant Baptist*, canvas, 52 × 33 cm. Washington, National Gallery of Art (Photo: Nat. Gal. of Art)
70. Michelangelo, *Holy Family: 'Il Silenzio'*, red chalk, 38.2 × 28.5 cm. London, Collection of the Duke of Portland (Photo: Warburg Institute)
71. Giulio Bonasone after Michelangelo, *Holy Family: 'Il Silenzio'*, engraving, signed and dated 1561 (Photo: Warburg Institute)
72. Lavinia Fontana, *Holy Family with the Sleeping Christ Child and the Infant Baptist*, panel, signed, 170 × 140 cm. Escorial, Panteón de Infantes
73. Spanish School, late 16th century, *Virgin with the Sleeping Christ Child and the Infant Baptist*. Barcelona, private collection
74. Detail of Fig. 68 (Photo: Mas)
75. *Harpocrates*, from Vincenzo Cartari, *Le Imagini de i dei degli antichi*, Venice, 1571, p. 375
76. *Harpocrates*, from Cartari, *Imagini*, Padua, 1615, p. 553
77. *Harpocrates* (Roman), 158 cm. Rome, Museo Capitolino (Photo: Warburg Institute)
78. Caravaggio, *Amore Vincitore*. Berlin-Dahlem, Staatliche Museen
79. Caravaggio, *St. Matthew and the Angel* (destroyed 1945). Berlin, Kaiser-Friedrich Museum
80. Giovanni Baglione, *Divine Love Overcoming Profane Love*. Berlin-Dahlem, Staatliche Museen (Photo: Alinari)
81. Orazio Gentileschi, *St. Michael Overcoming the Devil*. Farnese, San Salvatore (Photo: Vasari, Rome)
82. *Gladiator*, engraving after an ancient statue, from *Galleria Giustiniana del Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani*, I, Rome, 1631, pl. 117
83. Caravaggio, *St. John the Baptist*. Rome, Pinacoteca Capitolina
84. Caracciolo, *The Judgement of Solomon*. Florence, Collection of the Marchesa Serlupi Crescenzi
85. Caracciolo, *Soldier with Heads of Two Other Figures*. Stockholm, Nationalmuseum (Photo: Nationalmuseum)
86. *The Triumph of Saint Hermenegild*. Madrid, Prado (Photo: Prado Museum)
87. *Glory of Angels*, 195 × 295 mm. London, The British Museum (by permission of the Trustees)
88. *The Coronation of the Virgin*, whereabouts unknown (Photo: Mas)
89. *The Baptism of Christ*, 230 × 155 mm. Barcelona, private collection (Photo: Mas)
90. *Gentleman in a Landscape*, 200 × 130 mm. Hamburg, Kunsthalle (Photo: Kunsthalle)
91. *Saint Peter*, 215 × 135 mm. Florence, Uffizi Gallery (Photo: Uffizi)
92. Study for Frontispiece, 339 × 249 mm. Florence, Uffizi Gallery (Photo: Uffizi)
93. Study for Decorative Composition, 135 × 477 mm. London, The British Museum (by permission of the Trustees)
94. Study for Decorative Composition, 135 × 480 mm. London, The British Museum (by permission of the Trustees)
95. Engraving of San Girolamo della Carità, Rome (Photo: Raccolta Bertarelli, Milan)

96. Rome, San Girolamo della Carità (Photo: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome)
97. Drawing of San Girolamo della Carità, Rome (Photo: Ashmolean Museum, Oxford)
98. Bourdon, *Acts of Mercy: 3. To Welcome the Stranger*, Sarasota (Florida), Ringling Museum (Photo: Ringling Museum)
99. Poussin, *Sacraments II: 6. Ordination*. Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland, Collection of the Duke of Sutherland (Photo: National Gallery of Scotland)
100. Bourdon, *Acts of Mercy: 1. To Feed the Hungry*, etching (Photo: Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris)
101. Bourdon, *Acts of Mercy: 2. To Give Drink to the Thirsty*, etching (Photo: Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris)
102. Bourdon, *Acts of Mercy: 3. To Welcome the Stranger*, etching (Photo: Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris)
103. Bourdon, *Acts of Mercy: 4. To Clothe the Naked*, etching (Photo: Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris)
104. Bourdon, *Acts of Mercy: 5. To Comfort the Sick*, etching (Photo: Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris)
105. Bourdon, *Acts of Mercy: 6. To Liberate the Captive*, etching (Photo: Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris)
106. Bourdon, *Acts of Mercy: 7. To Bury the Dead*, etching (Photo: Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris)
107. Juan de Valdés Leal, *Vanitas*, 1655-9. Florence, Uffizi Gallery (Photo: Uffizi, Gab. Fot.)
108. Antonio de Pereda, *Allegory of Perishability*, c. 1650. Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum (Photo: Kunsthist. Mus.)
109. Juan de Valdés Leal, *Vanitas*, 1660. Hartford, Wadsworth Atheneum (Photo: Wadsworth Atheneum)
110. Brandi, *Minerva and the Muses*. Rome, Palazzo Taverna (Photo: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome)
111. Brandi, *Struggle of the Lapiths and the Centaurs*. Rome, Palazzo Taverna (Photo: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome)
112. Brandi, *Torments of Tityus, Ixion, Sisyphus and Tantalus in Tartary*. Rome, Palazzo Taverna (Photo: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome)
113. Brandi, *Confrontation of Phineus and Perseus*. Rome, Palazzo Taverna (Photo: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome)
114. Brandi, *Polyphemus and Galatea*. Rome, Palazzo Taverna (Photo: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome)
115. Brandi, *Venus at the Forge of Vulcan*. Rome, Palazzo Taverna (Photo: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome)
116. Brandi, *Homo Fortunatus*. Rome, Palazzo Taverna (Photo: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome)
117. Plan of the Mariahilfkirche, Freystadt
118. Interior of the Mariahilfkirche, Freystadt
119. Exterior of the Mariahilfkirche, Freystadt
120. Michael Wenig, engraving of the Mariahilfkirche, Freystadt, 1709. Munich, Stadtmuseum (Photo: Stadtmuseum)
121. Paolo Campi, *Angels Holding Crown of Thorns*, stucco. Rome, San Salvatore in Lauro
122. Paolo Campi, *St. Sebastian*, marble figure with stucco armour. Rome, Sant'Agnese in Piazza Navona (Photo: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome)
123. Paolo Campi, *Charlemagne*, marble. Montecassino, Cloister of the Abbey
124. Paolo Campi, *St. Benedict*, marble (Photograph pre-World War II). Montecassino, Grand Stairway of the Abbey (Photo: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome)

125. Paolo Campi, *St. Benedict*, marble (Photograph after World War II). Montecassino, Grand Stairway of the Abbey
126. Paolo Campi, *St. Scholastica*, marble (Photograph after World War II). Montecassino, Grand Stairway of the Abbey (Photo: Gab. Fot. Naz., Rome)
127. Paolo Campi, *St. Juliana Falconieri*, marble. Rome, San Pietro in Vaticano
128. Detail of Fig. 127
129. Paolo Campi, *Angels Bearing Laurel Wreath*, marble. Rome, San Giovanni in Laterano
130. Paolo Campi, *St. Peter Nolasco*, marble. Rome, San Pietro in Vaticano
131. Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *Queen Zenobia Addressing Her Soldiers*. Washington, National Gallery of Art (Kress Collection) (Photo: Nat. Gal. of Art)
132. Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *The Triumph of Aurelian*. Turin, Galleria Sabauda (Photo: Mus. civico, Udine)
133. Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *A Hunter on Horseback*. Milan, Crespi Collection (Photo: Mus. civico, Udine)
134. Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *A Hunter with a Stag*. Milan, Crespi Collection (Photo: Mus. civico, Udine)
135. Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *The Capture of Carthage*. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art (Photo: Met. Mus.)
136. Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, *A Soldier with Horse and Attendant*. Washington, National Gallery of Art (Rosenwald Collection) (Photo: Nat. Gal. of Art)

The Mosaic in Santa Maria Nova and the Original Apse Decoration of Santa Maria Maggiore

By JAMES SNYDER

Bryn Mawr College

With the rapid development of the cult of the Virgin in the 5th century, particularly following the Council of Ephesus (431) when Mary the Virgin was proclaimed God-bearer or *Theotokos*, a number of iconic portraits of Mary became established that served as models for her likeness throughout the Middle Ages; and, at a very early date, these portrait types were copied in the decorations of chapels and churches dedicated to the Madonna.¹ Already by the 6th century the impressive portrayal of the rigidly frontal Madonna and Child enthroned between angels—the *Nikopoia* (Victory-maker)—was widespread as an apse composition in the East; and in the earliest surviving apse mosaic dedicated to Mary in a Latin church, that in the Eufasian basilica in Parenzo (c. 540), we see the impact of the same kind of Byzantine model (Fig. 1).² Mary wears the typical blue dress and white *maphorion*, and the Byzantine angels that guard her throne isolate her from the donors and the martyrs who approach from either side. The only remnants of traditional western apse decoration that appear here are the hand of God issuing from the striated clouds in the top of the apse and the green meadows strewn with flowers, the Latin *paradisus voluptatis*, along the base.

In western apse decoration, it is true, there was an earlier example, dating from c. 430, in the Basilica Suricorum in Santa Maria in Capua Vetere, but the record of it made in the middle of the 18th century, when the mosaic was destroyed, is too brief to permit any exact reconstruction of its type, whether eastern or western, or its composition.³ One would naturally look to the great church of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome for an early Latin example for such apse decoration, particularly since the nave and triumphal arch of that church still retain much of their lavish 5th-century mosaic decorations; and the handsome 13th-century painting in the apse by Torriti to be seen there today unquestionably preserves something of the ancient tradition of how the Virgin was portrayed in the sanctuary, although the present Coronation theme was certainly an innovation. The earliest example of a portrayal of a Madonna in an apse that survives in Rome is the famous palimpsest wall in the sanctuary of Santa Maria Antiqua in the Forum, which is generally assigned to the 6th or

7th century (Fig. 2).⁴ It is interesting that the characterization of Mary in that fresco is very different from the usual Byzantine types although the church was a Greek foundation and hence strongly Byzantine in its general decorative program. Mary is flanked by two Byzantine angels, to be sure, but she is dressed in the regal costume of a queen and wears the huge bejeweled crown befitting her role as *Maria Regina*, a type frequently portrayed in early Latin icons and minor objects bearing Mary's likeness.⁵ It is generally assumed that these early versions of the *Maria Regina* copy or reflect in some degree a famed icon; and it is very likely that just such a portrait of Mary would have filled the early Christian apse in Santa Maria Maggiore, the major Roman church dedicated to her.

* * * * *

One of the most impressive mosaics of the *Maria Regina* in an apse may be seen in the church of Santa Maria Nova (St. Francesca Romana) at the opposite end of the Forum from Santa Maria Antiqua (Fig. 3), generally dated 1161, when the basilica was rededicated by Pope Alexander III. The richly-clad Madonna with a jeweled crown sits on a lyre-backed throne beneath an elaborate canopy of the heavens from which issues the hand of God holding a wreath. The child stands rather than sits in the niche of her left arm. Within an architectural setting of columns carrying an arcade of small bricks stand four Apostles, John the Evangelist and James to Mary's left, Peter and Andrew to her right. The inscription, beneath a small band of grass and flowers reads *CŌTINET IN GREMIO COELVM TE IN DOMO GENITRIX PROCERES COMITĀTUR ERILEM*. It is corrupt in its present form, but, as we shall see later, it can be restored.

According to the *Liber Pontificalis*, Santa Maria Nova was erected by Pope Leo IV (847-855), presumably to replace the church of Santa Maria Antiqua, although there is much documentary confusion regarding this point.⁶ During the papacy of Nicholas I (858-867) the church was decorated extensively for the first time,⁷ and it would seem logical to date the mosaic to this period. However, scholars have rightly pointed out that the style of the mosaic belongs to the mid-12th century since it resembles in many respects the apse mosaic in Santa Maria in Trastevere which was decorated by Innocent II. Early drawings of the sanctuary, in fact, indicate that the arch above the apse was originally decorated with a program nearly identical with that in the latter church.⁸ One could still argue, however, that the 12th-century mosaic to be seen there today preserves, in turn, an earlier apse composition first planned

under Pope Nicholas I in the 9th century, the period when so many Roman churches were rebuilt and redecorated in the fashion of early Christian models as part of the general program of Carolingian revival.⁹ There are many details in the mosaic that indicate such an origin, however submerged they may be under the veneer of 12th-century style. It has been pointed out by many authorities that the present mosaic betrays a definite "antique" flavor that links it to the earlier traditions of Roman mosaic decoration. Oakeshott, for instance, writes of a "deliberate antiquarianism" in the composition with "a conscious intention to combine antique *motifs* in a new whole."¹⁰

But there are more than mere motifs to suggest this intention. Secondary details such as the colorful canopy with the hand of God holding a wreath, the curious brick arcade that enframes the Apostles, and the elegant garlands that decorate the intrados of the arch are all details that one would naturally associate with Early Christian mosaics in Rome. Moreover, the postures and the gestures of the four Apostles are nearly identical with those of the Apostles grouped about the enthroned Christ in the *Traditio legis* (*Dominus legem dat*) composition that once decorated the 5th-century apse of Sant' Andrea Catabarbara as recorded in drawings (Fig. 4).¹¹ Peter and James have the same poses as Peter and Paul in the painting in Sant' Andrea, while the figure of Andrew to the far right repeats the pose of the Apostle behind Saint Peter in the drawing. The young St. John, to the far left, echoes in a slightly altered form the Apostle to the far left in Sant' Andrea. It has been demonstrated that these particular poses of flanking Apostles frequently appeared in Early Christian compositions of the *Traditio legis* theme,¹² and it is clear that these figures—the canopy, the arcade, and the garlands—all indicate a conscious attempt on the part of the designer of the mosaic to revive Early Christian prototypes. Such an outright return to 5th-6th-century mosaic compositions is, as mentioned above, typical of the Carolingian period in Rome, and for that reason it seems very likely that the 12th-century mosaic in Santa Maria Nova is a replacement of one very much like it dating from the papacy of Nicholas I in the 9th century.

But what of the Madonna? Except for the position of the child, the figure of Mary in Santa Maria Nova is very much like the Early Christian *Maria Regina* type. The only major difference between this portrayal and that in Santa Maria Antiqua (Fig. 2) is that in the later mosaic Mary is flanked by saints rather than by Byzantine angels. Otherwise she sits on the same lyre-backed throne, she wears a similar regal costume and jeweled crown, and her

position is rigidly frontal in the traditional fashion of this type. It could well be argued that both representations, that of Santa Maria Nova and Santa Maria Antiqua, repeat the hallowed image of the Virgin from some lost apse decoration in Rome.

* * * * *

The first and most important church dedicated to Mary in Rome is Santa Maria Maggiore, erected by Sixtus III some time between 430 and 440. The decorations of the nave and triumphal arch were very likely inspired by the writings of Pope Leo the Great and by the disputes regarding the Virgin and her son that were resolved at the Council of Ephesus in 431. The unusual nave program of Old Testament scenes and the unparalleled narration of Mary's role in the Infancy of Christ that unfolds on the arch before the apse are clearly part of some vast decorative scheme to honor the Virgin; and it should be noted that one unique feature of the Infancy cycle is the repeated portrayal of Mary, the *dei genetrix*, in the character of the *Maria Regina* wearing an elaborate courtly dress as she does in the mosaic of Santa Maria Nova, although the crown is replaced by a smaller diadem (Fig. 5). Would not the portrait of Mary in the apse too have presented her as the *Maria Regina*?

The present apse mosaic was executed by Jacopo Torriti for Pope Nicholas IV (1288-1292) to replace an earlier painting that was destroyed when the sanctuary of the basilica was enlarged (Fig. 6). It depicts the Coronation of the Virgin, Mary and Christ being enthroned within a huge oval mandorla carried by a host of angels. Below, on either side of them, stand six saints: Francis, Paul, Peter, John the Baptist, John the Evangelist, and Anthony, while two donors, including Nicholas IV, kneel before the mandorla. Three details of the mosaic suggest an Early Christian model: the fanciful tent of heavens above the enthroned figures, the spiraling acanthus scrolls that fill the background, and the charming water landscape filled with diminutive putti sporting on the backs of birds and fish in a river that issues from the four streams of Paradise in the center of the lower border. The tent or canopy of the heavens and the acanthus scrolls were familiar motifs in Early Christian representations of paradise settings derived from pagan sources. The classical "waters of Paradise" were, likewise, frequently incorporated in the Latin *paradisus voluptatis* as part of the Christian iconography for the heavens. It is indeed very likely that all three motifs were inspired by the original Early Christian apse painting there. Oakeshott, in fact, goes so far as to claim that

Torriti actually transplanted and reused some sections of the old mosaic in the new one. But it is very unlikely that the earlier painting depicted a Coronation scene as some have argued.¹³

That the original *Maria Regina* apse painting was devised for the church of Sixtus III is suggested by an important piece of evidence. Recorded in the 16th century, an inscription or *titulus*, then imbedded in the inner wall of the entrance of the church, reads as follows:

*Virgo Maria tibi Xystus nova tecta dicavi
 Digna salutifero munera ventre tuo
 Tu Genitrix ignara viri, te (sc. tu) denique faeta (sc. facta)
 Visceribus salvis edita nostra salus.
 Ecce tui testes uteri tibi praemia portant
 Sub pedibusque iacet passio cuique sua
 Ferrum, flamma, ferae, fluviis saevumque venenum
 Tot tamen has mortes una corona manet.*¹⁴

(I, Sixtus, have dedicated this new temple to thee, Virgin Mary, as a worthy gift to thy saving womb: You, mother not knowing any man and yourself born of a pure womb, are made our salvation. Behold, the witnesses of thy motherhood carry rewards to thee, and under the feet of each stand the instruments of His passion: sword, flame, beasts, river and bitter poison, but one crown awaits all of these many deaths).

The inscription, commemorating the dedication of the church, was presumably placed in the sanctuary where such depictions usually appeared in the Early Christian period.¹⁵ The verses are not easily interpreted in terms of a figurative composition, but clearly the Virgin and Child flanked by four or more martyrs were represented. Instruments of the passion appeared at their feet as they sometimes do in Early Christian paintings (e.g. the sword and flames beneath the feet of the martyr in Sant'Agnese f.l.m. in Rome).¹⁶ Finally, the 'one crown that awaits all' was probably the wreath held by the hand of God in the top of the composition.

* * * * *

We now return to the composition in Santa Maria Nova and its inscription. C. R. Morey discussed the restoration of the verses beneath the mosaic at considerable length in his book *Lost Mosaics and Frescoes of Rome*.¹⁷ According to Morey the inscription should read *Continet in gremio celum terramque regentem/ sancta dei genitrix proceres comitantur erilem (eriles?)*: "The Holy

Mother of God holds in her bosom the ruler of earth and heaven; the princes (Apostles) are in attendance on their lady's Son." These two hexameters have an early flavor about them just as the mosaic above them has; and with a few minor changes (*sancta* for *virgo*) they repeat the first two lines of a response in an early antiphony of Saint Peter's in Rome for the Christmas service, which reads as follows:

*Continet in gremio caelum terramque regentem
Virgo dei genitrix: proceres comitantur heriles
Por quos orbis ovans Christo sub principe pollet.
Maternis vehitur qui matrem generat ulnis
Bisseni comites quem stipant agmine fido.*

(The Virgin, Mother of God, bears in her bosom the Ruler of heaven and earth; the princes chosen by the Master attend Him, through Whom the joyous earth waxes strong beneath the sway of Christ. He who created His mother is carried in His mother's arms, and His twelve companions surround Him in a faithful band). Delaporte, who first took note of this response in an article published in 1910, suggested that the verses dated from the Carolingian period and that they served as a *titulus* for a representation of the Virgin and Child flanked by the twelve Apostles.¹⁸ In the same year, Mgr. Batiffol pointed out that the obvious station for the Christmas service was Santa Maria Maggiore, and he further suggested that the verses were inscribed in the Oratory of the Manger in that basilica during the papacy of Hadrian I (772-795) or Paschal I (817-824).¹⁹ Thus it would seem that the image of the *Maria Regina* and the inscription in Santa Maria Nova were both Carolingian in origin and that both were linked in some fashion to the imagery of the sanctuary of Santa Maria Maggiore. If one accepts the theory that the dedicatory verses of Sixtus III, discussed above, went with the Madonna and child in the apse of his church, then one need only restore the Child in a more hieratic position and exchange the four Apostles of Santa Maria Nova for the martyrs to make the correspondence complete. It is also possible that acanthus scrolls replaced the brick arcade in the background of the mosaic.

* * * * *

What other representation would be appropriate for Santa Maria Maggiore? In her fine study of Early Christian apse compositions, Christa Ihm tentatively suggested that the original mosaic in Santa Maria Maggiore would have resembled the one, discussed briefly above, in the Basilica Suri-

corum in Santa Maria in Capua Vetere, which she reconstructed as a veiled Madonna with Child enthroned within vine tendrils. However, the imagery of the *Maria Regina* may have had an early tradition in south Italy as well as Rome. Ciampini records a late Carolingian apse painting in the church of Saints Stephen and Agatha in Capua (Fig. 7) that displays that type.²⁰ The 5th-century mosaics in Santa Maria Maggiore have fascinated many scholars of Early Christian art; and aside from the rarity of these works, their unusual iconography has presented challenging problems. The exact textual sources for the mosaics in the nave may never be determined, but the fact that they are all Old Testament scenes, on both sides of the nave, no doubt indicates that they were selected for this church because Mary traditionally bridged the Old and the New. Likewise, the rare appearance of Infancy scenes on the arch, where one normally finds the hieratic representation of the *Maiestas Domini* (Rev. IV, V) (the Second Adventus of the Lord at the Last Judgment), was surely due to the desire to emphasize the Virgin's role in the first Adventus of the Lord when He first made His appearance in the flesh on earth. In the key-stone of the arch the image of the Lord in heaven was replaced by that of the *Etimasia*, the empty throne prepared in heaven awaiting the Second Coming of Christ.²¹ And for the same reason, the traditional portrayal of the majestic Christ enthroned among the Apostles in the apse of the early Christian basilica gave way in Santa Maria Maggiore to one honoring his mother, *Maria Regina*, in the company of her saints.

Notes

1. For the spread of the cult of the Virgin and the types of portraits of Mary in Early Christian art see especially, C. Cecchelli, *Mater Christi*, Rome, 1947; M. Vloberg, "Les types iconographiques de la mère de Dieu dans l'art byzantin," *Études sur la S. Vierge*, Paris, 1952; C. Ihm, *Die Programme der christlichen Apsismalerei vom vierten Jahrhundert bis zur Mitte des achten Jahrhunderts*, Wiesbaden, 1960, esp. 52-68; and A. Weis, "Ein vorjustinianischer Ikontypus in S. Maria Antiqua," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, VIII, 1958, 17-62.

2. For these types see Ihm, 59ff. The mosaic in Parenzo is discussed at length by B. Molaioli, *La Basilica Eufrasiana di Parenzo*, Parenzo, 1943.

3. The basilica was founded by Bishop Symmachus, a contemporary of Paulinus of Nola. The mosaic in the apse, destroyed in 1754, was described by Mazzocchi, *Comentarii*

in marmoreum Neapolitanum Calendarium, Naples, 1755, III, 705: *Musivum quod dixi, totam basilicae apsidem occupabat, in cuius medio Sancta Maria puerum Jesum in sinu gerens exhibebatur, cetera vero non inelegantibus ornamentis pro quinti saeculi aptu distincta cernebantur usque ad extremum fornicem, quem occupabat inscriptio.* Cf. E. Müntz, "Mosaique de la Cathédrale de S. Maria di Capua," *Revue Archéologique*, Ser. 3, XVII, 1891, 79-81; and C. Ihm, 56, Fig. 10, who offers a plausible reconstruction of the painting with a veiled Madonna holding her child frontally in the midst of an apse decorated with vine scrolls. For the possible influence of this mosaic on later apse decoration in Capua, see below, n. 20.

4. De Grüneisen, *Sainte Marie Antique*, Rome, 1911, 306ff.; J. Wilpert, *Die römischen Mosaiken und Malereien der kirchlichen Bauten vom IV.-XIII. Jahrhundert*, Freiburg i. Br., 1916, II, 578ff., 668ff.; P. J. Nordhagen, "The Earliest Decorations in Santa Maria Antiqua and Their Date," *Acta . . . Institutum romanum norvegiae*, I, Oslo, 1962, 56ff.

5. M. Lawrence, "Maria Regina," *Art Bulletin*, VII, 1925, 150-160; M. Vloberg, 494ff.; C. Cecchelli, *Mater Christi*, I, 54ff., 75ff.

6. M. Armellini (ed. C. Cecchelli), *Le chiese di Roma*, Rome, 1942, R. Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae*, Rome, 1937, I, 219-241 (see especially 222, n. 1, for a discussion of the confusions that have arisen concerning the name of this church). The mosaics are discussed by W. Oakeshott, *The Mosaics of Rome*, London, 1967, 251-255, and G. Matthiae, *Mosaici medicevali delle chiese di Roma*, Rome, 1967, I, 315-321.

7. *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, Paris, 1955, II, 158 (under Pope Nicolas I, 858-867): *Ecclesiam autem Dei genitricis semperque Virginis Mariae, que primitus Antiqua, nunc autem Nova vocatur, quam dominus Leo III papa a fundamentis construxerat, sed picturis eam minime decorarat, iste beatissimus praesul pulchris ac variis fecit depingi coloribus, augens decorem, et plurimus corde puro ornavit speciebus.*

8. C. R. Morey, *Lost Mosaics and Frescoes of Rome of the Mediaeval Period*, Princeton, 1915, 20-24, Pl. II; S. Waetzoldt, *Die Kopien des 17. Jahrhunderts nach Mosaiken und Wandmalereien in Rom*, Vienna, 1964, 33, Pls. 44, 45.

9. M. van Berchem and E. Clouzot, *Mosaïques chrétiennes du IV^{me} au X^{me} siècle*, Geneva, 1924, 218ff.; F. Hermanin, *L'arte in Roma dal sec. VIII al XIV (Storia di Roma, XXIII)*, Bologna, 1945, 201-222; Oakeshott, 195ff.; Matthiae, 225ff.

10. Oakeshott, 252.

11. Ihm, 154-155; Waetzoldt, 29-30, Pl. 15.

12. T. Buddensieg, "Le coffret en ivoire de Pola, Saint-Pierre et le Latran," *Cahiers Archéologiques*, X, 1959, 157-200.

13. For the vast literature on these mosaics see Matthiae, 87-122; Oakeshott, 311-318; H. Henkels, "Remarks on the late 13th-Century Apse Decoration in S. Maria Maggiore," *Simiolus*, IV, 1971, 128-149. For the Franciscan iconography of Torriti's mosaic see Charles Mitchell, "The Imagery of the Upper Church at Assisi," *Giotto e il suo tempo* (De Luca Editore), 1971, 131-133.

14. G. B. de Rossi, *Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae*, Rome, 1888, II, 71 (n.42),

98 (n.6), 139 (n.28). I thank Charles Mitchell for his kind help in translating this unusual document. While it is not my intent to pursue its significance further in this article, it should be pointed out that the reference to Mary herself as "born in a pure womb" is one of the earliest references to the Immaculate Conception.

15. A. Schuchert, *Santa Maria Maggiore (Studi di antichità cristiana, XV)*, Rome, 1939, 17ff., suggests that the inscription was destined for the apse. Grabar, *Martyrium*, Paris, 1946, II, 51, n.3, on the other hand, thinks that it was placed on the west facade. See also C. Cecchelli, *I. mosaici della basilica di S. Maria Maggiore*, Turin, 1956, 69ff., and Oakeshott, 313.

16. Ciampini, *Vetera monumenta*, Rome, 1690-1699, II, 103, Tab. XXIX.

17. Morey, 16-20.

18. M. Delaporte, *Rassegna gregoriana*, 1910, 230-247. The antiphonary is dated to the 12th century.

19. Mgr. Batiffol's communication in "Séance du 7 Décembre," *Bulletin de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France*, 1910, 365-367.

20. The basilica of SS. Stephen and Agatha in Capua was founded by Bishop Landolphus (856), enriched by Bishop Oto, and decorated with mosaics by Bishop Ugo sometime in the late ninth or early tenth century. Very little is known about the mosaic except for Ciampini's engraving of it (II, 166, Tab. LIV), although the church itself was restored and rebuilt in part several times before it was nearly demolished during bombardments in 1942. It was rebuilt and rededicated in 1957. The mosaic in Ciampini's plate displays a hieratic *Maria Regina* with frontal child enthroned between the Apostles Peter and Paul and the two patron saints. The postures of Peter and Paul repeat those of the familiar Early Christian *Traditio legis* composition (although their positions are reversed). The prophets Jeremiah and Isaiah in the spandrels of the enframing arch repeat the prophets Baruch and Isaiah who stood in similar positions in Santa Maria Nova, but the medallion bust of Christ and the dove with the triangular halo are surely later additions. The inscription along the bottom of the mosaic records the foundation, enrichment, and decoration: CONDIDIT HANC AULAM LANDULFUS ET OTO BEAVIT MOENIA RES, MOREM VITREUM DEDIT VGO DECOREM.

A notable exception to the portrayal of Mary as *Regina* in Carolingian apse mosaics is that of Santa Maria in Domnica in Rome, where the Virgin surrounded by a host of angels is dressed in the Byzantine fashion.

21. According to the Carolingian scholar Anastasius Bibliothecarius (d. 878), the idea of the "prepared throne" in Santa Maria Maggiore was inspired by a tradition initiated at the Council of Ephesus, the very meeting where Mary's role in the hierarchy was established. In the council chamber an empty throne was prepared with the scriptures opened across it, thus summoning the presence of Christ as the divine judge to preside over the meeting (*Historiae de vitis romanorum pontificum, MPL, CXXVIII, Col.267*).

Problems of Architectural Style and the Ambrosian Liturgy in Late Fourth-Century Milan

By SUZANNE LEWIS
Stanford University

Although the medieval churches of Milan have long been familiar landmarks in the history of Romanesque architecture, the post-war excavations of Sant' Ambrogio, San Lorenzo, San Nazaro and San Simpliciano uncovered a whole new aspect of the Lombard buildings. Indeed these imposing structures have become for this generation monuments of a much earlier Milanese age, whose foundations go back to the critical period of transition between Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages.¹

The florescence of the Early Christian period at Milan was concentrated in a very brief time encompassing something less than a single generation and spanning roughly the last quarter of the 4th century. Milan had in fact replaced Rome as the political capital of the Western Empire as early as the period of the Tetrarchy, and the history of its Christian community dates back at least to the middle of the 3rd century.² But it was not until the last quarter of the 4th century that the creative energies and varied ambitions of Milan crystallized in the powerful figures of Ambrose and Theodosius to produce its singularly remarkable architectural development.

The tangible results of this brief creative moment are truly impressive. Between 380 and 400 the North Italian capital was embellished by the construction of four monumental suburban churches (see Fig. 8) surrounding the imposing Cathedral basilica dating from the earlier 4th century in the center of the city. Built in rapid succession, this series of ambitious constructions began with simultaneous projects for the Basilica Apostolorum (Figs. 9 and 10), now San Nazaro Maggiore, in the southeastern sector on the colonnaded Via Romana, c.380-385, and the Basilica Ambrosiana (Fig. 11), dedicated in 386, in the western sector on the site of the Coemeterium ad Martyres.³ These two Ambrosian foundations were soon followed by another vast basilica on the Via Comasina in the northern sector, the Basilica Virginum, dated c.390-400, now San Simpliciano (Fig. 12).⁴ Roughly contemporary with this last great architectural undertaking initiated by Bishop Ambrose was the huge complex of San Lorenzo (Fig. 13) on the Via Ticinensis in the south sector, probably built under the direct patronage of Emperor Theodosius between 388 and 402.⁵

While all four foundations dating from the ecclesiastical and imperial reigns of Ambrose and Theodosius have as a common feature their suburban locations outside the Maximian walls, as a group they present a variety of architectural solutions. The pronounced disparity of plans, notwithstanding the obvious similarities between the Basilica Apostolorum and the Basilica Virginum, renders the definition of a late 4th-century Milanese style on the basis of these four buildings very difficult. What this remarkable variation in plan and structure immediately evinces is the fluid and even experimental character of the Milanese contribution to Early Christian architecture. With the exception of the traditional three-aisled plan of the Basilica Ambrosiana, we are confronted with three distinctive, if not eccentric buildings for which few clear prototypes or antetypes exist. The two single-naved cruciform basilicas founded by Ambrose, and the Theodosian double tetraconch of San Lorenzo, with its octagonal east chapel and elaborate western quadriporticus, all appear to represent original and indeed ingenious inventions by Milanese architects of the late 4th century. Although discussions of these buildings have tended to become enmeshed in a tangle of proposed connections and relationships, in the last analysis the unique and inventive aspects of the single-naved cruciform basilica and the double tetraconch palace church transcend the weight of traditions both past and present.

The peculiar variety of invention displayed by the Ambrosian aisleless basilicas and the complex Laurentian palace church, coupled with the conservative Roman character of the Basilica Ambrosiana, suggests a strange and remarkable character for the Early Christian development at Milan, but not as elusive as one might suspect. On the simple grounds of their chronology, these buildings present a very important transitional phase of church architecture in the last two decades of the 4th century between the periods of Constantine and Justinian. Geographically they form the originating core of a regional development which had its creative center at Milan and which extended over all of North Italy and probably included Transalpine Gaul as well. Within this regional-historical context I would like to suggest that the Milanese churches of the late 4th century may be seen as linked together by common structural concepts emanating from the peculiarities of the Milanese liturgy to form a cohesive architectural development.

* * * * *

The distinctive liturgical functions of the Milanese churches, as they crystallized under St. Ambrose, are among the least understood and most inade-

quately explored problems of Early Christian architecture in Milan. Basically a more archaic rite than that of Rome, the Ambrosian liturgy was clearly a separate tradition by the late 4th century, and one which has survived with an almost fanatic persistence into modern times.⁶ Willfully refusing to adapt itself to the innovations of the Roman rite, the fundamentally conservative spirit of the Milanese Church was bent on preserving Christian orthodoxy in a pure archaic form.⁷ With the single notable exception of the Offertory rite, no specific elements in the Milanese liturgy of the Ambrosian period, at least as far as we know it, may be held to account for the peculiar features observed in the Milanese churches of the late fourth century; but the militant conservatism of the Ambrosian Church must have exerted an influence on the curious shaping of its architecture.

The archaistic spirit of the Milanese Church during the period of Ambrose is nowhere so clearly expressed as in its peculiar architectural accommodation of the cult of the martyrs. The appearance of reliquary cults at Milan may be dated precisely to the Episcopate of Ambrose and indeed may be attributed directly to his elaborate campaign to arouse popular sentiment for the veneration of relics, following a similar revival of the cult of the martyrs at Rome under Pope Damasus.⁸ The revival in Milan probably figured as the decisive factor in the construction of several large suburban churches around the periphery of the city in the last decades of the 4th century. All four ecclesiastical structures now under consideration, including the palace church of San Lorenzo, in one way or another, constitute a variety of architectural solutions to the problem of accommodating a martyrrium function. It is in this connection that the distinctive liturgical aspects of late 4th-century Milanese architecture seems to emerge most clearly.

Although all four structures dating from the Ambrosian period seem to have had important functions associated with the cult of the martyrs, none may be considered unequivocally as a martyrrium in the narrowest sense of the term. To begin with the Basilica Ambrosiana, the cult of the martyrs St. Protasius and St. Gervasius, who were miraculously "discovered" by Ambrose in the Coemeterium ad Martyres (presumably after the construction of the new basilica was well advanced, if not completed), received no ostensible architectural expression in the structure of this singularly undistinguished three-aisled basilica, which lacked even the transept feature of the martyrrium basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul outside the walls of Rome.⁹ The celebrated relics of the martyrs were placed unobtrusively beneath its altar. Indeed the

only architectural justification for the original designation of the Ambrosian church as the Basilica Martyrum lay in the presence of the small martyrium of St. Victor to the southeast. This was a simple *cella memoriae* (Fig. 14), structurally separate from the church and antedating the construction of the Ambrosian basilica.¹⁰

The martyrium functions of the Basilica Apostolorum are equally ambiguous in their architectural expression. Originally dedicated to the Apostles, the basilica's apostolic relics, presumably consisting of *brandea* sent from Rome, were probably accommodated in a similarly undistinguished manner beneath the altar in the center of the aisleless nave. However, Bishop Ambrose's dramatic "invention" of the remains of the martyr St. Nazarius seems also to have occurred after the completion of the church, and the cult of the martyr may have been accommodated not in the basilica proper, but in a separate octagonal chapel annexed to the west end of the cruciform church.¹¹

The circumstances surrounding the acquisition of relics for the later church of San Simpliciano, founded towards the end of Ambrose's Episcopate as the Basilica Virginum, are almost identical. Apparently, the relics of the three Trentine martyrs, St. Sisinnius, St. Martyrus, and St. Alexander, were not brought to Milan until after the Bishop's death, although the negotiations for their transport to Milan were made by Ambrose himself at a time when the Basilica must have been nearly completed.¹² In this case the cult of the martyrs was clearly relegated to a quasi-independent cruciform chapel adjacent to the east wall of the north lateral arm of the church (see Fig. 12). Finally, in the case of the Theodosian palace church of San Lorenzo, the quasi-independent octagonal structure annexed to the eastern hemicycle of the main tetraconch as part of the original complex (see Fig. 13) probably functioned as a martyrium housing the relics of the Roman martyr St. Lawrence.¹³

The strict concept of the martyrium as a structural and liturgical form *sui generis*, in which the main ecclesiastical building is given over exclusively on a symbolic level at least to the cult of the martyrs, seems not to have existed at Milan in any of the four large suburban foundations undertaken in the late 4th century. On the contrary, all the great churches of the Ambrosian period appear to have been conceived primarily to serve other purposes: in the case of the three Ambrosian foundations as large suburban parish churches with normal congregational functions, and in the case of San Lorenzo as a palace church with special ceremonial functions for the Emperor. The introduction of martyrs' relics in these structures was plainly secondary, serving merely to

enhance the sanctity of their congregational context. The ancillary liturgical and symbolic role of the martyrrium in these Milanese churches is expressed architecturally in the peripheral accommodation of the cult of the martyrs in small, quasi-independent annexes to the main building.

In light of the zealous policies and active programs initiated by Ambrose to promote the cult of the martyrs at Milan, it may seem strange that the martyrrium received such a diffident architectural expression in the major constructions of this period. Ambrose himself was ambivalent towards the cult of the martyrs. His enthusiastic promotion of these cults was inhibited by his stringent policy of discouraging and even forbidding the elaborate and sometimes orgiastic festivities which attended the celebration of the martyr cults at Rome.¹⁴ For Ambrose, the revival of popular zeal for the martyrs was not the goal but rather an effective means to another and greater end, namely, the victory of militant Christian orthodoxy over heresy and paganism in Milan, the spiritual capital of the West.

The ancillary role of the martyrrium, as expressed in the small, quasi-independent structures annexed to large ecclesiastical buildings, is thus a clear reflection of Ambrosian policy. As an architectural concept considered within the context of the development of Early Christian architecture in general, the satellite martyrrium represents a *retardataire*, archaistic tendency. The Milanese practice of accommodating the cult of the martyrs in small separate chapels functioning apart from the large churches to which they were appended has its most obvious origins in the archaic funerary *aediculae* which marked the tombs of the martyrs in the major suburban necropolises of Milan in the 3rd century. The martyrrium chapels of the Ambrosian period may have originated from the architectural solution hit upon quite fortuitously in the chapel of San Vittore in Ciel d'Oro (Fig. 14), which maintained its distinct structural identity, but functioned as a satellite martyrrium after the construction of the adjacent Basilica Ambrosiana. The Milanese development represented by the Basilica Apostolorum, San Simpliciano, and San Lorenzo may well have set the precedent for the considerable number of satellite martyria which were built throughout North Italy during the 5th and 6th centuries.¹⁵

Beyond the peculiar archaistic phenomenon of satellite martyrrium structures and the corollary tendency to incorporate multiple functions within a single ecclesiastical complex, the late 4th century churches of Milan reveal a propensity to compartmentalize each separate liturgical aspect of Christian worship into distinct, clearly separate spaces within the basilica structure itself.

The Basilica Apostolorum may be singled out as the most instructive example in this case. The great aisleless hall aligned along the main longitudinal axis functioned as the liturgical core of the church and, as such, accommodated the altar in a single, uninterrupted aulic setting for the unfolding of the Mass carried out by the clergy in the center. The congregational functions were relegated to the two large lateral halls forming the arms of a pseudo-transept which was spatially separated from the nave by arcades (see Figs. 9 and 10). Annexed to the rectangular lateral halls were four small hemicycles to accommodate special burials. And finally, a quasi-independent octagonal chapel was perhaps annexed to the west end to function as a satellite martyrium.

While this predisposition to formulate a separate architectural space for each distinctive phase in the liturgical functioning of the church is, in varying degrees, a characteristic feature of Early Christian architecture in general, it is rather curious to observe this additive, compartmentalizing concept of the Christian cult building pursued with such uncompromising rigor in the late 4th century. Compared with the later coalescence of parts and the spatial fluidity which were to develop in the Christian buildings of the 6th century, the Milanese churches would appear to represent a spirit of strong, if not doctrinaire conservatism.

A final peculiarity of the Milanese churches lies in their insistent emphasis on the longitudinal axis even where the major elements of the plan more normally belong to a centralizing organization, as in the Basilica Apostolorum and San Lorenzo, suggesting that processional rites may have played a paramount role in the Milanese liturgy. Although this processional character in the architecture is consistently present in the late 4th century structures, we may suggest that its specific motivation lay in the special archaic Offertory rite in the Ambrosian Canon in which the Eucharistic gifts were brought in solemn procession by the clergy or, in some cases, by individual members of the congregation directly to the altar.¹⁶

The Milanese architectural aesthetic stands clearly apart from the tastes of Rome and Byzantium. In its emphatic compartmentalization of liturgical functions and its predilection for comprehensive accretions of these distinct structural units in axial and processional sequences, there is a certain inescapable awkwardness and lack of subtlety which set Milan apart from the other great architectural centers of the Early Christian world. These distinctive qualities of the Milanese style may well be attributed in part to the essentially provincial and conservative point of view imposed by the peculiar archaisms of

local liturgical requirements. For the rest, the curious character of these late 4th century buildings betrays a vigorous, militant spirit which links Milan with the northern aesthetic of Transalpine Gaul and with Ambrose himself, who had come there from the northern capital at Trier.¹⁷

Notes

1. See G. Traversi, *Architettura paleocristiana milanese*, Milan, 1964, for the most recent and comprehensive summary of findings by the post-war Italian excavators; also G. Bovini, *Antichità cristiana di Milano*, Bologna, 1970. Cf. the earlier surveys by A. de Capitani d'Arzago, *Architettura dei secoli IV e V in alta Italia*, Milan, 1944; P. Verzone, *L'Architettura religiosa dell'alto medio evo nell'Italia settentrionale*, Milan, 1942; De Capitani d'Arzago, "L'Architettura cristiana in Milano," *Actes du VI^e Congrès international d'études byzantines*, Paris, 1951, II, 67-84. For the best interpretation of the Milanese development as seen within the broad context of 4th-century architecture as a whole, see R. Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, Baltimore, 1965, 55-60. This paper presents some conclusions drawn from research on the Early Christian buildings at Milan carried out for my doctoral dissertation in 1959-60 under a grant from the American Association of University Women. See Suzanne C. Edwards, *Two Critical Aspects of Fourth Century Architecture at Milan: the Single-Naved Cruciform Basilica and the Palace Church*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1964.

2. The oldest Christian inscription found at Milan dates from 244 (*CIL*, V, 6181). The history of the Milanese Church prior to the Edict of Milan is extremely obscure; thus far it has not been possible to fix even an approximate date for the establishment of a Christian community in the city. For a brief but well documented ecclesiastical history of Milan, see A. Calderini, "Milano durante il basso impero," *Storia di Milano*, Milan, 1953, I, 301-411. Cf. Edwards, *Critical Aspects*, 58-69.

3. See S. Lewis, "Function and Symbolic Form in the Basilica Apostolorum at Milan," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 28, 1969, 83-98, which quotes all the important earlier literature, most notably the pioneering studies of Enrico Villa, on the Ambrosian structure of the present church of San Nazaro Maggiore. In contrast to the recent bibliography for the other Milanese churches, the literature on the Early Christian foundations of Sant' Ambrogio is very old, dating back to their discovery in the late nineteenth century by G. Landriani, *La Basilica Ambrosiana*, Milan, 1889. Since then, the only other new investigation has been that by F. Reggiori, *La Basilica Ambrosiana: Ricerche e restauri 1929-1940*, Milan, 1941.

4. Like the Milanese Apostoleion, the Basilica Virginum was uncovered beneath a Romanesque reconstruction in the 12th century church of San Simpliciano. See the following articles by E. Arslan: "Qualche dato sulla basilica milanese di San Simpliciano," *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, 23-24, 1947-48, 367-382; "La Basilica paleocristiana di San Simpliciano a Milano," *Actes due VI^e Congrès international d'études byzantines*, Paris,

1951, II, 15-24; "Nuovi ritrovamenti in San Simpliciano a Milano," *Bollettino d'Arte*, 42, 1958, 199-212; "Ultime novità a San Simpliciano," *Arte Lombarda*, 6, 1961, II, 149-164. Also, M. Mirabella Roberti, "Basilica di San Simpliciano," *Arte Lombarda*, 6, 1961, 165ff.

5. This dating contradicts the hypothesis of an earlier Arian foundation between 355 and 373 for San Lorenzo first offered by its excavators, A. Calderini, G. Chierici and C. Cecchelli, *La Basilica di San Lorenzo Maggiore in Milano*, Milan, 1951, as well as by W. E. Kleinbauer, Jr., "Toward a dating of San Lorenzo in Milan," *Arte Lombarda*, 13, 1969, 1-22. Cf. Edwards, *Critical Aspects*, 264-299; and S. Lewis, "San Lorenzo Revisited: A Theodosian Palace Church," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 32, 1973, 197-222.

6. In its present form the Ambrosian liturgy has been dated to the last quarter of the 4th century, but the evidence for this period is singularly meager. The most important documents are the writings of St. Ambrose himself: *De Mysteriis*, which supplies only the barest outlines, and *De Sacramentis*, which, after centuries of discussion, may be claimed as an undisputed attribution. The canon of the Milanese rite was not written out in its entirety until the early 10th century in the Ambrosian Sacramentary of Biasca. See the standard references by L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, 2nd English ed., London, 1904, and M. Magistretti, *La Liturgia nella chiesa milanese nel secolo IV*, Milan, 1899. Cf. also the recent well-documented work of A. A. King, *Liturgies of the Primatial Sees*, London, 1957, 286-456; and I. Schuster, "La liturgia Ambrosiana," *Storia di Milano*, Milan, 1953, I, 445-461.

7. F. Cabrol, *La Messe en Occident*, Paris, 1932, 37 and 106ff. Cf. also Edwards, *Critical Aspects*, 72-73 and 77-78; and Lewis, "Function and Symbolic Form," 92-94.

8. See Krautheimer, "Mensa-Coemeterium-Martyrium," *Cahiers archéologiques*, 11, 1960, 15-40; also Ch. Pietri, "Concordia Apostolorum et Renovatio Uris," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École française de Rome*, 73, 1961, 275-322, which explores the political and religious implications of the revival of the cult of the relics by Pope Damasus.

9. Lewis, "Function and Symbolic Form," 94; see F. W. Deichmann and A. Tschira, "Das Mausoleum der Kaiserin Helena und die Basilika der Heiligen Marcellinus und Petrus an der Via Labicana vor Rom," *Jahrbuch des Deutschen archäologischen Instituts*, 72, 1957, 105.

10. See Reggiori, *La Basilica Ambrosiana*, 157-183, for the Early Christian form of the chapel of St. Victor.

11. See Lewis, "Function and Symbolic Form," 96-98.

12. See Edwards, *Critical Aspects*, 206-210. The translation of the Trentine relics was reported by Paulinus, *Vita Sancti Ambrosii*, 52, in the first decade of the 5th century. See Arslan, "Osservazioni preliminari sulla chiesa di San Simpliciano a Milano," *Archivio Storico Lombardo*, 10, 1947, 5-32, for a full discussion of the documents relating to this problem.

13. See Edwards, *Critical Aspects*, 289-292 and 297-298.

14. Lewis, "Function and Symbolic Form," 93.

15. See Verzone, *L'Architettura religiosa*, 166 et passim; "Le chiese cimiteriali cristiane a struttura molteplice nell'Italia settentrionale," *Arte del Primo Millennio*, Turin, 1950, 28-41; De Capitani d'Arzago, *Architettura dei secoli*, 93-94.

16. According to Ambrose, *Expositio in Ps. CXVII*, 2, those who were baptized were permitted to offer their Eucharistic gifts at the altar; see Edwards, *Critical Aspects*, 74-75.

17. On the connections between the Ambrosian basilicas at Milan and the palace basilica at Trier, as well as other secular palatine buildings of the Tetrarchy, see S. Lewis, "The Latin Iconography of the Single-Naved Cruciform Basilica Apostolorum in Milan," *Art Bulletin*, 51, 1969, 214-218.

The Bronze Doors of Augsburg Cathedral

By CARL D. SHEPPARD

University of Minnesota

The great bronze doors of Augsburg Cathedral have been identified as being cast in the 11th century.¹ The style of the doors has usually been called Romanesque, probably implying what passes for "Pre-Romanesque" at present. As to both date and style, from the earliest mention of the doors in modern literature in a guidebook of 1832 to the last scholarly monograph in 1926, there has been general agreement. Yet there is no comparable material in monumental sculpture of any date, let alone the 11th century.

At least since the 16th century² the doors have been located on the south aisle of the nave, opening onto the main east-west highway through the town just before it meets the Via Claudia Augusta. Almost everyone agrees without evidence that this position is not the original one. Most scholars have concluded, nevertheless, that the present doors are composites of two other doors which once would have closed the entrances on either side of the eastern apse to the exterior of the building or to the crypt below. Robert Domm and Adolph Goldschmidt have published photographic mock-ups of what they feel the doors once looked like, J. Merz a line-drawing. The following have been suggested as working hypotheses for the original condition of the doors: they were of unequal width; each valve had three rows of plaques; each valve had only two rows. The scholars mentioned above, and everyone else who has published on the doors, agree, in any case, that the style of all the panels indicates that if additions to the prime condition have been made they were done almost contemporaneously with the original fashioning of the doors.

At present, they consist of two valves of unequal dimensions. The right valve has fourteen panels; the left has twenty-one and is almost a foot broader. The panels are fixed to wooden cores by flat-headed pins, now badly rusting and discoloring the lovely patina of the bronze. They are separated by vertical and horizontal strips with lily-like elements over the nails on the outside; on the interior the vertical strips cross over the horizontal ones and are held in place by human heads.

On the left valve the vertical strips overlap the middle row of plaques, reducing them by about half their size. This is most easily proven to be the case by examination of the "Creation of Eve" (Figs. 15 and 16). The head of

Adam extended too far to the left and interfered with the frame. The craftsman merely snipped out a bit of moulding so the strip could lie flat and left the figures intact. So far as I know, there is no record of the Augsburg doors being dismantled since their repair in the sixteenth century. Consequently no one has seen these plaques in their entirety. I would assume that nothing new of iconography would be discovered if the strips were removed, but the original composition would be restored to each of the seven panels of the middle row, enhancing them considerably and possibly suggesting to a restorer an entirely new manner of display.

Out of the thirty-five separate panels on the doors, there are ten sets of scenes that are close variations of each other.³ This "duplication" of scenes has puzzled all scholars who have worked with the doors. Why the variations? A more detailed analysis of the figures on the doors establishes that there are only a very few figure types used by the artist who fashioned the plaques. This is most apparent if the lower part of the torso in each instance is examined—there exist only five postures, minimally adjusted to fit one or another action or merely repeated again and again. These are characterized as follows: 1) right leg straight with the foot pointed down and to the right, left leg bent at knee and foot pointed to the left (fourteen times); 2) right leg straight and foot down, left knee raised (higher than 1, above) and foot pointed down to left (two times); 3) the reverse of 1 (two times); 4) feet together but pointed down, one left and one right (once); 5) both feet pointed to left, right leg crossed over left and striding (twice).⁴

This restricted number of types is combined with a similarly restricted number of configurations for the head and upper torso: for the head, full front, left or right profile, three-quarters left or right, and (even if the designation be awkward) seven-eighths left or right. In spite of the turn of the head or the direction of the legs, the shoulders are fully frontal, except for the profile position taken by the two variant figures which hold up an offering or flask. Arms are attached according to the action involved or the attribute held. They are appended inorganically to the body.

The quality of inarticulateness of the sculptures does not result from artistic incompetence but rather from the fruit of a venerable technical tradition and an accompanying aesthetic unconcern for faithfulness to visual appearance. The artist, or artists, worked in the mode prevalent in the West beginning in Early Christian art and affirmed for at least half a millennium after that. Copy books filled with motifs or with drawings of extant models must

have been used, and the elements thus found were combined or adapted directly as necessity required.

The images closest in style to that of the artist of the doors, although in another medium, are by the 10th-century Gregory Master in the Codex Egberti.⁵ The miniatures of the Codex are executed in a manner reminiscent of the illusionist technique of the fourth century. High-lights and shadows create the third dimension, but the figures themselves are more stereotyped than varied. Instead of a ground line separating earth and sky, there are fields of color behind the figures. Abstraction has, however, displaced the tricks of illusionism by line and by the disproportion of figure to setting.

The tradition behind the representations on the Augsburg doors can be demonstrated by the abbreviated way the artist indicated space. The presentation presupposes a ground line for each isolated figure. Where the ground line does not exist its implied presence can be used to explain the position of the feet and the twist of the lower part of the body of the figures. Where it does exist, the ground lines are indicated summarily by incision, by a raised border, or by a pile of fish-scale motifs representing a hill. These modes or symbols for visual space and for the architecture and the human figures are found in Early Christian and Early Medieval figurative art in all media from mosaics to rock crystal and enamel. The Augsburg doors belong to the terminal phase of this tradition in the West—just before the development of the Romanesque style—and could be considered either 10th- or 11th-century for this reason. The great charm of the doors resides in the keen aesthetic insights of the artist. If they strike us as being in any way amusing or quaint it is because we intuitively compare them to later medieval, Byzantine or Renaissance modes of seeing and techniques of execution.

Just as with location, original condition and duplication, one is left in somewhat of a quandary by examination of the iconography of the doors. Given the medieval date and some of the identifiable scenes, it appears that a program of significance once ordered the sequence of panels, and may still do so; but it now escapes us through our ignorance of the symbols used. Two of the thirty-five panels are occupied by monstrous human-headed knockers. Seven more can be exactly recognized: the Creation of Adam, the Creation of Eve, the Fall of Man, Samson and the Lion (twice), and Samson Killing the Philistines with the Jawbone of an Ass (twice). There are five scenes that suggest violence: a lion alone (twice), a lion attacking a four-legged animal, probably a deer, and a centaur-sagittarius (twice). There are two more visually complex

scenes: a bear, standing on his hind-quarters, reaches up into a tree, while two birds fly above (twice); and a woman strides along scattering feed to chickens (twice). The rest of the panels have single figures, variously dressed in tunic and cloak and placed as kings or orators, in prayer or admonition, or recoiling, shying away, or making offerings. In four more, individuals appear with snakes, serpents or basilisks, not counting the Fall of Man.⁶

No set of explanations has been successful in clarifying all these scenes. Besides the obvious Old Testament episodes, scholars usually have agreed that the lions and Samson signify protection. One of the kings is normally identified as David, some of the figures with reptiles as Moses and Aaron. So far, all scholars have let their interpretations of iconography be influenced by their conclusions concerning the original condition of the doors. If some of the panels are indeed additions, then the original symbolic scheme had to be established without them. Again if one decides that one of the variations of a theme is of a later manufacture, the conclusion also has a bearing on the original program of the doors. Lastly, if the doors were re-arranged at some undetermined date, then the present sequence of the panels is irrelevant in so far as their subject matter is concerned.

One could, however, assume that the present sequence and number of panels is substantially original. The sequence among many panels may then become clearer. Some, at least, of the single figures could be understood in relation to their adjacent panels and their specific actions interpreted as a result of this juxtaposition. One of the most obvious would be the centaur who apparently shoots an arrow at a lion in the next panel. Similarly, instead of recoiling or being startled *in vacuo*, a figure might be reacting to a sermon or admonition, as the King to the Orator. The Samson Killing the Lion might be in apposition to the man standing on a hill, pointing to his cross-topped staff.

Goldschmidt grouped the representations of animals together as symbols appropriate to church portals,⁷ as later examples in Provence and Lombardy indicate. They could represent the pursuit of Man's soul by the Devil, the Battle and Victory over Evil. Many of the standing figures could be taken as types of Christ: Aaron, Moses, Samson, David, etc. Meyer Schapiro gave the same figures less symbolic emphasis: "What unites all these varied subjects is the content of force embodied in nameless fighting men, Biblical heroes, and voracious beasts."⁸ Schapiro's observations are particularly valid for figurative art of a time when general rather than specific symbolism seems to explain better

the fantastic, the monstrous, the Biblical and the Classical juxtaposition of themes.

One of the most difficult scenes to reconcile with any overall interpretation of the iconography has been that of the Woman Scattering Feed, which appears twice. It is placed on the bottom inner edge of each door. Øystein Hjort⁹ further extended research by André Grabar¹⁰ on a symbol discussed in the content of pre-Christian and Early Christian art: The Bird in a Cage. The representation meant "danger avoided" or "protection of the hearth" and is found in conjunction with other motifs indicating the pastoral life, or *la vita rustica*. Hjort cited the mosaic of the triumphal arch of Santa Maria in Trastevere, Rome, as a late 14th-century but most helpful instance of the appearance of the Bird in a Cage. There are two of these on the Triumphal Arch, one each just above Isaiah and Jeremiah. The apse carries Christ Enthroned with the Virgin. Jeremiah's phylactery has the message "*XPC DNS captus est in peccatis nostris.*" The bird represents Christ and the cage, our sins. The Bird in a Cage represents Christ in the flesh and is a symbol of the Incarnation and of the Church, *Ecclesia*. Another mosaic executed in the 12th century but in a similar spirit of revival of Early Christian modes is that of the apse of San Clemente, Rome. Along the base of the hemispherical mosaic is an inscription indicating that the entire composition figuratively represents the Church of Christ.¹¹ In the great acanthus rinceaux appears the Bird in a Cage and at a lower level in the composition is the Woman Scattering Feed. The latter represents the Church, too, but in a more mundane manner and in a protective guise. In apposition to the Bird in a Cage, it takes the meaning of Mother-protector, of the Church itself.

The atropopaic meaning thus ascribed to the two scenes of the Woman Scattering Feed accords very well with the positions of the sculptures on the doors at Augsburg and could explain as well why the scene was repeated. I feel that the panel with the bear, tree, and birds could be explained by similar research.

A variation of this motif appears in Mediaeval heraldry—the bear rearing on its hind legs against a tree but without the birds. The modern symbol of the city of Madrid, for example, has just such a device. Berne, Switzerland, and Berlin also use the bear as an identifying emblem. In these cases the apparent meaning relates to the concept of "wilderness." The city exists in the place of wilderness either actual or metaphorical; it signifies security against external forces. If this is correct these panels of the doors symbolize salvation,

or more accurately, the condition that makes salvation a necessity, and thus are apposites to the Woman Scattering Seed.

The bear in relation to the tree was used by Nanni di Banco in the 15th century in his relief of the "Assumption of the Virgin" on the pediment of the Porta della Mandorla of the Duomo, Florence.¹² The same subject occurs in the relief of Adam and Eve on the Campanile of the Duomo. In these cases the interpretation concerns "the wilderness of sin," similar to that which fits the two instances on the Augsburg doors. This concept was further elaborated into the paradigm of Paradise—Wilderness—Protection—Ecclesia, which suits the Augsburg doors even better.

The association of the bear with wilderness can be traced even further back in time. In Rome, the representation of the animal is in two different but related contexts. One is the amphitheater where these beasts appeared in games, either with men or with wild animals. The first is depicted in a Tunisian 4th-century mosaic from Thurbo Maius;¹³ the second in the hunt on a Tunisian mosaic at Thysdrus.¹⁴

In general, the iconography of the doors presents the human condition after the Fall and the protection from Sin offered through the ritualistic and moral orders of the Church—a very appropriate program for a major church entrance to a major church of the 11th century. If one can begin to make out the iconography of the doors in their present condition, one should be able to use the same clues about the "duplicate" scenes. They can be explained as iconographically necessary and consonant with the major theme of the Church as the means of Salvation in Paradise. The fact that no one scene is an exact copy can be explained by the technical preferences of the artists. Unlike Barisanus of Trani,¹⁵ the Augsburg sculptor used a mould for only one casting. Actually, he would not have needed to make new moulds each time. What might have occurred is that, the variations of each panel being minor, they could have been developed through manipulation of the wax over the relief sculpture before casting.

At Augsburg, the artist was confronted by the problem of fitting panels of a proportion determined by his already developed compositions into spaces that were too small. He solved his problem by narrowing the middle row of the left side by means of frames rather than by altering his established designs. If both these suppositions are correct, one can conclude equally well that the doors now are substantially as they were originally and could have been made for the portal they now grace.

Notes

1. J. Merz, *Die Bildwerke an der Erzhüre des Augsburger Doms*, Stuttgart, 1885, reviews the pertinent literature before his date of publication (4, n. 1), and discusses the written sources about the Cathedral on 4ff. Robert Dom, *Das Bronzetur des Augsburger Doms*, Augsburg, 1925, 2-3; and Adolf Goldschmidt, *Die Deutschen Bronzeturren des Frühen Mittelalters*, I, *Die Frümittelalterlichen Bronzeturren*, ed. Richard Hamman, Marburg, 1926, 26, n. 1. The Cathedral was rebuilt after the collapse of 994. It was consecrated in 1065.

2. Merz, 7.

3. So close are some of the variations that the craftsmen who made the majestic plaster replica in the Victoria and Albert Museum did not make separate casts of some of them, just as the break in the moulding to accommodate Adam's head is not indicated.

4. The plates of Goldschmidt offer the best reproductions available: 1—LXXVIII; 2—LXXXIX; 3—LXXV; 4—LXXVIII; 5—XCVI.

5. Hubert Schiel, *Codex Egberti der Stadtbibliothek Trier*, Basel, 1960, 977-93.

6. As pointed out by Merz, 17, the serpents that stand vertically probably should be read moving backwards in space.

7. Goldschmidt, 28.

8. Meyer Schapiro, "The Bowman and the Bird on the Ruthwell Cross and other works: the interpretation of secular themes in Early Mediaeval Religious Art," *The Art Bulletin*, Dec. 1963, 353.

9. Øystein Hjort, "L'oiseau dans la cage: exemples médiévaux à Rome," *Cahiers Archéologiques*, XVIII, 1967, 21-23, and Hélène Toubert, "Le renouveau paléochrétien à Rome au début du XII^e siècle," *Cahiers Archéologiques*, XX, 1970, xxx.

10. André Grabar, "Recherches sur les sources juives de l'art paléochrétien," *Cahiers Archéologiques*, XII, 1962, 115-152, 124.

11. Hjort, 26.

12. H. W. Janson, "Nanni di Banco's 'Assumption of the Virgin,'" *International Congress of the History of Art XX, Acts*, II, The Renaissance and Mannerism, Princeton, 1963, 98ff.

13. M. Yacoub, *Musée du Bardo*, Tunis, 1970, Fig. 96.

14. *Institut d'archéologie, Tunis, Notes et Documents*, N.S., V (*Découverts archéologiques à Thysdrus en 1961*), Pl. XVII.

15. I would like to thank Professor David Walsh, who is working on this sculptor, for obtaining a copy of Merz' publication for me.

Marcialis Pincerna and the Provincial in Spanish Medieval Art

By JOHN WILLIAMS

University of Pittsburgh

Some of the details, such as Marcialis Pincerna and the Cock in the picture of the Last Supper, may be local allusions whose meaning has been lost, but they add to the overall impression of a lively, original personality which still emanates from the frescoes.

That Spanish medieval art tended to be provincial is a fact. The danger lies in forgetting or underestimating just how provincial it generally was. True provincialism, in which forms and iconographies emanating from artistic capitals inspire and guide the art of adjacent regions, however idiomatic the local translation may turn out to be, is apt to be confounded with idiosyncrasy, where the peculiar is the rule. Thus, the quotation given above, taken from a recent account of the 12th-century fresco cycle in the Pantheon of the Kings of the Church of San Isidoro in León,¹ betrays an underlying assumption that the cycle's *Last Supper* may be satisfactorily understood in terms of the local and peculiar. At least as it touches on the identity of *Marcialis* such an assumption is misleading.

The *Last Supper* (Fig. 17) is artfully composed upon the groin-vaulted surface of the westernmost of the two central bays of the Pantheon. Arranging the table so that it paralleled the long axis of the rectangular vault, the painter followed the chiasmic scheme imposed by the projecting groins. Viewed from the artificial perspective provided by a flattened wide-angle photograph of the total vault surface, the composition may seem unnecessarily radial. This, however, is a view one does not naturally experience in the low bay itself, where the spandrels rise almost vertically from a point only several feet above one's head. A secondary architectural scheme was imposed by the painter himself in an effort to suggest a location within a building, as Biblical description and iconographic convention called for. The most important segment of this architectural setting consists of the superstructure of an edifice seen from the exterior, which rests upon a canopy sheltering the figures of Christ, Peter, John, and Judas. The fictive architecture is made up of a domical structure centered in front of a basilical construction in a combination suggesting the rear view of a church. The arched canopy imposed on it becomes a kind of

volte-face apsidal interior filled with the hieratically frontal figure of Christ presiding over the Communion Table.

The scene is chiefly inspired by John's Gospel account, for only there (xiii.26) does Christ designate his betrayer by the offering of the sop. In type, therefore, it belongs to an iconography associated with the West since the 9th century.² Although the type used here, with Christ centered and Judas approaching from the other side of the table, is prominent in German art of the 10th and 11th centuries, it was also current in France. A manuscript version from the second half of the 11th century from St. Germain-des-Prés³ is almost identical to the Leonese interpretation. Not only does Judas seize the fish at the moment he receives the sop from Christ's hand, but in both of them the Apostle John, in the Byzantine fashion, is an elderly bearded figure.⁴ A fresco of the second quarter of the 12th century in the church of St. Martin in Vicq-sur-Saint-Chartrier⁵ also closely parallels the Pantheon *Last Supper*, although here the reclining John is beardless.

This particular iconography of the *Last Supper* appears in Spain in works roughly contemporary with the León fresco cycle.⁶ It is found, for example, on an ivory plaque of the first half of the 12th century (Fig. 18), which joined the earlier reliefs of the life of St. Emilian on the large reliquary in the monastery of San Millán de la Cogolla in upper Castile.⁷ A similar formula is found in the Bible of Ávila (Fig. 19).⁸ This version coincides more particularly with that of León in having Judas reach for the fish at the moment he receives the sop from Christ's hand. Thus, in its general outlines the Pantheon *Last Supper* belongs to an iconographic tradition well established in Spain as well as Gaul.

The Pantheon Master departed slightly from convention in placing two Apostles on the same side of the table with Judas, an arrangement imposed by the shape of the vault and one which takes advantage of its concave surface. However, the most puzzling features for commentators have been the figures standing under arches on the opposite spandrels and labelled *Marcialis Pincerna* and *Tadeus*. The latter, the Apostle Thadeus (Jude), is shown approaching the table with a vessel containing a fish. His position is anomalous in that he is isolated from his colleagues, whereas Matthias, who will become an Apostle only later by election after Judas' treason, is seated at the right end of the table itself. Some confusion is apparent here.

However, it is Marcialis the Cupbearer (Fig. 20) who has been seen as the most idiosyncratic figure in the scene. He is represented as a barefooted young

man dressed in a red tunic and blue mantle. His right hand grasps the handle of a large pitcher; his left hand extends a cup which has presumably just been filled. In the early part of this century Émile Bertaux identified him, without discussion, as "the donor,"⁹ a suggestion taken seriously by Chandler Post, who sought to add plausibility to this identification by noting on the one hand that cupbearers were court officials in western Spain in the twelfth century, and on the other that Pincerna was, in at least one Peninsular inscription, a surname.¹⁰ The suggestion made by Georgiana King in *The Way of St. James*,¹¹ that the figure was St. Martial of Limoges, Post merely acknowledged as "ingenious."

Surely Miss King was right. To interpret this figure as a donor is to anticipate Dirk Bout's Louvain Altar-piece by better than three centuries. The active participation of the figure in the scene, the fact he is dressed in the same fashion as the other Apostles and like them is barefoot, all argue against the supposition that our Marcialis was included as a "local allusion," and for his identification as the Limousin saint whose cult radiated from the basilica of St.-Martial. There are, moreover, precedents and parallels for our scene.

Around A.D. 250 a certain Martialis founded a Christian community at Limoges and was its first Bishop.¹² The site of his burial outside the village became a popular shrine. Promotion of the cult of St. Martial by the monastery and See of Limoges reached a peak with an active campaign to have him elevated to the rank of Apostle. At least five councils dealt with the question until finally in 1031 he was officially given the title "Apostle."

The popularity and spread of the cult of Martial in the 11th century led to his representation in various guises in manuscript illumination, sculpture, and murals. Most of these are portraits of Martial adapted to standard iconographic formats. However, the earliest recorded appearance of Martial in art makes him the subject of a fresco cycle. In a sermon which included arguments for the antiquity of the Martial legend, Adémar de Chabannes alluded to a wall painting in which Martial was depicted handing a linen towel to Christ as the latter washes the feet of the Apostles after the Last Supper.¹³ Elsewhere Adémar is at pains to point out that these paintings of the Washing of the Feet and "other aspects of the life of Saint Martial" were in the ancient basilica of St.-Martial, the one demolished in 1021, and that their very appearance, "rude and confused," made them effective witnesses to the antiquity of the legend of St. Martial. Adémar was one of the most devoted champions of Martial's Apostolicity. Although he averred that this church was more than five centuries old, in fact it had stood less than two hundred years. However,

even if one cannot take at face value his claim about the cycle's age, one hesitates to doubt the existence of a mural program. It would seem likely that it was composed at the end of the 10th century on the basis of local legends.

The nature of these is well known for they form the basis for the fictitious *Vita Prolixior*, composed in the first half of the 11th century.¹⁴ It begins with events in Martial's youth. According to the narrator, who identifies himself as Aurelian, a companion of Martial and his successor in the See of Limoges, Martial was the son of Marcellus and Elizabeth, Jews of the tribe of Benjamin.¹⁵ At the age of fifteen he was taken to hear Christ preach and he and his parents were baptized, along with Zacheus and Joseph of Arimathea, by the Apostle Peter. A kinsman, Peter persuaded Martial to join him as a disciple of Christ. After Christ's death Martial accompanied Peter to Antioch and then to Rome, where Peter commissioned him to preach the Gospel in Aquitaine. This he did with great success, aided by prodigious life-giving miracles, until his death on June 30, A.D. 71. Within pseudo-Aurelian's account of Martial's service with Christ we find specific details that accord with his activities in the fresco described by Adémar and in the *Last Supper* of the Pantheon:

Calling to mind the prophecy of our Lord Jesus Christ, when He dined with His disciples in the flesh and gave to them the mysteries of His body and blood in the sacrament of bread and wine, and, rising from the feast itself, washed their feet and dried them with a towel, that most holy man, Martial, was appointed with Cleophas and many other disciples to serve, so that they supplied the things which were necessary for the task, namely, a supply of food and drink and water and towels for cleaning and washing the disciples' feet.¹⁶

It is precisely as privileged servant, as one bringing wine to the first Communion, that Martial attends the scene in León. This legend must be the origin of the *Marcialis Pincerna* in the Pantheon.

It is not the first time he appeared in such a guise. In paintings decorating the tribune of the south transept of the Cathedral of Le Puy¹⁷ was a version of the Last Supper. It was organized in the Eastern manner, i.e., with the Apostles ranged behind a sigma table, the left end of which is occupied by Christ. Although the scene was destroyed in restoration, a copy made at that time preserves its essentials and shows a figure on our side of the table approaching Christ with a pitcher and a chalice (Fig. 21). He is without a

nimbus, as is a figure seated at the opposite end of the table from Christ. One of these two must be Judas, for there are eleven other nimbed figures seated behind the table. Within the Byzantine convention of this type of Last Supper, Judas is sometimes, though not always, placed as far from Christ as possible. This tradition, together with the host-like crossed morsel in front of him, a reference to the "Communion of Judas," makes the identification of this figure as Judas certain. Presumably then the servant approaching Christ with pitcher and cup is the legendary Martial. The tribune frescoes of Le Puy, some of which survive, have been dated to the third quarter of the 11th century. It is to this iconographic tradition that the Leonese *Last Supper* belongs in so far as Martial is included in the scene as a servant. However, the marked compositional differences between the Le Puy and León versions raise the question of whether this tradition was graphic or verbal. The Le Puy *Last Supper* belongs to a type originating in the East. It is a rather pure version of the Byzantine convention in that Judas is not brought near Christ to receive the sop as recounted in the Gospel of John.¹⁸ On the other hand, the Pantheon's *Last Supper* represents a popular Western type. The only thing the two have in common is the participation of Martial, and even here his position is substantially different. It would be wrong to suggest there was an archetypal Martialine iconography which determined fixed conventions. More likely his figure was conveniently attached to the *Last Supper* in whatever region the Martial cult made headway. Thus the impact of the verbal tradition seems especially evident in the Last Supper of the lintel of St-Julien-de-Jonzy, where a figure beneath an arch at the right end of the table holds a carafe and glances toward the group around the table, while at the same time holding a towel for Christ, who washes the feet of Peter.¹⁹

The spread of the cult of St. Martial to Spain is seen as early as the 11th century in Castilian Calendars,²⁰ but the journey to Limoges by Archbishop Diego Gelmírez of Santiago de Compostela in 1102 for the purpose of venerating the Saint's relics²¹ reveals a significant intensification of the cult in the 12th century. When Lucas of Túy, a Canon of San Isidoro, composed his chronicle of Spanish history in the first quarter of the 13th century, *Martialis discipulis Apostolorum Lemonica* appeared between SS. Matthew and Luke in his enumeration of the sites evangelized by the Apostles and in which they died.²² The Pantheon's *Last Supper* shows unmistakably, however, Leonese interest in the fantastic life of St. Martial a century earlier. Whether Martial's inclusion derives merely from the stimulation of the legend or whether it was prompted

by an iconographic tradition operating through pictorial models is a question beyond the scope of this essay. The corresponding figure holding a fish under the arch on the opposite side of the composition implies, on the one hand, that the legend alone prompted the addition of the two serving figures, for it is plausible to think of him as Cleophas, the only other disciple identified in the *Vita Prolixior* as assisting at the Last Supper.²³ On the other hand, the painted inscription labeling him as Thadeus, a patently wrong identification, suggests the use of an unfamiliar pictorial model without identifying labels, and an ignorance of the Martial story in all its details.

What is certain, however, is that the presence of Martialis Pincerna is not to be understood as an obscure and idiosyncratic local reference, but as the result of cultural influences, direct or indirect, radiating from central France. Still another instance of such influences may be seen in the Pantheon in the representation of St. Martin of Tours confronting a regally dressed black figure, where, again, pious legend seems to be the inspiration.²⁴ This is not to say that the question of local influences is irrelevant. On the contrary. Who among the representatives of Church or State determined that the Gallic saints Martial and Martin should adorn the vaults of the burial place of the kings of León, while saints Isidore and Vincent, whose relics reposed in splendid coffers nearby, should not? This is the central issue in understanding the Pantheon cycle.

Notes

1. O. Demus, *Romanesque Mural Painting*, London, 1970, 485.
2. For the Johannine *Last Supper* see G. Schiller, *Ikongraphie der christlichen Kunst* II, Gütersloh, 1968, 44-46, Pls. 336-339; Émile Mâle, *L'art religieux du XII^e siècle*, Paris, 1922, 112-114; O. Pächt, *The St. Albans Psalter*, London, 1960, 58-60.
3. Paris, B.N. lat. 12054, Fol. 79; H. Swarzenski, *Monuments of Romanesque Art*, Chicago, 1954, Fig. 166; J. Porcher, *Manuscrits à peintures*, Paris, 1954, No. 241.
4. The paint in this section of the fresco has flaked badly. The outline of the lower part of John's face does remain, however, and if he had no beard his face was extraordinarily long.
5. Demus, 424, Fig. 150.
6. The Pantheon cycle is usually dated to the third quarter of the 12th century, chiefly on the basis of the identification of the kneeling "Fredenando" of the *Crucifixion* with

Fernando II of León. However, there is evidence which seems to place the frescoes in the first half of the 12th century. See J. Williams, "San Isidoro de León: Evidence for a New History," *Art Bulletin*, 58, 1973, 180ff.

7. A. Goldschmidt, *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen aus der romanischen Zeit*, Berlin, 1926, IV, 30, Pl. XXXII.

8. *El arte románico* (Catalogue), Barcelona and Santiago de Compostela, 1961, 12.

9. E. Bertaux, in *Histoire de l'art*, ed. A. Michel, II, 1, Paris, 1906, 414-415.

10. C. Post, *A History of Spanish Painting*, I, Cambridge, 1930, 178.

11. G. King, *The Way of St. James*, Bryn Mawr, 1920, II, 202.

12. See L. Duchesne, "Saint Martial de Limoges," *Annales du Midi*, IV, 1892, 289-330; H. Leclercq, "Limoges" in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et liturgie*, IX, 1, Col. 1063ff.; C. de Lasteyrie, *L'abbaye de Saint-Martial de Limoges*, Paris, 1901.

13. F. Arbellot, "Dissertation sur l'apostolat de St. Martial de Limoges et sur l'antiquité des églises de France," *Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique du Limousin*, IV, 1852, 209ff., 267-8, cited by Grabar, *Cahiers archéologiques*, II, 1947, 167, n.1.

14. Walter de Gray Birch, "Vita Sanctissimi Martialis Apostoli," *Journal of the British Archeological Association*, XVIII, 1872, 353-390. A shorter *Vita* had been composed in the 9th century. The postulated 10th-century program would have been contemporaneous with a cycle of St. Peter's life, painted on the entrance wall of the church of St. Peter at Fleury. See R.-H. Bautier, *Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de France*, 4, 1969, 116.

15. In the *Vita Martialis* in Stuttgart, Landesbibl. H.B. XIV 6, Fol. 71r, of the twelfth century, Martial is depicted as a young man standing in front of his parents. Pseudo-Aurelian's *Vita* inspired the most extensive cycle of all as late as the 14th century, when Pope Clement VI commissioned Matteo Giovanetti da Viterbo to paint a life of St. Martial in the Papal Palace in Avignon. The *Last Supper* is not among the thirty-five episodes depicted. See G. Kaftal, *Iconography of the Saints in Tuscan Painting*, Florence, 1952, 686f.

16. Consummata vero saluberrima domini nostri Jhesu Christi predicatione, quando cum discipulis suis corporaliter caenavit, ac misteria eis corporis et sanguinis sui in panis et vini sacramenta contradidit, pedesque eorum ab ipsis surgens dapibus lavit et lintheo deterisit, iste sanctissimus vir Martialis ad serviendum fuit deputatus cum Cleopha ac multis aliis discipulis, ut ea, quae tali apparatu necessaria erant, ipsi supplerent, cibi videlicet et potus copiam, et aquam et lintheamina ad discipulorum pedes abluendos et detergendos (W. de Gray Birch, *Vita Martialis*, 359).

17. Demus, 416; P. Deschamps and M. Thibout, *La peinture murale en France*, Paris, 1951, 56f., Fig. 12.

18. Some Western adaptations of the Byzantine formula bring the figure of Judas close to Christ under the influence of the Gospel of John. The composition then resembles that of the Le Puy *Last Supper*. However, the fact that the figure approaching Christ at Le Puy holds a pitcher and the presence of twelve other Apostles rules out the possibility that it was one of these. See Schiller, II, Figs. 82-85, 87.

19. Schiller, Fig. 92. R. Hamann, *Die Abteikirche von St. Gilles und ihre künstlerische Nachfolge*, Berlin, 1935, 344, speaks of him as a "winemaster," but one would expect some specific identification to motivate the introduction of such a figure into this scene.

20. Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia, Cod. 18, Fol. 8v (from San Millán) and Santo Domingo de Silos, Cod. 3 (J. Vives and A. Fábrega, *Hispania Sacra*, II, 1949, 358. Cod. 3 and Cod. 4 have been confused in this publication of calendars). A very early Spanish copy of the *Vita Martialis* is in the 11th-century portion of a manuscript from Silos (Paris n. a. lat. 2170, Fol. 237-255). A capital in the west gallery of the cloister of Silos, from the second half of the 12th century, has a youthful figure with a platter containing a fish in front of the table of the *Last Supper*. Perhaps he should be identified as St. Martial on the basis of the *Vita Prolixior* account of the youthful Martial's role as a servant at the Last Supper.

21. M. Suárez and J. Campelo, eds., *Historia Compostelana*, Santiago de Compostela, 1950, 52.

22. *Hispaniae Illustratae*, ed. A. Schott, Frankfurt, 1608, IV, 34. It is tempting to think that Martial was given his prominent place in the Pantheon of Leon because he was identified, locally, with Martial, the son of Leon's legendary first martyr, who, like the father of Martial of Limoges, was named Marcellus. Although this Marcellus, a Centurion, was in reality a North African, he appears as Leonese in manuscripts of the 11th and 12th centuries. Georgiana King, II, 181, asserted that Lucas of Túy made the two Martials one, but this is not, in fact, the case. At the beginning of his chronicle (2) Lucas mentions Marcellus the Centurion and proceeds to give him a wife, Nona, and twelve sons, including a Martial, whereas a Leonese Breviary of the 12th century gave him only three sons—Claudius, Lupercus, and Victoricus. Later on (34) Lucas cites St. Martial as being of Limoges and does not mention León. Thus a 12th-century source in León does not even mention Martial; and Lucas of Túy not only seems to be inventing the family, but when given the chance he fails to suggest a Leonese history for Martial of Limoges. For these reasons it is unlikely that viewers of our *Marcialis Pincerna* associated him with Martial, son of Marcellus of Leon. Still, it is not impossible. For the Marcellus popularly but erroneously associated with León, see B. de Gaiffier, "S. Marcel de Tanger ou de León? Évolution d'une légende," *Analecta Bollandiana*, LXI, 1943, 116-139; *Archivo leonés*, 23, 1969, 13-23.

23. To be identified with Cleopas, one of the disciples who met Christ on the road to Emmaus (*Luke* xxiv:18)?

24. It was inspired, perhaps, by a passage in Sulpicius Severus' *Vita S. Martini Turonensis*, where Satan appears to St. Martin in princely garb (*Vie de Saint Martin*, ed. J. Fontaine, Paris, 1967, I, 307-308).

Two Ivory Madonnas

By BEATRICE GILMAN PROSKE
Hispanic Society of America

Ivory carving has always been an art practiced by special craftsmen at distinct centers. From the 9th to the 12th century such centers sprang up throughout western Europe. There was a period during the transition from Romanesque to Gothic styles, before the Paris ateliers began to circulate their wares in the latter part of the 13th century, when the art lost favor, perhaps because so much sculptural talent was being expended on cathedral building. Very few ivories remain from the time between 1200 and 1250, and what few can be found are individual in style, not easily related to each other or assigned to a well-defined workshop.¹

Among these rare pieces is a figure of the Virgin and Child in the collection of the Hispanic Society (Figs. 22, 24, 26).² Rather than a statuette, it is a high relief cut from half the solid end of an elephant tusk, a slight indentation towards the base at the back showing where the cavity of the tusk began. The whole treatment of the seated Virgin with the Child on her right knee is handled like a relief, with the planes somewhat flattened and only the face completely in the round. Even the knees do not have room for normal projection, although they are in a natural position instead of being spread apart to form a V-shape with the closely placed ankles, as was often the case in Romanesque art. The Child's figure in particular has suffered from the cramped position made necessary by the curve of the ivory. The stocky proportions agree with a general trend in sculpture towards the end of the 12th century, when they were preferred over the attenuated forms of preceding styles.

There is nothing unusual about the idea, the Virgin seated in a frontal position, looking outward at the spectator, with a knob pierced to hold a scepter in her left hand. However, the Child's position is an innovation of the carver's. The statuette shows clearly how Romanesque characteristics lingered as new Gothic elements were introduced. The work has lost the linear, schematic treatment of earlier carving and has not achieved truly natural forms. The figures are not fully realized under drapery that seems to hang without benefit of the body beneath. The Romanesque habit of drawing the cloth tightly across to emphasize the roundness of a thigh is completely absent. Instead, the folds of the Virgin's tunic and mantle are represented by means of

shallow grooves ending in notches, straight or diagonal, shorter for gathers; the material is represented as folded into a cascade outside the left knee and falling in softer loose folds at the edge of the diagonal between the knees. At each side of the right knee the mantle lies in small triangular pouches reflecting Gothic taste.

Indicative of the first half of the 13th century is the way the Virgin's veil lies in free-falling cascades at both sides of the face. A convention of this kind, adapted from observation of actual cloth, had been used in Romanesque times but with the folds always kept very flat and close to the face. Their new freedom on the ivory is a token of the naturalistic tendency that is a prime factor in the rise of Gothic art, evident in the whole appearance of the statuette. An end of the veil brought across the throat is slightly ruffled in an informal manner. This ruffled effect can be found occasionally in Romanesque sculpture. An early 12th-century example is the veil worn by Herodias on a capital from the Cathedral of Saint-Étienne in the Musée des Augustins, Toulouse. More like a frill separate from the veil is that on the Virgin with the Child receiving the model of a building from a cleric in the cloister at León Cathedral, to be dated about 1218.³ A swag across the throat between the two ends of the veil appears on several representations of the Virgin of the late 12th century in the province of Burgos, such as the one from Cerezo de Riotirón now in The Cloisters, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.⁴ On the left shoulder of our ivory Virgin an end of veil appears below the part brought across the throat, probably meant as a piece crossing underneath from the right side. The Virgin's face, a long oval in shape, has been damaged by the loss of a splinter extending from the crown through the nose; the circlet has been re-patterned and the right eye crudely recut. The left eye, shallowly set, is drawn with a smooth eyeball framed by curving lines to delineate the lids. The ends of the full lower lip are drawn up in a smile.

The Virgin's crown has four foliations above a circlet with two rows of pearling. It was quite natural to ornament any narrow flat surface with pearling, and actual crowns had been decorated with strings of pearls from the 9th century. In Romanesque art such crowns are not common, but one with a single row of pearls is worn by a king on a jamb of the west portal of Túj Cathedral, carved about 1225, as well as on the slightly earlier mid-post capital of the cloister door at Tarragona Cathedral. The foliations of the ivory Madonna's crown are softer and less stylized than in Romanesque sculpture and agree with the leaves on the scrolls at the base.

This pedestal foliage, opposing scrolls springing from the base of a vertical pile of palmettes at the front, also emphasizes the transitional character of the piece. On one of the early 12th-century capitals from Saint-Étienne at Toulouse a base of leaf scrolls is placed like this below the Virgin.⁵ Although the pearly stems are a commonplace in Romanesque art, they are most frequent in the Toulouse region and in Cataluña, where they do not revolve, as these do, in scrolls that suggest late-antique carving. The leaves that spring from the scrolled stems on the ivory are softer than the hard-edged cutting of Romanesque work without yet achieving a likeness to real leaves. Some of them turn off the edge of the scrolls like Gothic crockets. The triangular shape of the palmettes, drilled between the leaf sections, may have a remote ancestry in Hispano-Moresque carving, such as that on ivory boxes. The rounded ends of some lobes are like forms invented by early French Gothic sculptors towards the end of the 12th century.⁶ Trefoil shapes have a parallel in those on the end of an early 13th-century sarcophagus in the porch of the Convent of Las Huelgas, Burgos.⁷

The Child carries on the classic tradition by wearing a mantle over a tunic, although it is draped across the knees instead of being worn toga-fashion. The strangely relaxed position in which the figure is seated sideways with the left knee bent and the right leg extended, is a foretaste of the realistic inventions of Gothic art. The peculiar gathered edge of the mantle where it is tucked under the extended leg might have been observed from a reclining figure in a manuscript, such as the Berthold missal (1215-1232) from Weingarten Abbey.⁸ A clear indication of approximate date is the Child's hair style, with a little roll at the edge of the forehead below the part, and the waves at each side of the face ending in an upward turn. This style begins in France towards the end of the first quarter of the 13th century, as it may be seen on the right door of the south front at Chartres Cathedral. In Spain it is used at Burgos Cathedral on the Sarmental Door of the second quarter of the century, and slightly later at Burgos in the gallery above the Puerta de la Coronaría and at León Cathedral on the south portal. Since as the century progressed the bang and the ends developed into firmer rolls, as in the miniatures of the *Cántigas* of Alfonso X, illuminated between 1257 and 1284,⁹ the style of the ivory Child's hair would be associated with the decades from 1240 to 1260.

Another ivory Virgin and Child in the Schweizerisches Landesmuseum, Zurich, (Figs. 23, 25, 27) presents extraordinary similarities when compared to the one in the Hispanic Society while at the same time having other details

peculiar to itself. In the first place there are resemblances in the ivory, of a deep yellowish tone with a distinctive pattern of cracks. Both statuettes are cut from half a tusk, and the measurements are almost the same.¹⁰ The two bend in opposite directions as if they were cut from opposite sides of the same tusk. The fact that more of the central cavity shows on the Zurich Madonna indicates that it was cut a little lower on the tusk, which may be the reason why the concentric rings on the under sides of the two bases do not quite coincide (Figs. 26, 27). The character of the drapery, with narrow folds set close together, is very similar. The mantle is drawn up between the knees in a similar long diagonal on the Zurich Madonna and the edge is also frilled, even if in a more artificial manner. Around the Virgin's feet the lower edges of the garments fall in the same complicated scrolls, and the sides of the stool are finished with the same small capitals.

It is hard to compare the Virgins' faces since that of the Hispanic Society's ivory is so damaged. That of the Zurich ivory is rounder, and the expression a more obvious imitation of the smile of a French Gothic Madonna. The eyes are quite differently carved, those of the Zurich Virgin being smaller and more fully modeled, the eyelids swelling softly above the line of the eyelashes and blending into the planes of cheeks and brow without the harsh lines of the Hispanic Society's Virgin. In contrast, the locks of hair beside the face are little defined, hardly distinguishable from the squashy folds of the veil behind them. The ends of the veil are crossed below the throat in long parallel folds instead of presenting the ruffled effect of the Hispanic Society Virgin's. This arrangement is not unusual; it can be found in an early 13th-century tympanum at Laon Cathedral and on the Virgin and Child from Sahagún in the museum at León, of the second half of the 13th century. One end of the veil is drawn underneath to appear on the Virgin's right shoulder, gathered below the upper fold in much the same way as on the Hispanic Society Virgin's left shoulder but more logically related to the rest of the veil. The crown, sitting higher on the head, is quite different, the circlet carved with leaf patterns that rise at the front in half palmettes placed back to back to join the floriation at the top, while at the sides the floriations are composed of another trefoil above a trefoil on the circlet.

Below the Virgin's feet are two wyverns, not treated as the serpent of evil trampled by the righteousness of the Virgin but as purely ornamental adjuncts, each holding in its mouth the stem of a leaf drawn like those on the scrolled stems at the base of the Hispanic Society's Virgin. Fantastic creatures in pairs,

with tails ending in leaf scrolls, were common on Spanish Romanesque capitals. A single creature in low relief is sunk in a panel on the base of the Virgin from Sahagún at León. The decorated bases below both ivory Madonnas, placed like consoles to support the figures, imply artists familiar with architectural carving. The Child, seated in the bend of the Zurich Virgin's left arm with His feet braced against His mother's knees, is entirely different from the other Christ Child. His face is rounder, with a cheerful smile. The curve of the upper eyelid above the straight-edged lower lid is a French Gothic convention. The hair lies flat on top of the head behind a high, bulbous forehead, breaking into a few shapeless curls at the sides. He has no halo and carries a book in His left hand. He wears a tunic laid in pleats at the top, below the neck, and a mantle thrown over the knees with an end caught up under the left hand. The Virgin's left hand is tucked under the edge of the Child's tunic and roughly finished, no doubt because it could not be seen from the front.

Both statuettes are pierced for attachment to a background, but in different places. On the Hispanic Society's ivory there are holes drilled through at both ends of the bench where the Virgin sits. Other holes, at the front and back of the head, do not go through the ivory and may have held a metal crown or halo. The Zurich ivory has a piece shaped like a keyhole cut out of the bottom, a hole in the middle of the back, and one at the back of the crown, neither cut through to the front.

The combination of likenesses and differences suggests a common workshop but a different carver for each statuette. The hardest problem is to find a site for such a workshop. Neither of the ivories has a long history. The one in the Hispanic Society's collection came through a Paris dealer from Madrid, having been owned by an Austrian ambassador to Spain, Ricardo Traumann, who collected most of his works of art in Spain. The first account of this ivory appeared in 1901.¹¹ The Zurich Madonna came to the Museum from a monastery at Mehrerau, but it had been found at Baden in Aargau on the stone floor of an old house where, before its value was recognized, it had been used as a child's plaything. Baden has been famed as a watering place since Roman times, and such an object might have found its way there in the hands of any visitor. It was first published in 1881.¹²

Since the few other ivories of the period present no close comparisons and are equally uncertain as to origin, the only resource is to look for the special characteristics of these two ivories in sculpture in other materials. Madonnas carved in wood offer no clues, and their dates can only be reckoned approxi-

mately. There are, however, some resemblances to sculptures in stone. Futterer, influenced by the place where it was found, sought German parallels for the Zurich ivory while deriving the drapery style from Reims, but the resemblances that she found are less convincing than similarities which can be seen among sculptures found in Spain for both ivories. A drapery formula of narrow folds set close together, in many variations, was widespread in Western Europe during the first part of the 13th century. It was, however, especially characteristic of Spanish sculpture in the last quarter of the 12th century, later than the classicizing art of Provence but earlier than that at Reims, and it carried over into the 13th century. The most important examples in Spain are the reliefs of the Annunciation and the Tree of Jesse in the cloister at Santo Domingo de Silos, although the cutting there is much deeper and the folds are more complicated than those on the ivories. This sculpture had a great influence in the province of Burgos and outlying regions.

More distinctive on both ivories is the strong diagonal of the Virgin's mantle, drawn upward from the inner side of her right foot to the top of her left knee. Such a diagonal appeared in Romanesque sculpture but without the long end tucked in beside the foot and continuing a section of the mantle drawn over the leg. The ends of falling folds naturally result in a cascade; in Spain they may achieve a ruffled effect like that edging the diagonal on the ivories, as on the portal of the Church of Santo Domingo at Soria. On both ivories the scrolled edge of the Virgin's tunic, covering her feet, is an advance in realism over the pleated folds of Romanesque art, which were usually lifted to reveal the tips of the shoes. The calligraphic quality of these folds is, as Futterer recognized, reminiscent of Villard de Honnecourt's drawing of the Church Triumphant in his sketchbook, where the folds carry on the vertical lines of the drapery and have a livelier sweep. A like treatment to that on the ivories can be found in Spain, as on some of the jamb statues of the main portal at T uy Cathedral, done about 1225.

The character of the carving, with some awkwardness especially in the folds, suggests a provincial site, removed from important artistic centers. The combination of straight vertical lines contrasting with passages of softer curves is characteristic of Spanish carvers of the transitional period. Spanish parallels for the veil ruffled across the throat and for the scrolled edges of the tunics over the feet have been noted. There was also some use of loose folds over the feet in both English and German 13th-century sculpture, as on the Mater Dolorosa of the Crucifixion group at Halberstadt. In both countries these folds are

sharper edged and more angular, in restless movement. Suggestions of a knowledge of sculpture of a century earlier at Toulouse and also of French Gothic sculpture imply the possibility of wandering craftsmen, although by the second quarter of the 13th century, cathedrals rising in Burgos and León brought French carvers who could have provided models for imitation. All these items are frail straws on which to base deductions, but they do point the direction of a wind blowing towards the region of Burgos and León. A late flowering of Romanesque sculpture was concentrated in the territory on both sides of the Pyrenees from Toulouse in France to León in Spain.¹³ The pilgrimage road to Santiago de Compostela traversed this country and carried artistic influences along with the throngs of pilgrims.

Notes

1. R. Koechlin, *Les ivoires gothiques français*, Paris, 1934, I, 46.
2. Under examination by ultra-violet light and magnification made at the Conservation Center of the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, by L. J. Majewski and Alan Thielker, the fluorescence pattern was completely consistent with an old ivory. It showed that the lost flake on the face had been missing for many years and that there had been no more recent recutting. Microscopic examination showed that the statuette was cut from a single piece of ivory and that there were no later tool marks. There was a line of abrasion across the front of the base that indicated an early mounting by means of a metal band.
3. M. Gómez-Moreno (*Provincia de León* Madrid, 1925, 237), surmised that the relief might be related to an adjacent tomb of that date.
4. J. Pérez Carmona, *Arquitectura y escultura románicas en la provincia de Burgos*, Burgos, 1959, 238-247.
5. Council of Europe, *El arte románico*, Barcelona and Santiago de Compostela, 1961, Pl. XXVII, No. 356.
6. D. Jalabert, *La flore sculptée des monuments du moyen age en France*, Paris, 1965, 96-98.
7. M. Gómez Moreno, *El panteón real de las Huelgas de Burgos*, Madrid, 1946, Pl. VIII.
8. New York, The Pierpont Morgan Library. Ms. M.710.
9. J. Guerrero Lovillo, *Las cántigas*, Madrid, 1949, 190.
10. Measurements: Hispanic Society, height 24.2 cm., width of base 10.2 cm., depth of base 4.3 cm.; Zurich, height 23.8 cm., width of base 9.2 cm., depth of base 4.5 cm.

11. Sociedad española de excursiones, Madrid, *Boletín*, IX, 1901, Pl. facing page 121; Hispanic Society of America, *Catalogue of Sculpture (Thirteenth to Fifteenth Centuries)*, New York, 1932, 7-11; Hispanic Society of America, *Handbook*, New York, 1938, 65.

12. "Elfenbeinerne Madonnenstatuette aus dem XIII. Jahrhundert," *Anzeiger für schweizerische Alterthumskunde*, IV, 1881, 165; J. Baum, "Romanische Marienbilder im Schweizerischen Landesmuseum," *Anzeiger für schweizerische Alterthumskunde*, New Ser., XXVII, 1925, 215-227; I. Futterer, *Gotische Bildwerke der deutschen Schweiz, 1220-1440*, Augsburg, 1930, 15-16; Tardy, *Les ivoires*, Paris, 1966, 59.

13. J. Baltrušaitis, "La troisième sculpture romane," *Formositas romanica; Beiträge zur Erforschung der romanischen Kunst*, Frauenfeld, 1958, 47-84.

The Vision of St. Bernard: A Study in Florentine Iconography

By R. STEVEN JANKE

State University of New York College at Buffalo

The *Vision of St. Bernard*, Florence, Accademia, a polyptych attributed to the Master of the Rinuccini Chapel, survives from the mid-Trecento, a period of great iconographic innovation.¹ In the central panel (Fig. 28) within a verdant landscape, the Virgin, together with two attendant angels, hovers before St. Bernard, who, pen in hand, kneels calmly at a *prie-dieu* as two monks look on. The Trecento artist uses a purely visual device to stress that St. Bernard's meditation is directly responsible for the Virgin's presence. The sentence in his manuscript, "Regina celi mater crucifixi dic mater domini si in Jerusalem eras quando captus fuit filius tuus . . .," is completed by the inscription issuing as gold uncials from the mouth of the Virgin, "Jerusalem eram quando hoc audivi."² This text from the *Liber de Passione Christi et doloribus et plangentibus matris ejus*, ascribed to St. Bernard, determines the subject of meditation, the Virgin's sorrow at the time of the Passion.³ Whereas the sadness inherent in the theme reflects the spirit of Florence recovering from the Black Death, the subject also is appropriate to the destination of the altarpiece in the Campora, an important daughter house of the Florentine Badia, which was itself dedicated to the Virgin.⁴ She is also represented with the Archangel Gabriel in *tondi* on the pinnacles; this sub-theme may serve a more important function than its ubiquitous nature might first suggest.

Some years earlier, in 1335, Bernardo Daddi had painted a vision of St. Bernard, now lost, for the chapel dedicated to that saint in the Palazzo Vecchio.⁵ Although it is unlikely that the Master of the Rinuccini Chapel was influenced by the work, the painting and the chapel affirm a significant veneration of St. Bernard in Florence.⁶

A closer study of the pictorial theme might elucidate the honor bestowed on St. Bernard. Although neither the *Vita* begun by William of Thierry nor the *Legenda Aurea* describes the specific vision depicted here, William of Thierry does describe several of the saint's visions including one in which the Virgin appeared to him during an illness.⁷ The *Legenda Aurea* provides a literary parallel only for the use of a landscape setting, but it also states: "Again he admitted that sometimes, while he was at prayer or meditation, the

whole of the Sacred Scripture had appeared to him spread open and explained."⁸

Fra Filippo Lippi's *Vision of St. Bernard*, London, National Gallery, is apparently that overdoor in the Palazzo Vecchio for which payment was made in May 1447; and as a second documented representation commissioned for this center of Florentine civic life, it would be associated with another overdoor showing the Annunciation.⁹ Such a juxtaposition of the two events surely influenced Filippino Lippi's version (Fig. 29) commissioned in the 1480's by Piero di Francesco del Pugliese for his chapel in the Campora, where the Rinuccini Master's polyptych had been set up in the previous century.¹⁰ Within an elaborate landscape setting, St. Bernard is seated at a desk, a writing board atop a gnarled stump; his books are arranged on a rocky ledge nearby; two demons are chained in a cavern. Accompanied by four youthful angels, the Virgin stands before the saint, while the donor appears in profile at the lower right.

That Filippino's representation varies significantly from the anonymous Trecento work requires further attention. Anna Jameson considers the subject mystical and devotional and stresses St. Bernard's devotion to the Virgin as evident in his celebrated work the *Missus est*.¹¹ Of particular importance for an interpretation of Filippino's painting is her reference to the *Missus est*, to which an allusion also appears in the *Legenda Aurea* after a description of St. Bernard's vision of the new-born Child at matins on Christmas.

In replacing the Trecento selection from the *Liber de Passione Christi* with this passage from Luke i:26-31, Filippino imbued his composition with a spirit of hopeful anticipation rather than an attitude of lamentation. He laid stress upon the visual nature of the text by silhouetting the beautifully inscribed parchment against the dark rock so that it functions as a visual and verbal transition between St. Bernard and the Virgin. He achieved a synthesis, a visual unification of its two principal literary rôles which underlie an interpretation of the painting: first, as the gospel text for the Feast of the Annunciation; second, as the text chosen by St. Bernard for his earliest sermons on the Virgin.¹² Implicit within the Marian imagery are civic attitudes and ideals. Florentine veneration of the Virgin (of great importance from an early date as attested by the foundation of the *Servi di Maria* in 1233) received its finest statement on the Feast of Her Nativity in 1296, when she was acclaimed protectress of the city at the foundation of the new cathedral being constructed in her honor. Moreover, that the passage from Luke takes its place within the

order of the mass for the Feast of the Annunciation should make one to pause, for March 25 was chosen not only as the principal feast of the *Servi di Maria* but also, and more importantly, as the beginning of the Florentine year.¹³

In the 1480's Bernardo and Filippo Nasi commissioned Perugino to paint a Vision of St. Bernard for their new family chapel in the refurbished church of the Cestello, a Cistercian house.¹⁴ Having a different visual appeal from Filippino's lively, lyrical narrative, Perugino's tableau establishes the quietude of the event, while his dismissal of a text (an important departure from Filippino's interpretation) emphasizes the grandeur of a renewed classical spirit with which he has infused this medieval mystery.

The subject was taken up in the 16th century when, as Vasari informs us, Fra Bartolommeo, after having entered monastic life following Savonarola's execution, began to paint again upon receiving a commission from Bernardo del Bianco for an altarpiece to be placed in his family chapel in the Badia (Fig. 30).¹⁵ Like the Master of the Rinuccini Chapel, Fra Bartolommeo created a visionary experience in which the Virgin hovers before the saint. He has, however, greatly increased the number of angels and has given their garments a sense of buoyancy lending credibility to the position of the Virgin, who holds the Child. Space opens up behind the figures; steps lead to a terrace marking the middle ground; in the distance is a more rolling landscape. Exactly on axis in the center foreground stands a small painted icon of the Crucifixion, which signifies that St. Bernard's contemplation again has overtones of suffering, recalling the Master of the Rinuccini Chapel, rather than presenting a pure vision of hope such as was depicted by Filippino Lippi. Such a change of emphasis may help also to explain the presence of the Child. These alterations within the iconographic scheme allowed Fra Bartolommeo to avoid written texts without sacrificing clarity of intention. At the same time, the absence of a text allows for greater breadth of interpretation. The subject itself may have provided the stimulus for Fra Bartolommeo's decision to begin painting after a lapse of six years, for it relates, at least indirectly, to his association with Savonarola and his decision to enter monastic life.

Such medieval qualities of Fra Bartolommeo's composition as have been mentioned were current in Florence during the late Quattrocento, the era of Savonarola. Yet more specific associations can be cited. At San Marco in 1495, Savonarola delivered a sermon in which he described a vision relating how on the Feast of the Annunciation he had gone in the company of Faith, Simplicity, Prayer, and Patience to petition the Virgin on behalf of the city. The

text of the sermon, recorded in the *Compendio di revelatione*,¹⁶ begins by recalling the image Savonarola had described previously of the *crux irae dei*. Nevertheless, by the end of his sermon, Savonarola acknowledged the Virgin's promise of final glory for the city of Florence. The eternal duality of good and evil, of suffering and salvation is stated by Savonarola in literary imagery, by Fra Bartolommeo in pictorial form. Surely the meaning and the allusion of Fra Bartolommeo's statement were not lost on his fellow citizens who, in the previous decade, had fervently attended to Savonarola.

Vasari spoke well of Domenico Puligo's *Vision of St. Bernard*, Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery, which completes the sequence of large Florentine altarpieces.¹⁷ His borrowings from Perugino are apparent, yet Puligo reverted to the earlier tradition of placing the figures in a landscape. The figures achieve a sense of monumentality despite the softness of execution which owes much to Andrea del Sarto.

In surveying the theme of the Vision of St. Bernard, we have noted changes within the temperament of the citizenry of Florence. The earliest documents reveal its origin within a civic context, and the earliest extant large-scale representation, a statement of sorrow and a plea for divine intercession, clearly reveals public and private reaction to the Black Death. The sub-theme of the Annunciation occurs again and again, binding the major theme irrevocably with civic aspirations, and receives its finest realization in the work of Filippino Lippi. It would appear, in fact, that St. Bernard's devotion to the Virgin, worthy in itself of Florentine imitation, helped raise him to a position of such prominence within the Florentine hierarchy of saints that a special chapel was dedicated to him in the Palazzo Vecchio. Toward the end of the tradition, Fra Bartolommeo reverted to many features of its Trecento interpretation, both in motifs which were used and in a practice of reflecting specific events of contemporary Florentine history. Other artists, such as Perugino and Puligo, while failing to imbue the subject with extraordinary meaning, created compositions worthy of religious devotion and artistic praise.¹⁸

Notes

1. Richard Offner, who first attributed the altarpiece to the Master of the Rinuccini Chapel (*Studies in Florentine Painting, the Fourteenth Century*, New York, 1927, 122-

124), dates the painting c. 1356-1359. See also Luisa Marcucci, *Gallerie nazionali di Firenze: i dipinti toscani del secolo XIV*, Rome, 1965, 94-96, for a summary of recent scholarship. On Tuscan art of the period see Millard Meiss, *Painting in Florence and Siena after the Black Death*, Princeton, 1951, *passim*.

2. Marcucci, 95.

3. Martin Davies, *National Gallery Catalogues: The Earlier Italian Schools*, 2nd ed. rev., London, 1961, 291-292. Davies, 396-398, also lists a work from the shop of Orcagna which uses this inscription with a standing figure of St. Bernard.

4. Marcucci, 95, records the history of the painting.

5. Marcucci, 95.

6. See Davies, 293, n. 8. In the early sixteenth century Ridolfo Ghirlandaio was commissioned to fresco the chapel; along with the Vision of St. Bernard, he represented the Annunciation. See Carlo Gamba, "Ridolfo e Michele di Ridolfo del Ghirlandaio," *Dedalo*, III, 1922, 488.

7. The complete text of the *Vita* is printed in Migne, *PL*, CLXXXV, 225ff.

8. Trans. Granger Ryan and Helmut Ripperger, New York, 1969, 469. See also Alfred Scharf, *Filippino Lippi*, Vienna, 1950, 20, who mistakenly says that the source is the *Legenda Aurea*.

9. Davies, 291-293. See also Vasari-Milanesi, 1906 ed., II, 617. The painting is illustrated in *National Gallery Catalogues, Earlier Italian Schools: Plates*, II, London, 1953, 233.

10. Vasari mistakenly names Francesco del Pugliese as the donor of the painting; see Vasari-Milanesi, III, 463-464. I. B. Supino, "La capella del Pugliese alle Compora et il quadro di Filippino," *Miscellanea d'arte*, I, 1903, 1-3, published documents from the Archivio di Stato, Florence, which record the painting by Filippino and other gifts of Piero di Francesco del Pugliese. Supino believed the painting finished before 1486.

11. *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, 4th ed., London, 1867, 144.

12. Although the preserved documents do not describe the iconographic program for the altarpiece, the fact that the donor presented a manuscript containing the life of St. Bernard together with his homilies on the gospel *Missus est* to the Campora in 1490 supports the interpretation that the donor himself selected the new iconography. See Supino, 3.

13. This custom continued until 1750. See Giovanni Papini, *et al.*, *Florence, Flower of the World*, trans. A. P. Vacchelli and H. M. R. Cox, Florence and New York, 1951, 203-207. See also Walter and Elisabeth Paatz, *Die Kirchen von Florenz*, Frankfurt a. M., 1952, III, 321.

14. Vasari-Milanesi, III, 584, and IV, 237, n. 1. Georg Gronau, "Peruginos 'Sankt Bernhard' in der Alten Pinakothek," *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, IV, 1909, 52, reproduces the early documents concerning the commission; he also corrects the erroneous attribution of the painting to Raffaellino del Garbo made by Milanesi. The painting is illustrated in Raimond van Marle, *The Development of the Italian Schools of Painting*, XIV, The Hague, 1933, 343, Fig. 220.

15. Vasari-Milanesi, IV, 181-183. The date of the painting is generally given as 1504-1507. For documentation, see Vincenzo Marchese, *Lives of the most eminent Painters, Sculptors and Architects of the Order of S. Dominic*, trans. C. P. Meehan, Dublin, 1852, II, 136, 353-356. Marchese notes that the original contract asked for a standing Madonna with SS. Bernard, Francis, Barnabas, and Benedict. The significant change of theme has also been observed by Ludovico Borgo, "The Problem of the Ferry Carondelet Altarpiece," *The Burlington Magazine*, CXIII, 1971, 369-371.

16. An Italian edition was published in Florence, August 18, 1495; a Latin edition was issued the following year.

17. Vasari-Milanesi, IV, 465. See also Federico Zeri, "Eccentrici fiorentini, I," *Bollettino d'arte*, XLVII, 1962, 235 and 236, n. 28. The painting is illustrated in Bernard Berenson, *Italian Pictures of the Renaissance: Florentine School*, II, London, 1963, No. 1401.

18. The Vision of St. Bernard also appears in Florentine predella panels. Artists thus using the theme are Rafaellino del Garbo, Jacopo del Sellaio, and Il Bacchiacca.

An Antiphonal Page of the Sienese Quattrocento

By MARVIN EISENBERG

University of Michigan

An illuminated page from a lost antiphonal acquired some years ago by the J. B. Speed Art Museum in Louisville has never gained notice in the literature of art (Fig. 31).¹ The Latin text abbreviated from Luke i:26-27 and the Gregorian notation comprise a Marian antiphon for choral use in the Office of the Feast of the Annunciation (March 25th), while within the double field of the lavishly ornamented initial M the Archangel Gabriel and the Virgin enact the moment of the sacred pronouncement (Fig. 32). Thus, on this single page text and image form an exact parallel: *Missus est Gabriel angelus ad Mariam virginem. . . .*

The Louisville page is an excellent specimen of the art of the liturgical choral manuscript, a category of book painting that flourished in Tuscany in the 14th and 15th centuries. The scribes, illuminators and miniaturists whose combined talents produced these books could be both monks and laymen collaborating in monastic scriptoria, as at Santa Maria degli Angeli in Florence, a major center of choral book painting in the later Trecento and early Quattrocento.² Or the book could be made by secular craftsmen in a *bottega* where a master and his assistants were at the same time occupied with the painting of altarpieces. A clear distinction between the contributions made by the illuminator and the miniaturist in enriching these choral books is discernible in both color and technique. For the enframing initial letter the palette is usually restricted to a few brilliant hues, and here as well as in the more variegated color of the typical leaf and tendril ornament the tempera is applied in flat areas in which the texture of the brushwork is obscured. But in the miniature, which may represent a narrative scene or a single figure of a prophet or saint, the spectrum is wider with the stippled technique of tempera painting used to model dimensional figures in a coherently constructed space. The complex surface patterns spun out by the surrounding ornament serve as a foil to the space box opening behind a "proscenium" which gains its shape from the contour of a particular initial letter.

If both the naturalistic and fanciful illumination of these choral pages descend from the long traditions of manuscript art, the figurative or narrative miniatures have their root in panel painting. Many of the letter fields on these

Tuscan choral pages are in fact ample enough to contain figures and settings as complex as those depicted in the predella panels of altarpieces. Indeed the major miniaturists in both monastic and secular shops often worked primarily as panel painters or even frescoists while the manuscript art held only a secondary role in their production.³ This is exactly the case with the prolific Sieneſe Quattrocento master Sano di Pietro (1406-1481) whose style we recognize in the Louisville antiphonal page.

The touchstone of Sano di Pietro's craft as a manuscript painter is a choral book of the early 1470's in the Piccolomini Library of the Cathedral of Siena.⁴ In this gradual which was originally made for use at the Cathedral eighteen pages contain ornamented miniatures by Sano and his assistants. An illuminated initial S (Fol. 34v) with the Presentation in the Temple and an initial O (Fol. 103) with the Birth of St. John the Baptist (Figs. 33 and 34) offer several direct comparisons with the Louisville page, although a book intended for the important rites of a cathedral is inevitably richer and more refined in ornamentation.⁵ Shapes of leaves and patterns of geometrical ornament are of the same style and identical also are the strong chromatic contrasts between the vermilion used for the contours of the letters and azure of the enfolding leaves. Just as in the Siena miniatures each of the resonant colors of the Louisville *Annunciation* is washed to highlights resulting in a blond tonality. The dominant notes are the limpid blue of the Annunciate Virgin's mantle, exactly the color of the leaves which unfurl at the corners of the initial M, and the rose madder of her tunic echoed in Gabriel's flowing cape and in the leafy cascade. The secondary note of pale green in the lining of the Virgin's mantle is repeated in her book which overlaps the enframing letter, in the leaves and double palmette wrapped around the center bar of the M and in the marginal vegetation. Neutral contrasts to this chord of blue, rose, and green are provided by Gabriel's white tunic and the grayish whites and browns in the details of the bedchamber. Areas of gold leaf framed in by the rectangular perimeter of the initial and repeated in the haloes of the Virgin and Gabriel further enhance this elegant page.

A trademark of Sano di Pietro's style is found in the facial features of the Annunciate Virgin with the large eyes strongly highlighted in white and arched by thinly pencilled brows, the blunt nose, and the small puckered mouth. But in contrast to the complex chevroning and looping of the drapery forms in the Siena miniatures, the draperies of the Virgin and Gabriel are simpler in their folding. Here an analogy with Sano's style is better drawn by

turning to his work in predella form, as in the figure of the Virgin in a panel in the Vatican Pinacoteca (Fig. 35).⁶ Here the mantle falls in parallel folds with little complication of the internal line. Such variations in the degrees of complexity of drapery forms provide little help in determining a secure chronology of the static course of Sano's career. Nor can a tendency toward simplification be explained away as the work of a less sophisticated assistant. In a period when *botteghe* such as Sano's functioned literally as picture factories, if the stamp of the master's style prevails in the design of a work, particularly when that master is one who tended toward the perfunctory repetition of formulae, it is of little use to fragment the artistic milieu of that shop by conjuring up a corps of assistants to whom particular works are speciously assigned. With several hundred works still preserved which are undoubted products of Sano di Pietro's shop, it is inevitable that assistants were involved in a painting process which by its very nature is highly stratified. Thus the localization of the Louisville page in the shop of Sano di Pietro in the third quarter of the 15th century would seem to be reasonably precise.

Sano's essentially conservative art abounds in direct quotations from the founding masters of the Sieneese school. In the miniatures of the Siena Cathedral gradual reproduced here (Figs. 33 and 34) the inspiration was obviously the Lorenzetti's two Marian altarpieces for that same church—Pietro's *Nativity of the Virgin* and Ambrogio's *Presentation in the Temple*, both of 1342.⁷ The Lorenzettian motif of the checkered counterpane has migrated as well to the Louisville *Annunciation* where it is used in abbreviated and foreshortened form and in combination with the half-closed curtain to symbolize the privacy of the Virgin's bedchamber (*thalamus virginis*).⁸ By choosing to depict the Virgin Annunciate in a standing position, Sano perpetuated a type which had first become popular in Siena in the days of Guido and Duccio and which in turn had its origins in Byzantine art. The elongated lobe of the M surely invited this use of a vertical form just as the center bar of the letter easily replaced the pillar which traditionally separates Gabriel from the Virgin in the scene of the Annunciation.⁹ But while the Gabriel was also shown in full length in those earlier Sieneese Annunciations where the standing Virgin received his message, Sano's kneeling archangel is a simplified reminiscence upon Simone Martini's opulent Gabriel in the altarpiece of 1333 for the Cathedral of Siena.¹⁰ In the conservative art of Sano di Pietro and his shop the radical images of Sieneese painting were paid unflinching homage.

Notes

1. The dimensions of the entire page are 19 x 15 inches. The rectangular field of the initial measures 8 x 5 $\frac{7}{8}$ inches. The vellum is in excellent condition; there are a few losses in the tempera and gold leaf, particularly in the haloes and the Virgin's blue mantle. The page was acquired from H. P. Kraus, New York, in 1963. The provenance is unknown. While this essay was in preparation the miniature was reproduced in an article on contemporary art criticism by Leo Steinberg ("Reflections on the State of Criticism," *Art Forum*, X, March, 1972, 42, Fig. 8, where the miniature is called 14th-century Florentine, following the Museum's label).
2. P. d'Ancona, *La miniatura fiorentina*, Florence, 1914, I, 20-23, II, 125-141.
3. For example, in Florence Don Lorenzo Monaco and Fra Angelico; in Siena Lippo Vanni, Niccolò di Ser Sozzo Tegliacci, Giovanni di Paolo.
4. The standard monograph on Sano di Pietro is E. Gaillard, *Sano di Pietro, 1406-1481, Un peintre siennois au XV^e siècle*, Chambéry, 1923. See also, R. van Marle, *The Development of the Italian Schools of Painting*, IX, The Hague, 1927, 466-532; and P. d'Ancona, *La miniatura italiana*, Paris, 1925, 84-85. Sano's dated and documented work as a miniaturist ranges from 1445 to 1473 (Gaillard, 31, 99 and 118). For the documentation of Gradual 19 see V. Lusini, *Il Duomo di Siena*, Siena, 1939, II, 297-298.
5. For an example of more modest illumination produced in Sano's shop, see an antiphonal in the museum at Pienza (E. Carli, *Pienza, La città di Pio II*, Rome, 1967, 118 and Pl. XXXI).
6. For the complete panel see E. Francia, *Pinacoteca vaticana*, Milan, 1960, Fig. 52 (where the male saint is wrongly identified as Dominic; see G. Kaftal, *The Iconography of the Saints in Tuscan Painting*, Florence, 1952, Cols. 820-821 and Fig. 933, under the entry on St. Peter Martyr).
7. Van Marle, II, 1924, Figs. 243, 278. Sano depended even more directly on Ambrogio's *Presentation* in the altarpiece once in the Cathedral of Massa Marittima (see F. Saponi, "Appunti intorno a Sano di Pietro, miniatore senese del secolo XV," *Rassegna d'arte*, II, 1915, 221, where illustrations of Sano's miniature and altarpiece are juxtaposed). For the alternate interpretation of these Presentations as Purifications of the Virgin, see G. Rowley, *Ambrogio Lorenzetti*, Princeton, 1958, I, 18-19; and H. W. van Os, *Marias Demut und Verherrlichung in der sienesischen Malerei, 1300-1450*, 's-Gravenhage, 1969, 5ff.
8. The symbolism and tradition of the bedchamber in the depiction of the Annunciation are discussed in the fundamental study by David M. Robb, "The Iconography of the Annunciation in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," *Art Bulletin*, XVIII, 1936, 489ff.
9. On folio 63 of Gradual 19 in the Piccolomini Library Sano represented the Annunciation in the letter D (see Lusini, Pl. facing 266). Here the wide, unbroken field of the letter allowed the depiction of the seated Virgin and kneeling Gabriel as well as a richly patterned floor and obliquely placed bench.
10. Van Marle, Pl. facing 232. Just as in Simone's altarpiece, Sano gave Gabriel the attribute of the olive branch (see Van Os, 24, for a discussion of the particular popularity

of this symbol in Siense Annunciations). In a cut miniature in the Louvre, close to the style of Lippo Vanni, the Annunciation is depicted in an initial M with both figures standing in the elongated double field of the letter (Van Marle, Fig. 375). Also see Van Os, Fig. 12, for a similar rendering of the scene in a miniature from the school of Pietro Lorenzetti.

A Statue of St. Christopher at the M. H. de Young Memorial Museum at San Francisco*

By MOJMÍR S. FRINTA

State University of New York at Albany

At the exhibition "The Waning Middle Ages" organized in November 1969 by the University of Kansas Museum of Art, there was a wooden statue of St. Christopher labelled: Netherlands (Guelders?), early 15th century. Its lender, the M. H. de Young Memorial Museum, ascribed it to Burgundy or West Germany, ca. 1390.

Theodor Müller, the recently retired director of the Bavarian National Museum, published in 1967 a short article on the statue in which he suggested a relationship of the statue to Bohemia.¹ His perception of the "style rustique" around 1400 in Central Europe seems to me a right one, and I would like to elaborate on the problem of the localization of the statue² (Fig. 36).

The figure is robust and energetic in stance without that sinuous and precious elegance that distinguishes the works of the "Beautiful Style" which coexisted with the more virile "style rustique" in Central Europe at the turn of the century. Yet distinctive ingredients of the suave Beautiful Style may be recognized in the figure of the Christ Child, as if bridging the gap between the two modes of expression. The sculptor was preoccupied neither with decorative impact of the drapery of the Beautiful Style (the moderately projecting folds are still within the traditions of the fourteenth century woodcarvers' forms and provide a contrast to the exuberant rendering of the hair),³ nor with an overall anatomical correctness. His preoccupation was rather with the emotional characterization of St. Christopher's face; and one feels, indeed, the intensity of the expressive countenance. The main theme, that of the giant's strength and awesomeness, is conveyed by the massive proportions, the large feet, and the exceptional character of the face. It is of the category of the severe Old Testament prophets as much as of the wild men from the margins of the great Bible of Wenceslaus in Vienna. The modelling of the face is very vigorous, and the area of the eyes especially is treated in decisive planes with realistic observation revealing the bony structure. The strong modelling does not produce the feeling of vague and amorphous three-dimensionality of the

* I wish to thank the American Council of Learned Societies for a grant supporting my research of East-Central European sculpture around 1400.

“Soft Style,” but is sharpened by an innate sense of the graphic, exemplified by the treatment of the patriarchal beard and bushy hair. The individual tresses swirl in flaming three-dimensional design and end in voluted curls. We can only guess as to the original installation of the statue, which could hardly have been a niche-like compartment of a shrine although the statue was not meant to be freestanding. Its back was less carefully finished but the well carved folds on the left flank and the calligraphic curls on the head of the Christ Child, spreading well onto the back, show that the group was intended to be viewed from one side as well (Fig. 37).

Müller aptly brought two comparisons for these basic tendencies. A grimacing head on a console from the “Schöne Brunnen” in Nuremberg represents the expressionistic tendency whereas the component of linear graphism was exemplified in a drawing of St. John the Baptist’s head in the Munich State Library. The drawing, though more schematized, is similar in the physiognomical sense to St. Christopher and belongs to the same stylistic level (Fig. 38). Z. Drobná showed that the drawing is of Bohemian origin;⁴ Müller thus brought together examples from two important Central European centers, Bohemia with Prague and Nuremberg, an insight important as to its art-geographic significance.

We may add another example from the Schöne Brunnen in which the two main characteristics become united. It is a statue of Moses from the upper level of the “Beautiful Well,” today, as all other surviving portions, in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum (Fig. 39). The sharp nose dominates the features with the area around the eyes stressing the cheekbones in a way that is reminiscent of St. Christopher. Likewise the abundant hair and beard have the same three-dimensional and at the same time graphic quality. In addition, the voluminous drapery is that of the Beautiful Style, which stylistic amalgamation characterizes the situation in Central Europe. The sculptures of the Beautiful Well may be dated 1385-92 and are the work of a group of sculptors from the orbit of the Parler’s lodge in Prague. Müller mentioned in this context similarities with the tympanum of the Prague church of the Virgin Mary in Teyn.⁵ The investigation into the bony structure of the head combined with a formalized rhythmical design of the beard and hair distinguishes it from the Parlerian sculpture in Prague such as the royal effigies in the crypt and the portrait busts in the triforium of St. Vitus’ Cathedral.⁶ An excellent example of the expressive and at the same time decorative style of the Parlerian architectural sculpture is a Wild Man(?) head from the eastern façade of the Old

Town Bridge Tower in Prague dating between 1390-95⁷ (Fig. 40). The luxurious hair and beard envelop the face in swirling and swelling forms analogous to the growth on St. Christopher's head.

Yet another comparison with Prague sculpture may be made. The copper gilt reliquary bust of St. Paul in the palace of Prague's Archbishop presents analogies to the head of St. Christopher (Fig. 41). The arrangement of the hair is again similar and so is the realistic elaboration of the area of the eyes. The heads of both are slightly tilted up producing thus a mystic but at the same time an active mood and generating a certain emotional tension. The bust, along with its pendant, the bust of St. Peter, was commissioned by the Prague Archbishop Albík of Uničov and may be dated 1413.⁸

The chain of affiliated works can be further enlarged by linking in an alabaster statue of an apostle (St. Andrew?) in the Cathedral Museum in Erfurt (Fig. 42). This is the same concept of humanity, severe and ecstatic as the bust, and again related to the Christopher statue. The linear treatment of the facial details is here increased and the contracted muscles of the forehead, already marked in St. Christopher's face, create a curved schematic pattern above the bridge of the nose.⁹ The exuberant curvilinear drapery system of the late Beautiful Style, and the exaggerated, highly dramatic pose, present also on St. Andrew's companion piece, a St. John the Baptist, indicate a more advanced stage, perhaps in the 1420's.¹⁰ The donors kneeling at the bases of the two statues remain unidentified, and the origin of the statue is undetermined. They may possibly be Thuringian or Franconian but the alabaster is an uncommon material in Central Europe.

The pronounced graphic effect which we noted in all these examples may be observed also in contemporary Bohemian painting, for example, in the illumination of a Bohemian Bible of 1391 in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York (M.833).¹¹ The rhythmical linear treatment of the beard of prophet Joel as well as the exaggerated treatment of the facial muscles above the eyes should be noted (Fig. 43). The linearism of course exists on the figures of the epitaph of Jan of Jeřč dated 1395.¹²

As noted above, the sweet and playful countenance of the Christ Child fits well into the concept of the Christ Child in the works of the Beautiful Style. The Child is, however, usually naked in the Beautiful Madonnas; but similar robed representations may be recognized in the painted St. Christopher on the reverse of a Mourning Virgin in Církvice in Bohemia, and especially close representation in a seated Madonna in limestone in the collection of J. Böhler

in Munich, perhaps from Salzburg or Styria (Fig. 44). Both are excellent examples of the Beautiful Style, the Církvice panel being earlier (before 1400), the statue perhaps two decades later.¹³

Now what do all these comparisons mean in terms of geographical relationships, and ultimately what bearing could they have on the localization of St. Christopher statue? The notion of Bohemia emerges as a fountainhead as we scrutinize the examples. Yet I submit that it is not absolutely essential to try to prove whether the statue was made in Prague rather than in Nuremberg, as it is the personal concept of the artist that determines the appearance and not the place. It is well known that these two centers were artistically related and an artist or group of artists may have worked in both towns during his or their careers.¹⁴

The term "Bohemian style" is not used solely in the context of works originating in Bohemia. Rather it applies to a style that appears to have been elaborated there during the period when Bohemia was the center of the Holy Roman Empire. The artists active in Bohemia in the time of the Luxemburg dynasty by no means all originated there but many brought in concepts from various parts of Europe. The Bohemian style came to life in the favorable conditions of Imperial Prague through multiple inspiration grafted on local existing idioms and taste. The term "Luxemburgian art" would in many respects coincide with the meaning of "Bohemian style" and would seem to be preferable were it not somewhat misleading in its connotation of "Luxemburg" as a territory. Another choice, the term "Imperial Luxemburgian art" would allude more to the international sources of "Bohemian style," especially in its relationship to the art flourishing in the domains of the *Kurfürsten*. Yet not even the latter can safely cover the meaning of "Bohemian style" and therefore this last term is probably still the best solution if understood with some elasticity.

The "Beautiful Well" is one of the instances of artistic contacts between Prague and Nuremberg. We know nothing of the personalities of the sculptors of the Parler's circle beyond the almost mythical utterances about the Prague Junkers-Panici who were exalted as famous architects and sculptors.¹⁵ We must suppose considerable mobility for these sculptors who issued from the building lodge of the Prague cathedral of St. Vitus. The influence of this center radiated throughout East-Central Europe, and thus we can recognize their imprints in Austria (St. Stephen's in Vienna), Styria (Mariazell), Slovenia (Ptujška Gora), Hungary (Buda), Silesia (Wrocław, Opole), Bavaria

(Regensburg, Eichstätt; Müller mentioned sculptor Hans Heider, active in Upper Bavaria, as a follower of the Parlers). The Bavarian and Franconian instances largely belong to the Beautiful Style the origin of which is to be sought from among the younger members of the Parlerian circle.

Finally, a comment on the previous attributions of the statue to the eastern Netherlands or else to Burgundy or west Germany may be added. There must be something about the statue that led the researchers in this direction. It is the ensemble of the characteristics that determine an attribution, whereas the isolation of certain features only, under a limelight, might lead one astray. The structural concern and realism in the rendering of some facial features, observed on our sculpture, was the leading characteristic of the progressive tradition of the art of the West, or more specifically, of northwestern Europe, including the Rhineland. Robust and expressive forms may be linked with Middle Rhine and Lorraine.¹⁶ Parallels for the linear finish of details may be found also in that area. What makes the difference between the Northwest and Central European production is, it seems to me, the content, emphasis, and objectives. The Western works appeal more by their rational, proportioned, and poised qualities of perfection and coolness, whereas salient in Central European art is the emotional component, occasionally leading to less controlled expression (or even seeming wildness of design) and overriding the measured whole. There is more fantasy, irrationalism, illogic. Yet these qualities do not affect the appearance of this work to such a degree as to make it diametrically opposed to the qualities prevailing in the West, for both shared a common parentage in the past.¹⁷

The ultimate impulses for a grand scale development of sculpture of the fourteenth century in Central Europe are to be traced through largely unrevealed channels, to Swabia, Rhineland, and the eastern Netherlands. We may interpret certain characteristics in Central European art as attributable to the artists who migrated there, lured by the opportunities, or who were in the retinue of dignitaries appointed from the Western parts of the Holy Roman Empire to the court at Prague. We may imagine the arts of the two areas as branches issuing from a common trunk but shaped and colored, to become distinguishable, by their distinct emotional and esthetic content due to a specific development in different circumstances.

The work of Sluter and other early fifteenth century Burgundian sculptors perhaps came closer to the mood of Central European sculpture in its divergence from the traditional Gothic of the West, which was nurtured by

French inspiration—idealizing, aloof, and poised art. Northern feeling of vehemence and pathos became a common denominator for both. This may be so perhaps because of the special rôle played by the North western area in the fertilization of the sculpture evocative of high aspiration in late 14th century Bohemia. On the other hand, a reverberation, not yet sufficiently studied and understood, of the by then accomplished and original Bohemian art on the western border areas of the Empire should not be discarded as insignificant. The circle of an art's peregrination may have been completed.

Notes

1. "Eine Christophorusfigur um 1400 und ihre Beziehungen zu Böhmen," *Sborník Národního Muzea v Praze* (Acta musei nationalis Pragae), Prague, 1967, 275-277.
2. The material itself, lindenwood, points to Central Europe rather than to the Netherlands where oak was the preferred material.
3. Such as a fragmentary St. John and a St. Nicholas from Vyšší Brod in the National Gallery, Prague. Albert Kutal, *České gotické sochařství 1350-1450*, Prague, 1962, Pls. 127, 131.
4. Zoroslava Drobná, *Die gotische Zeichnung in Böhmen*, Prague 1956, Fig. 86.
5. Kutal, Pls. 96-99.
6. Kutal, Pls. 46-79.
7. Piotr Skubiszewski, "Nagrobek Henryka II we Wroclawiu," *Prace komisji historii sztuki*, Wroclaw, 1960, Fig. 52.
8. Josef Cibulka "Proprší sv. Petra a Pavla v arcibiskupském paláci na Hradčanech," *Cestami Umění* (In Honor of Antonín Matějček), Prague, 1949, 106-116.
9. It can be compared to an analogous treatment of the forehead of St. George in the equestrian statue in the Prague castle Hradčany cast in 1373 by the brothers Martin and George of Kolozsvár (Kutal, Pl. 115). This morphological detail is ultimately of Byzantine and Italo-Byzantine origin.
10. Mojmír Frinta, "A Portrait Bust by the Master of Beautiful Madonnas," *The Art Quarterly*, Spring 1960, Fig. 14.
11. Meta Harrsen, *Central European Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library*, New York, 1958. She proposed the name Master of the Morgan Bible for this illuminator.
12. Antonín Matějček, *Czech Gothic Panel Painting 1350-1450*, Prague, 1950, Pls. 133, 135.
13. V. Frömllová, "Církvická deska se Sv. Kryštofem," *Umění*, 1967, No. 2.

14. The free imperial town of Nuremberg enjoyed the special interest of the Emperor Charles IV; it was there that his Golden Bull was promulgated in 1355, and his oldest son Wenceslaus was born in 1361.

15. A. Kotal (100ff.) proposed their identification with the documented masters of the Prague lodge, Janko, Wenceslaus, and Peter.

16. J. A. Schmoll genn. Eisenwerth, "Zur Lotharingischen Skulptur zwischen 1300 and 1420," *Alte und Moderne Kunst*, 56/57, 1962, 10-14.

17. A comparable intensity of expression and formal treatment analogous to our St. Christopher was arrived at much earlier in the Mosan region as is shown by two bronze seated figures of Moses and a Prophet in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford (*The Year 1200*, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, February-May 1970, No. 98). Was it again the same Byzantinizing ideal of a severe and imposing, yet other-worldly, countenance that haunted the imagination of the sculptors of Strasburg Cathedral (cf. the transept tympanum and at a later date the head of a prophet in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, No. 56.506), and again later on the immigrant sculptors of the formidable effigies of the Přemyslide dynasty in the Prague Cathedral?

The System of Proportion of Filippo Brunelleschi¹

By ELIZABETH R. SUNDERLAND
Duke University

Filippo Brunelleschi, active in the first half of the 15th century in Florence, is generally accepted as the creator of the style of architecture which we call Renaissance. His buildings are characterized by the use of classic orders and round arches. However, in spite of a good hundred years of effort, historians of architecture have not been able to find his system of proportion. The difficulties have been enormous because no one has known the system of proportion of the Middle Ages. As a result no one has been able to say whether Brunelleschi had changed the Mediaeval system or not. A quarter of a century after the death of Brunelleschi, Leon Battista Alberti, a great admirer of Brunelleschi, recommended in his books on architecture a geometric system for buildings. Architectural historians therefore concluded that Brunelleschi invented the idea and that he was the one who changed the unknown system of the Middle Ages for a geometric system in his buildings. But studies even with the methods of Procrustes have not given any conclusive results.

Documents tell us that in the 15th century a unit of measure was employed in Florence which was called the *braccio*.² It had a length of approximately 58 centimeters (two feet of 29 centimeters).³ Architectural historians have, therefore, assumed that the same unit was the standard for all buildings constructed in the city and environs.

But during the feudal period each lord and each organization which had seigniorial rights could fix the weights and measures to be used in the territory subject to that sovereignty. As the tax paid for their use provided an excellent revenue, each little princeling was interested in having his own weights and measures. I have shown elsewhere⁴ that among neighboring churches one finds all sorts of units of measure: in a series of churches belonging to the order of Cluny a foot used in the mother abbey was employed (a foot of 34 centimeters between c. 950 and 1049, and a foot of 29.5 centimeters after 1049). In churches built in the same time and period and in the same style by other religious groups other units of measure were used.

In addition, once the length of foot was established for each church, the dimensions of all of them turned out to have been done in multiples of 3, 4, 5,

7, and 10. One of the numbers was used as the basis for the dimensions of length and another for those of the width. Some examples follow:

Cluniac before 1049:

Romainmôtier (Switzerland). 34-centimeter foot, 3 for lengths
against 4 for widths

Bourbon Lancy (Saône-et-Loire). 34-centimeter foot, 3 for lengths
against 4 for widths

Charlieu III (Loire), half finished before 1049. 34-centimeter foot,
7 for lengths against 4 for widths

Possession of St.-Pierre de Chalon:

Chapaize (Saône-et-Loire), c. 1000. 33-centimeter foot, 7 for lengths
against 4 for widths

Establishments independent of Cluny:

Baume-les-Moines (Jura). 31-centimeter foot, 3 for lengths against
4 for widths

Gigny (Jura). 33-centimeter foot, 3 for lengths against 7 for widths

Cluniac after 1049:

Paray-le-Monial (Saône-et-Loire). 29.5-centimeter foot, 4 for lengths
against 3 for widths

St.-Etienne (Nevers-Nievre). 29.5-centimeter foot, 4 for lengths
against 3 for widths

Berzé-la-Ville (Saône-et-Loire). 29.5-centimeter foot, 4 for lengths
against 3 for widths

In addition, the designers also delighted in number combinations for parts of their churches which would not only give the crossed numbers but also multiples of one or both of them in two directions.

Thus Gigny, which uses threes in lengths and sevens in widths, has a nave 21 by 84 which can give threes and sevens, threes and threes, and sevens and sevens, and has a crossing 18 by 21 which can give threes and threes as well as the major system of threes and sevens.

Three, four, five, seven, and ten are the sacred numbers of the Middle Ages, but symbolic meanings attached to them long before the Christian era.⁵ The most superficial reading of the Old Testament makes it obvious that numbers are used in a way which indicates that they have partly lost their numerical force and have passed over into the province of symbolic signs. The sym-

bolic character of the numbers is an inheritance from the civilizations of the Mesopotamian area.

The importance of number to the early church is well expressed by Augustine: "... for there is a relation of numbers which cannot possibly be impaired or altered."⁶ And again: "... we must not despise the science of numbers, which in many passages of Holy Scripture, is found to be of eminent service to the careful interpreter. Neither has it been without reason numbered among God's praises, 'thou has ordered all things in number, and measure and weight.'⁷ And again "Ignorance of numbers . . . prevents us from understanding things that are set down in Scripture in a figurative and mystical way."⁸

Three symbolized the Trinity; four, by analogy with the four cardinal directions, etc., symbolized the earth. Five, according to Saint Irenée of Lyon, was a sacred number for all kinds of reasons:⁹ "Soter (Saviour), Pater (Father), Agapé (Love) are all composed of five letters; the Lord, after having blessed five loaves, fed with them five thousand men; the very form of the cross, too, has five extremities, two in length, two in breadth, and one in the middle, on which the person rests who is fixed by the nails. Each of our hands has five fingers; we have also five senses."¹⁰

Concerning seven Augustine writes: "Much more might be said about the perfection of the number seven . . . Suffice it here to say that three is the first whole number that is odd, four the first that is even, and of these two seven is composed."¹¹ On this account it is often put for all numbers together . . . And many . . . such instances are found in the divine authorities, in which the number seven is . . . commonly used to express the whole, or completeness of anything."¹² ". . . The number seven itself, which is often used to represent the notion of the universe, and is often applied to the Church on the ground of her likeness to the universe."¹³ "For this reason the Apostle John writes in the Apocalypse to *seven* churches."¹⁴ Ten, not considered a multiple of five, according to Saint Augustine "signifies perfection;¹⁵ for to the number seven, which embraces all created things, is added the trinity of the creator."¹⁶ And certain multiples of the sacred numbers took on special meanings. Thus eight became the symbol of salvation and regeneration.¹⁷

Only the sacred numbers—threes, fours, fives, sevens, and tens—appear in the church plans described above. The conclusion can hardly be avoided that they are there for symbolic reasons. The designers, by crossing two sets of

numbers, could include heaven and earth in the very measurements of their churches.

As a result of these studies of Mediaeval architecture it seemed to me possible that Florentine churches, even though designed by a single architect like Brunelleschi, could have been built with different units of measure because they belonged to different religious groups. In fact, the units of measure do not repeat themselves in the churches by Brunelleschi.

To be certain that the Florentines in the Middle Ages used the same system of numbers as the French, the author measured the church of the Holy Apostles (Romanesque) and the church of Santa Croce (Gothic). The Holy Apostles is said to have been much admired by Brunelleschi. Its plan proves that the same system of numbers was the basis of its proportions. The foot employed was 29.5 centimeters in length. Multiples of 4 are used for the lengths and 7 for the widths. In addition there are 7 bays of the nave and its length, 84 feet, contains the two numbers 4 and 7. The distance between the centers of the piers is 12 feet. The nave width is 21 feet and the over-all width, nave and aisles is 42 feet.

The Gothic church of Santa Croce, built by the Franciscans between 1295 and 1442, changes the clear system of the Romanesque period. The dimensions in both directions are divisible by 3, probably in honor of the Trinity. But there is also a mixture of other symbolic numbers. The length of the transept, 189 feet, is divisible by 3 and 7, as is the total length, 378 feet, and the depth of the eastern chapels, 21 feet. The nave, 300 feet long, must symbolize the cross. The letter Tau was used by the Greeks as the symbol for the number 300. For the Christians the letter T symbolized the cross and as a result the number 300 symbolized the cross, as one can read in the letter of Barnabas in the Early Christian Period.¹⁸ The foot used is 30.5 centimeters in length.

In the following discussion the dome of the Cathedral of Florence and the loggia of the Foundling Hospital, though both by Brunelleschi, will be omitted. The cupola rests on Mediaeval foundations and as a result its dimensions, at least in plan, were determined in the Middle Ages. The loggia is a civil building and I have no idea whether symbolic numbers were used in secular buildings in the mediaeval period.

The Old Sacristy of the Church of San Lorenzo in Florence was begun by Brunelleschi c. 1418 and finished in 1428. The big square room crowned by a ribbed cupola is prolonged towards the south by a square sanctuary, also surmounted by a cupola, decorated by three niches and flanked by rectangular

rooms. The plan (Fig. 45) clearly shows the system. The dimensions in lengths are multiples of 3—36 for the big room under the dome, between the pilasters; 12 probably for the diameter of the cupola over the sanctuary; 51 for the total length of the two areas between the pilasters; 12 for the diameter of the circles with which the niches of the big room on each side of the arch of the sanctuary were drawn; 9 for the width of the sanctuary niches. For the widths the dimensions are in multiples of four: 36 for the big room, 12 for the cupola of the sanctuary; 16 for the diameter of the circle which is the basis for the niches of the sanctuary. Brunelleschi has evidently employed the mediaeval system. The foot used is 31.5 centimeters in length.

For the elevation we find the same thing. From the plinth the arcade of the sanctuary is 28 feet high, the big square room is 40 feet high and the total height under the cupola is 60 feet. The relationships are arithmetical and the number is 4. The measurement between the ground and the entablature is thus 20 feet. In the sanctuary the total height under the cupola is 36 feet, which contains 3 and 4. The niches are 18 feet high by 9 feet wide. The system could be considered arithmetical or geometric. However, as the rest of the chapel is arithmetical, one can conclude that Brunelleschi was thinking of numbers and not of geometry when he laid out the dimensions of the sanctuary.

The Church of San Lorenzo, begun shortly after the Old Sacristy, was finished long after the death of the architect. As a result no one is sure whether the whole design is Brunelleschi's or not. In the plan symbolic numbers were certainly used, but with a mixture. Across the church the length of the transept, 123 feet, is divisible only by 3, the length of the transept with the end chapels, 165 feet, also is divisible only by three. The crossing, however, with a width of 36 feet, is divisible by 3 and 4. The same dimension, 36, is the width of the nave; but, the width of the church—nave and aisles included—is 80 feet, divisible by 4, while the total width with the lateral chapels is 102 feet which is divisible only by 3. For the longitudinal measures we find a similar situation. The total length of the church, 252 feet, is divisible by 3 and 4, but the length of the nave, 174 feet, is divisible only by 3. It seems that Brunelleschi (if it were he) with these alternations had begun to play a little with the numbers. The foot is the same one as in the Old Sacristy: 31.5 centimeters.

In the elevation the number is 4: the height of the nave arcades, 44 feet; the height of the crossing arches, 64 feet; of the nave, 72 feet; under the cupola, 92 feet. The relations are purely arithmetical. In addition he gives

another dimension in terms of 4: the height of the wall of the clearstory is 20 feet.

The chapter house of the monastery of Santa Croce (c. 1430-44), usually called the Pazzi Chapel for the family which commissioned it, has been admired as the most beautiful example of the Early Renaissance style. There are, indeed, round arches and pilasters with entablatures which are derived from classic architecture. The cupola still has Gothic ribs, as does that of San Lorenzo's sacristy. Apart from this detail, it has been thought that the building was entirely Renaissance in style. But let us consider the plan. The foot used was 30.3 centimeters in length. The length of the room is 60 feet, the diameter of the main dome is 36 feet, the width of the sanctuary under the cupola and the entrance archway is 16 feet. It is evident that the relation of these numbers is numerical and not geometrical and that everything is divisible by 4. In the other direction the depth of the room is 36 feet and with the sanctuary it is 54 feet, and the widths of the arcades at each end are 15 feet. All these numbers are divisible by 3. Brunelleschi has obviously made a plan in the Romanesque system—with multiples of 4 in one direction and of 3 in the other.

The dimensions of the elevation are a bit more complicated: from the ground to the height of the barrel vault is 48 feet and to the top of the dome is 68 feet—their relation is numerical. Both are multiples of 4.

Another series of numbers divisible by 4 starts on the bench around the chapel on which the friars sat for chapter meetings. It has the same level as the floor of the sanctuary. The height of the big arcades at each end of the chapel and of the sanctuary and over the door is 36 feet, and the points where the architect placed the centers of the semicircles are concealed in the entablature. As the arches are 15 feet wide on the ends and 16 feet wide over the door and the sanctuary, those centers are lower for the sanctuary and the entrance than for the ends of the room, in order to keep the heights of the arches uniform around the interior. Over the sanctuary and the door, that point is 28 feet above the bench, which corresponds to the top of the frieze. As a result the round arches are not true semi-circles. It would seem that in this case Brunelleschi made an effort to be non-geometric.

The Church of Santo Spirito (1436-after 1470) is the last of my series. The foot has a length of 30.7 centimeters. Most archaeologists have been convinced that Brunelleschi here finally created a totally geometric building. The plan shows that Brunelleschi used the number 7 in both directions. The nave, 42 feet wide, is exactly half of the total width of the nave and aisles, 84 feet,

and a quarter of the length of the transept, which is 168 feet. The side aisles are made up of squares of 21 by 21 feet. But the total length of the church, 294 feet, is a bit disquieting if this be a geometric system. It is 7 times the width of the nave. Also the length of the nave, 189 feet and divisible by 7, is four and a half times the width of the nave. Thus the relations are arithmetic and not geometric.

The elevation, also, does not follow a geometric system: the nave arcades do not have the height of 42 feet demanded by the geometric system—but 40 feet. The height under the arches of the crossing is 76 feet and the height under the ceiling 84 feet. All these numbers are divisible by 4 and do not have a geometric relationship. But the fact that the height of the nave is exactly double that of its width and that this figure, 84 feet, corresponds to the total width of the church, nave and aisles included, has made art historians assume that Brunelleschi had applied geometry alone to the dimensions of Santo Spirito.¹⁹

In conclusion, it is very evident that Brunelleschi clung to the system of symbolic numbers of the Middle Ages. It was for his successors, such as Alberti, to introduce a geometric system.

Notes

1. This paper is based on research done in Florence in 1965 with a grant from the Duke Endowment Foundation.

2. Vasari's life of Brunelleschi, for example, gives dimensions for the cathedral dome in *braccia*.

3. F. Palazzi, *Novissimo Dizionario della Lingua Italiana*; the *braccio* equals c. 58 centimeters.

4. E. R. Sunderland, "Symbolic Numbers and Romanesque Church Plans," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 1959, 94-103.

5. Virgil Hopper, *Mediaeval Number Symbolism*, N.Y., 1938.

6. *The Works of Aurelius Augustine*, trans. Marcus Dods, 15 vols., Edinburgh, 1871-1876, "On the Morals of the Manichaeans," XI, 24.

7. Augustine, "The City of God," XI, 30.

8. Augustine, "On Christine Doctrine," II, 25.

9. *Irenaeus*, trans. Alexander Roberts and W. R. Rambaut, *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, V and IX, Edinburgh, 1868; "Against Heresies," III, 11, 8.

10. Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," II, 24, 4.

11. Three and four were major numbers in the Pythagorean system because the Pythagoreans conceived of mathematics in geometric terms. Thus one was thought of as a point, two as two points, etc. Two points joined make a line, but with three points can be made a triangle and with four points a pyramid. Because three is the smallest number which can represent surface it was thought of as the first "real" number, and four the second "real" number because it can represent a solid.

12. Augustine, "The City of God," XI, 31.

13. Augustine, "Letter LV," V, 9.

14. Augustine, "Letter LV," VI, 10. In other words by writing to seven churches John wrote to *all* churches—seven being the number of all or completeness. This idea of seven must account for the many groups of sevens of the middle ages: the seven virtues, the seven vices, the seven liberal arts, etc.

15. This is essentially Pythagorean. Ten was considered the most important of all numbers because it contained all numbers. It was, then, the number of totality.

16. Augustine, "Reply to Manichaeus' Fundamental Epistle," X, 11.

17. Augustine, "Letter LV," IX, 16, and X, 17.

18. Letter of Barnabus, *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, IV, 117.

19. Most of the elevation measurements have been taken from Heinrich von Geymüller, *Die Architektur der Renaissance in Toscana*, Munich, 1885-1893, I, *Filippo de Ser Brunellesco*; I was able to measure only a few myself. The dimensions of the ground plans are all my own.

Ancient Paragons in a Piccolomini Scheme

By ROBERT L. MODE

Vanderbilt University

The National Gallery in Washington has two panels from a series of *uomini famosi* ("famous men") representations executed in Siena at the end of the fifteenth century.¹ Of these the *Claudia Quinta* (Fig. 46) by Neroccio de'Landi retains the original dimensions prescribed for each rounded oblong panel in the set, while the so-called *Eunostos of Tanagra* (Fig. 47), attributed to the Master of the Griselda Legend, is missing the lower one-sixth of its former area.² To date there have been few studies concerned with the origins and disposition of the scheme from which these works derive.³ And yet it is possible to arrive at a number of fundamental conclusions about such matters from the available evidence.

De Nicola and Berenson proposed that there were seven related panels in the series, executed by four different masters, i.e. *Scipio Africanus* by Francesco di Giorgio, *Claudia Quinta* by Neroccio de'Landi, *Sulpicia* by Giacomo Pacchiarotto, and the remaining four examples (*Alexander the Great*, *Eunostos of Tanagra*, *Tiberius Gracchus* and an unidentified *Virtuous Woman*) by the Griselda Master, possibly upon designs by Signorelli.⁴ To these has been added a much reduced likeness of *Judith* attributed to Matteo di Giovanni.⁵ While it is possible that other heroes or heroines were included in this series, the configuration of the eight known panels limits the possibility that additional paragon likenesses were called for as part of the original program.

Subjects such as those with which we are dealing were restricted in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to private and civic structures, each of which had programmatic demands associated with its function. Exemplars of civic virtue were preferred for a *palazzo pubblico*, while worthies of this and other types were admitted to the sanctuary of a private edifice.⁶ That the series in question was undertaken for a family residence is attested to by the preeminence of female paragons and the emphasis on private virtue in both the pedestal inscriptions and background scenes.⁷ As ancient examples of continence and temperance the personages portrayed served as ideal surrogates for chivalric models which had previously held sway in courtyards, loggias and apartments.

Certainly the sophisticated historical nature of this particular paragon

series points to the patronage of a Siennese family enamored of the distant past, and indeed it seems certain that the entire set was done for none other than the ancient house of Piccolomini. The winged putti or genii that support the pedestal plaques (where these have survived intact) are shown with one hand grasping a volute attached to the cartel and the other hand wrapped around a Piccolomini crescent. The device of the crescent moon had specific and exclusive reference to this family in Siena. Thus the crescent-bearing putto appears on the tomb of Bishop Testa Piccolomini in Siena cathedral, executed by Neroccio de'Landi in 1485.⁸ A similar device was employed in the spandrels of the arch over the Piccolomini altar on the north wall of the church, where Andrea Bregno and his workshop carved angels holding the crescent device aloft. But the most telling parallel to the pedestal cherubs in this series is found in the varied putti types that occur throughout the Piccolomini library decorations by Pinturicchio (Fig. 50), which differ only in that the winged babes there do not hold but gesture toward the crescents in the Piccolomini escutcheon.

The latter project, begun in 1495 and completed in 1508, was undertaken by the most influential member of the Piccolomini family at the turn of the century: Cardinal Francesco Todeschini Piccolomini, for a few brief weeks Pope Pius III (1503). It was while the library was being constructed that the paragon panels bearing the Piccolomini emblem were executed, making it possible for the cardinal to have had a hand in both enterprises. Nonetheless, one can hardly reconcile the division of the *uomini famosi* project among several Siennese masters with the fact that the cardinal had lost contact with local workshops while away in Rome. By its nature this undertaking demanded close supervision by a patron familiar with the artistic forces then at work. Though small in scope the panel scheme was carefully carried out in stages, not pushed to completion as has been previously suggested.⁹

Since completion of a series begun by important local masters was left to a relatively unknown artist like the Griselda Master, it would appear that financial considerations may have entered the picture along the way, in which case the Piccolomini Cardinal seems an unlikely choice on other grounds. That expense must have been at least one factor in shaping the overall scheme is clearly indicated by the decision to depict the heroes and heroines on individual panels of relatively small dimensions. The established tradition of portraying worthies from antiquity (excepting men of letters) was purposefully abridged here. While borrowing the format, pedestal, and similar de-

vices, the planner of the series chose to forego the scale and expense of a fresco scheme using life-size or larger images (*giganti*).¹⁰ Thus the Piccolomini commission was no more than a compromise between grander mural programs and less ambitious *cassone* decorations such as the *Hippo, Camilla, Lucrezia* (Fig. 51) by Guidoccio Cozzarelli.¹¹

It is worth noting that in the case of Neroccio de'Landi and Pacchiarotto, both of whom had a part in the series of ancient paragons, certain members of the Piccolomini family did not command absolute trust where money was concerned. In February of 1485 the brothers of Bishop Testa Piccolomini transferred the commission for a tomb honoring the recently deceased prelate from those originally given the assignment to Neroccio, who insisted on partial payment in advance and a more favorable sequence of installments.¹² There must have been grounds for taking these precautions, perhaps even past defaults of payment such as those which impelled Pacchiarotto some years later to seek reimbursement for the work he was engaged in for the family chapel at San Francesco.¹³

Taking all this into account, a more likely candidate for patron of the panel scheme is Giacomo di Nanni Piccolomini, who styled himself a *cavaliere* and thus was at least susceptible to the lore surrounding noble worthies. In 1484 this Messer Giacomo declared as the first item on a list of properties his "palazzo nuovo principiato . . . in posto nel popolo di Sancto Martino et Compagna di Pantaneto da la piazza Piccolomini."¹⁴ Work on this palace was to continue in stages, as testified to by his declarations of 1491 and 1498, and that of his son Silvio in 1509.¹⁵ Here, then, was a Piccolomini proud of his patrician heritage, possessed of a new palace which he could not afford to finish all at once but which required suitable decoration for its habitable quarters. The process of completing the *palazzo* followed the same patient system of accretion over many years that marked the development of the *uomini famosi* project.

When the series of ancient paragons was begun in the fourteen nineties the dimensions of the undertaking were not necessarily fixed. That the original set was enlarged appears certain. At first it had been divided into matched pairs, then groups of four male versus four female figures. This in itself was a departure from the traditional pattern of odd-numbered divisions derived from the standard *neuf preux* prototype.¹⁶

The first pair in the series, begun in 1494-95, was the *Judith* (Fig. 48) by Matteo di Giovanni and the *Scipio Africanus* (Fig. 49) by Francesco di Gior-

gio. These two examples reveal the working out of figure proportion and scale relative to the shape and dimensions of the panels. In neither case does the figure and its landscape background appear to have achieved the high degree of integration visible in the later examples. Moreover, the mood of both panels is overly tense and martial for works intended to brighten the walls and inspire the occupants of a gracious Sienese *palazzo*. All such considerations were resolved in the remaining paragon representations that came to comprise the series.

Matteo di Giovanni died in June of 1495, and shortly thereafter Francesco di Giorgio left Siena in answer to an urgent plea issued by the Neapolitan court for his services as a military engineer in the struggle against Charles VIII's occupying army. The presence of Francesco in Naples is recorded in August and again in December of 1495, after which time he made his way back to Siena in time to undertake a major commission to do two bronze angels for the high altar of the Cathedral (paid for in mid-1497).¹⁷ By the time he returned the Piccolomini panel scheme had been placed in other hands, just as had occurred in the tomb project for Bishop Testa Piccolomini a decade earlier.

Once again Neroccio de'Landi was called upon to serve a branch of the Piccolomini family,¹⁸ assisted this time by the enigmatic Griselda Master. The latter produced the *Eunostos of Tanagra* while the *Claudia Quinta* was being executed by Neroccio to compose the second pair. Both the *Eunostos* and *Claudia* were designed to fit the specifications governing the *Judith* and *Scipio* panels; but in harmony of pose, drapery, lighting and landscape setting they more than matched the earlier examples. Although quite distinct in details of design and execution (physiognomy, treatment of the hair and hands, color), every effort seems to have been made to unite the *Eunostos* and *Claudia* in a complementary fashion. This applies to the graceful disposition of both figures, who have been similarly fitted with simple tunics that hang in fluted folds which serve to emphasize their slightly hip-shot poses. Their body sashes are tied in identical, puffed half knots. Even the hems of their garments are delicately embroidered counterparts to one another, and the stippled lining of *Eunostos'* mantle echoes the sleeve and bodice material worn by *Claudia*.

Perhaps the strongest unifying element of all is the arrangement of background elements which serve to link the two works. Thus the serried episodes depicted in the distance counterbalance each other, as do the inlets of the sea behind the swelling landscape. It is clear from the way the actions illustrating

their respective deeds are arranged, so that those behind *Eunostos* move from right to left, while those behind *Claudia* read from left to right, that the two were designed to complement each other. Moreover, the similarly constructed buildings with their matching orthogonals make the relative placement of the panels perfectly secure. On the basis of this internal evidence one can posit that there was a conscious effort on the part of a single individual to harmonize the landscape and episodes in both paintings, and, to some extent, in the two earlier examples. As proven by his later additions to the series, as well as the style accorded his eponymous *Griselda* panels in the National Gallery (London), the *Griselda* Master was the ultimate reconciler of scenic disparities during the successive phases of the *uomini famosi* project.

There is general agreement that the author of the *Griselda* and Piccolomini panels previously cited had his roots in the art of Luca Signorelli, one critic going so far as to suggest that Luca was the father as well as mentor of this shadowy figure.¹⁹ Temperamentally the two artists could not have been closely attuned, since the *Griselda* Master possessed a more delicate nature appropriate for one immersed in small scale illustration. This would serve to explain why he sought employment in Siena at the very moment when Signorelli was choosing to engage himself in monumental enterprises that left little time for allegorical portraits or devotional subjects. Certainly the refined figures of the *Griselda* Master have more in common with the graceful Baptist in Luca's Volterra *Madonna and Saints* of 1491 or the young magus in the Louvre *Adoration of the Magi* from 1493-94 (in which Signorelli was assisted by his son),²⁰ than with the bolder types that gained ascendancy in the Città di Castello *Martyrdom of St. Sebastian* (1496/8?) and in the great fresco cycles at Monteoliveto Maggiore and Orvieto.

In his association with Neroccio after 1495 the *Griselda* Master established his reputation to such a degree that he was permitted to pursue the program of *uomini famosi* singlehandedly. First he arranged the principal pairs with the *Claudia* and *Eunostos* panels outside the likenesses of *Judith* and *Scipio*, so that the architecture behind the two lateral figures would have effectively bracketed the entire unit. In this way the division between male and female worthies could have been maintained, in accord with a well-established iconographic tradition.²¹ At the same time he avoided having to make extensive alterations in the scenic portions of the earlier pair, merely giving emphasis to the inward movement of action in the background while lining up the horizon lines as closely as possible.²²

There is no telling exactly when the decision was made to enlarge the scheme through the addition of *Tiberius Gracchus* and *Alexander the Great* on the one hand, and two virtuous female exemplars on the other. Quite possibly the set of eight was intended from the outset. Still, the more suave treatment of the *Tiberius*, the *Alexander*, and the unidentified *Virtuous Woman* in the Poldi-Pezzoli (Milan)—all of which bear the imprint of the mature Griselda Master—suggests a hiatus around 1497-98, followed by a further development of the program. This might explain why the series was completed with the painting of *Sulpicia* by Pacchiarotto, which can hardly be dated earlier than 1500.²³ Either the Griselda Master left Siena at the turn of the century, or else Pacchiarotto was called in to replace an unsatisfactory or damaged panel executed some time before. In any case, the discrepancy in style caused by this final transfer of artistic responsibility is surely the explanation for *Sulpicia* displacing *Judith* as an end panel in the final scheme. Not only is the figure by Pacchiarotto broader and the landscape setting more expansive, but the treatment of every detail in early sixteenth-century terms further distinguishes it.

To understand the *Judith-Sulpicia* exchange (see Figs. 56 and 57) one must pay special attention to the pedestal designs as they have survived in five of the original eight panels. Doubtlessly the putti function as bearers of the Piccolomini crescents; but in another sense they serve as supporters of inscribed plaques that tell about each paragon. In this capacity they stand with legs crossed beneath them or stretched out to either side. The variable disposition (two pairs have crossed legs, three have legs outstretched) indicates that a regular alternation of poses was planned. This agrees entirely with the logical reconstruction proposed here, which shows *Judith* and *Sulpicia* in the interchangeable “first” and “third” positions on the female side. It likewise offered a fitting counterpoint to the even ranks of heroes and heroines.

As a final means of casting light on the project as a whole, certain parallels might be drawn between the Piccolomini scheme and related developments in and around Siena. Thus, it is worth noting that the joint effort described herein had an immediate precedent in Siennese art. Designs for *Sibyls* set in the pavement of the side aisles of the Cathedral were submitted by leading masters in 1482-83.²⁴ Examples of special interest are the *Samian Sibyl* (Fig. 52) by Matteo di Giovanni and the *Hellespontine Sibyl* (Fig. 53) by Neroccio de'Landi. The raised plaque in the former example may have influenced the design of the hero pedestal plaque; but more importantly, the basic moods and

postures of these figures carried over to the heroines designed later by both artists.

Aside from the obvious affinity between the exemplar panels and the pavement *Sibyls* in Siena cathedral there are direct links to be made with contemporary *uomini famosi* renderings. Occasionally there are panels placed beside the eight known *Piccolomini* examples, but they are commonly rejected owing to differences in dimensions or details. Foremost among these derivative works are three closely related panels in Boston and Tours by an artist close to Signorelli, yet completely distinct from the Griselda Master.²⁵ There is also a group of panels in private collections published by Roberto Longhi without any dimensions given, some of which agree with the *Piccolomini* scheme in general configuration only.²⁶ Neither set approaches the latter, however, in figure style, landscape design or even pedestal type.

The closest parallel to the set of worthies done for the *Piccolomini* is the group of historic exemplars painted by Perugino in the Sala delle Udienze of the Collegio del Cambio at Perugia.²⁷ Though monumental in scale, the examples by Perugino resemble the panel types in particulars of pose, gesture and costume. The figures of *Horatio Cocles* and *Publius Scipio* (Fig. 54) share attitudes and attributes in common with the near contemporary *Alexander the Great* (Fig. 55) by the Griselda Master. At the very least one supposes that mutual influences were at work here.

The tradition of depicting *uomini famosi* continued in Siena and throughout most of central Italy well into the sixteenth century. But never again would artists of as varied backgrounds and ages take part in a single enterprise of this kind. Such a mixture of talents rarely produces felicitous results, even when a unified conception is held in common. It is to the credit of the Sieneese school in the late Quattrocento, and the decorative sense of the Griselda Master, that the *Piccolomini* panels achieved uniformly high quality with fluent integration.

Notes

1. Six others from this series are dispersed as follows: Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery (*Sulpicia*); Birmingham, Barber Institute (*Alexander the Great*); Bloomington, Indiana University, Kress Collection (*Judith*); Budapest, Szépművészeti-Museum of Fine Arts

(*Tiberius Gracchus*); Florence, Bargello (*Scipio Africanus*); Milan, Poldi-Pezzoli (*Virtuous Woman*).

2. *Claudia Quinta* (Mellon Collection, No. 12; "Neroccio de' Landi," 105 x 46 cm.); see Gertrude Coor, *Neroccio de' Landi, 1447-1500*, Princeton, 1961, 190 (Catalogue No. 61). *Eunostos of Tanagra* (Kress Collection, K1400; "Master of the Griselda Legend," formerly "Luca Signorelli," 88.5 x 52.5 cm.); see Fern Rusk Shapley, *Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection, Italian Schools XV-XVI Century*, London, 1968, 98 (K1400).

3. Giacomo de Nicola, "Notes on the Museo Nazionale of Florence-IV," *Burlington Magazine*, XXXI, 1917, 224-228; Bernard Berenson, "Quadri senza casa: Il Quattrocento senese, II," *Dedalo*, XI, 1931, 750f. (again in *International Studio*, XCVIII, April, 1931, 19f.).

4. De Nicola, 227; Berenson, "Quadri," 753 and *Italian Pictures of the Renaissance, Central Italian and North Italian Schools*, London, 1968, II, Pls. 904-909. Berenson related the hero panels with "Umbro-Sienese" characteristics to the master responsible for three scenes from the Griselda Legend (National Gallery, London, Nos. 912-914) as early as 1911, finding affinities with the Sienese Bernardino Fungai (in *Central Italian Painters of the Renaissance*, London, 1911, 171). De Nicola observed the influence of Pinturricchio, but even more so Signorelli, and the only departure from the latter position has been Alberto Martini, "The Early Works of Bartolomeo della Gatta," *Art Bulletin*, 42, 1960, 133f., who suggested a possible identification with the late style of della Gatta. Prior to Shapley (above, 98) the name of Signorelli was tied to the hero designs executed by the Griselda Master; but no reason exists for denying these conceptions to the latter master, whose imagination is as patent as his technique.

5. Fern Rusk Shapley, *Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection, Italian Schools Schools XIII-XV Century*, London, 1966, 157-158 (K496). Dimensions of the *Judith* are 22 x 18½ in. (55.9 x 46.1 cm.); balustrade added later.

6. For the iconography of civic paragons in Italian palace decorations of the early Renaissance see Theodore Mommsen, "Petrarch and the Decoration of the Sala Virorum Illustrium," *Art Bulletin*, XXXIV, 1952, 95-116; also, Nicolai Rubenstein, "Political Ideas in Sienese Art: The Frescoes by Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Taddeo di Bartolo in the Palazzo Pubblico," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 21, 1958, 179-207. For chivalric exemplars and related imagery of the Trecento and early Quattrocento the best source is still Julius von Schlosser, "Zur Kenntnis der künstlerischen Überlieferung in spätem Mittelalter," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, XXIII, 1902, 279-338 (Italian edition edited by Gian Lorenzo Mellini, *L'arte di corte nel secolo decimoquarto*, Cremona, 1965). The two traditions are examined at length in Chapter IV of the Ph.D. dissertation by the author of this article, entitled *The Monte Giordano Famous Men Cycle of Cardinal Giordano Orsini and the Uomini Famosi Tradition in Fifteenth-Century Italian Art* (University of Michigan, 1970).

7. Chastity or attempted continence characterize the women (even *Judith*, who may also symbolize fortitude) and two of the male worthies, the abstinent Eunostos of Tanagra and Tiberius Gracchus. Only Scipio and Alexander connote patriotic valor without the addition of continence; and their cartels praise their temperance as revealed in the background episodes, where Scipio allows the Carthaginian maiden Lucretia to go marry prince Aluceius and Alexander spares the family of Darius.

8. Coor, 94, n. 329, Fig. 46.

9. Berenson, "Quadri senza casa," 753. Private commissions for family palace decorations were not subject to the same time restrictions applied to church and civic commissions, unless a monumental enterprise was planned or a specific event in need of festive adornment was projected. The exemplar portraits were not all done at the same time, anyway, so this explanation for the division of responsibility seems untenable.

10. *Giganti* such as the Roman heroes painted larger than life-size for the Sala Virorum Illustrium of the Carrara palace in Padua (ca. 1370) or the Sala dei Giganti in the Palazzo Trinci at Foligno (1424) were set into arches with inscribed bases below. In Tuscany there were ample precedents for the arched format: the lunette frescoes of Niccolò di Pietro Gerini in the Palazzo Datini at Padua (*cortile*), documented as executed in 1391; the hero scheme in the antechapel of the Palazzo Pubblico, Siena, by Taddeo di Bartolo (completed in 1409); and the ancients in triumphal arch openings painted in the Sala dei Gigli of the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence by Ghirlandaio and his workshop (1482-85). Only the Castagno frescoes for the Villa Legnaia (ca. 1450) used a rectilinear pattern of fictive niches that allowed the artist full expression of his love for varicolored marble paneling.

11. Paul Schubring, *Cassoni*, Leipzig, 1923, 330 (No. 468), Pl. CXI in *Tafelbild*. Schubring recorded this *cassone* with its heroine decorations in the Palazzo Chigi-Zondadori at Siena, but more recently it has been removed to Vicobello as part of the collection of the Marchesa Chigi-Zondadori Bonelli (Berenson, *Italian Pictures*, I, p. 100).

12. Gaetano Milanese, *Documenti per la storia dell'arte senese*, Siena, 1854, II, 399f. and 408f. (Doc. 276 and 284). Also transcribed by Coor, 147-149 (Appendix I, Doc. XIXA and XIX). In Neroccio's contract his predecessors, Vito and Lucillo di Marco, are referred to as *scharpelini*—indisputably a lower category than *maestro scultore*, implying that the Piccolomini commissioners were seeking a bargain when they first let out the tomb contract. When they finally had to turn to Neroccio they were willing to loosen their purse strings, if only slightly.

13. Milanese, *Documenti*, 1856, III, 48 (Doc. 19). On September 18, 1510, Cardinal Giovanni Piccolomini wrote to his brother Pier Francesco as follows: "È venuto a me el Pacchierotto a domandarmi denari per conto de la Cappella, et molto s'è lamentato. . . ." Final payment for work on the Piccolomini chapel in S. Francesco was not made to Pacchiarotto until December of 1514, when Andrea Piccolomini recompensed the artist for his work on the walls and ceiling.

14. Archivio della Consorteria Piccolomini, XLIII, 1484. Published by S. Borghesi and L. Banchi, *Nuovi documenti per la storia dell'arte senese*, Siena, 1898, 333 (Doc. 168).

15. Borghesi and Banchi, 333. In 1509 Silvio di Giacomo declared that he and his brother Enea were sharing the "palazo nuovo, il quale al presente si edifica con grave pesa come si vede."

16. *Neuf preux* or "Nine Worthies" imagery appeared in Italy before the middle of the fourteenth century, but its tripartite iconography (three pagan, three Hebrew, and three Christian heroes) was most influential during the first half of the Quattrocento. Except at Manta castle (Piedmont) there was no direct copying of French models, but the use of "nine" exemplars (or figures in multiples of three) became widespread, effecting

uomini famosi cycles in Siena (Palazzo Pubblico), Florence (Palazzo Vecchio, Villa Carducci-Pandolfini at nearby Legnaia), Lucignano (Palazzo Comunale), and elsewhere. Nine heroines were also represented, as at Manta; for their influence see Francesco Novati, "Un cassone nuziale senese e le raffigurazioni delle donne illustri nell'arte italiana dei secoli XIV e XV," *Rassegna d'Arte*, XI, 1911, 61-69.

17. Allen Stuart Weller, *Francesco di Giorgio, 1439-1501*, Chicago, 1943, 390-393 (Doc. CXXI, CXXV, CXXIX and CXXXI).

18. Neroccio had come into the Testa Piccolomini tomb commission under remarkably similar circumstances, after Lucillo di Marco died and Vito di Marco left Siena (Coor, 147).

19. Coor, 95. The two sons of Luca Signorelli were Antonio (†1502) and Polidoro (†1506). For further reference to them see Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori, ed architettori*, ed. Gaetano Milanesi, Florence, 1878, III, 691, n. 2.

20. Mario Salmi, *Luca Signorelli*, Novara, 1953, 51. The role of the younger Signorelli is not spelled out, so that one cannot be certain if any of the figurative elements are completely by his hand.

21. At Manta castle the *neuf preux* and *neuf preuses* were placed in consecutive order around the *sala baronale*, with no integration of male and female worthies. This segregation of sexes continued in the frescoes by Castagno at the Legnaia villa, and the Perugino series of philosophers, lawgivers, republican heroes, prophets and sibyls in the Collegio del Cambio at Perugia (1498-1500).

22. Shapley, 1966, 157, includes the strip of landscape visible above the parapet with the balustrade itself as a later addition to the mutilated *Judith* panel. Not having had the opportunity to see this work first-hand I cannot judge to what degree the upper landscape follows the original design, but the tents and equestrian figure on the right agree with the type of scenic backdrop found in the *Scipio Africanus* (altered or added by the Griselda Master).

23. The late date of the *Sulpicia* by Pacchiarotto has never been questioned; nor have the close ties between the three remaining panels by the Griselda Master been disputed. These latter paintings must be dated 1498 to 1500, owing to connections with Perugino's Cambio (Perugia) frescoes and signs of renewed contact with Signorelli—then active in Monteoliveto Maggiore and Siena. The drapery of the *Tiberius Gracchus* and Milan *Virtuous Woman*, and the anatomical power of *Alexander the Great's* sturdy legs reveal new influences from Signorelli. In addition, there is a definite link between the *Virtuous Woman* and Signorelli's *Mary Magdalene* in the left wing of the Bicchi altarpiece (Berlin, Staatliches Museum) done for Sant'Agostino in Siena (1498), as first mentioned by Coor, 95, n. 329.

24. Robert H. Hobart Cust, *The Pavement Masters of Siena (1369-1562)*, London, 1901, 31f. and V. Lusini, *Il Duomo di Siena*, Siena, 1939, II.

25. Bernard Berenson, "Les peintures italiennes de New York et de Boston," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 1896, 205-207 (as Peruzzi); Philip Hendy, *The Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Catalogue of Paintings*, Boston, 1931, 333-335 ("Influenced by Signorelli"). Weller, 295, took issue with a note by Richard Offner linking these panels to Francesco di Giorgio; instead, Weller contends, the armor and facial types are close to Neroccio.

This would make the workshop of Neroccio de'Landi a Siense sanctuary for Umbrian painters in the period just before 1500, with the Griselda Master being the chief luminary.

26. Roberto Longhi, "Un intervento Raffaellesco nella serie 'eroica' di Casa Piccolomini," *Paragone*, No. 175, 1964, 5-8.

27. Vasari, III, 581-582. Vasari recorded the date 1500 that accompanied the name of the artist (still visible), and this is the presumed date of completion. Nonetheless, payments were made to the artist for several years thereafter (see Umberto Gnoli, *I documenti su Pietro Perugino*, Perugia, 1923, 51f.).

Plus Oultre: The Idea Imperial of Charles V in his Columnar Device on the Alhambra

By EARL S. ROSENTHAL
University of Chicago

The Columns of Hercules and the motto *Plus Oultre* were chosen as the distinctive elements of the device of Charles V in 1516, his sixteenth year, when he was still the Duke of Burgundy and the King Designate of Spain; but, because of the unusual flexibility of its format, the device served him for the rest of his life. The original French motto and also the ungrammatical (if more familiar) Latin translation, *Plus Ultra*, were read as a prepositional phrase, "further beyond," with the Columns of Hercules (the Straits of Gibraltar) construed as its object.¹ The variable element that made possible its use in all parts of his ever-expanding empire was the symbol placed in the central field between the Columns. It usually represented the institution or dignity which Charles vowed he would carry, literally or figuratively, beyond the Columns of Hercules. It is now clear that he first used the device as Master of the Order of the Golden Fleece for the meeting of the eighteenth Chapter in Brussels in October of 1516. A contemporary description of the new device painted in the choir of the church of Sainte Gudule on that occasion mentions only the Columns and a crown placed above them; but it is very likely that the symbols of the Order, the steel and flint, occupied the central field, because they are found in the earliest extant examples used in Flanders.² With this device, young Charles seems to have pledged himself to carry the symbols of the Order (and the House of Burgundy) beyond the Straits of Gibraltar against Islam and on to the Holy Land—the avowed aim of the knights of the Golden Fleece. In time these symbols were replaced by others, such as the royal arms, the crucifix, the imperial arms and crown and the double eagle. In all cases, it was the Christian Faith or, at least, Christian rule that Charles vowed to carry beyond the current limits of his empire. In later years the inference of Christian or imperial expansion was so well established that the central symbol could be used to indicate the particular area of the globe that he vowed to add to his growing empire. That variant, which I shall call the "global version," is impressively represented in the decoration of Charles' palace on the Alhambra in Granada.

The first example known to me is a relief placed above a stone fireplace in

the bed-chamber of the rooms constructed for Charles in 1528-1532 on the northern edge of the Moorish palace of the Alhambra (Fig. 58).³ In this intimate setting, a few years after his honeymoon with Isabel of Portugal at the Alhambra, Charles' columnar device was joined by means of a banderole to a vertical windlass (*cabrestante*), apparently a device used at that time by his wife because it was also used on the wooden ceiling of Isabel's bedchamber.⁴ In the center of the mantel are two Ionic columns, with striations indicating the water of the Straits between them. In this case, the French form of the motto is seen on the banderole, though the first two letters are missing because the loop at the top has broken away. Because of the use of the two-headed imperial eagle of the Habsburgs, it is likely that the carving was designed after Charles' final coronation by the Pope in Bologna on 24 February 1530, while the crown with cross arches is an old symbol of the imperial dignity that survived in the arts into the sixteenth century.⁵

The globe held by the imperial eagle is dominated by the continent of Africa (Fig. 59). Its elongated shape (in contrast to the squat shape generally seen at the time) suggests that a Portuguese chart of the 1520's served as its model, because only the mariners of that country were aware of the length of that coastline. On the left of the globe is the New World dominated by the large land mass of Brazil and, to the right, India. This disposition, with Africa occupying the central axis, is typical of Portuguese maps of the period, notably those of Jorge and Pedro Reinel and Diogo Ribeiro, who was appointed cartographer to the emperor in 1523.⁶ One might say this "view of the world" was peculiarly Portuguese because it stressed the areas of their major explorations and discoveries. It gives the central place to the route to India along the western coast of Africa—a route reserved for Portugal by papal decree in 1454.⁷ When the Spanish crown decided to let Columbus try "the wrong way," the Portuguese followed, discovering the coast of modern Brazil. The prominence given to that part of the New World and to Africa in the globe held by the imperial eagle over the fireplace was not, I suspect, accidental, nor was the use of the nautical windlass to represent Isabel of Portugal. The intertwined devices were apparently intended to impress the viewer with the extent of the combined empires over which Charles or one of his heirs might one day rule as a result of his marriage to the Portuguese princess; and the windlass implied that the ships of Portugal, like those of Spain, would continue to weigh anchor for exploratory voyages still "further beyond" the Columns of Hercules.

The central position of Africa on this globe had yet another level of mean-

ing within the precincts of the Moorish fortress of the Alhambra in the early 1530's. For contemporary Spaniards Africa was Islam. It was from the North African coast that the enemy harassed Spanish ships and even invaded their southern harbors. Andalusians continually urged Charles to realize Ferdinand the Catholic's plan to secure the western Mediterranean by taking key ports along the African coast.⁸ Foremost among the proponents of this goal was the governor of the Alhambra who (in the name of the emperor) commissioned this fireplace. He was Don Luis Hurtado de Mendoza, the third Conde de Tendilla and the second Marqués de Mondéjar, who, as the *Capitán General* of Andalusia was in charge of the defense of the southern coast of Spain. In 1534, a few years after this device was carved, Barbarossa took the port of Tunis. The following summer Charles launched his successful campaign against that naval base, with Don Luis leading the cavalry, the famous *jinete* of the Alhambra. Tunis was apparently then considered to be only the first step in the taking of Africa, because Charles confidently assumed the title IMPERATOR AUGUSTUS AFRICANUS during the several years following that campaign.⁹ Also of interest in this context is an interpretation of Charles' columnar device found in a history of the Order of the Golden Fleece written by Alvaro Gómez de la Ciudad Real. Composed in Latin verse shortly before 1538 (and translated into Spanish prose by Juan Bravo shortly before 1546), Gómez explained that Charles took the Columns of Hercules as his device because they were "the end and the head of Spain" and, "pledging himself to go beyond [them], he placed in his device, over the arms of his forebears, [the motto] PLUS ULTRA"; then, Gómez continued, "How the Mohammedans wept!" and Juan Bravo added, in the slightly extended Spanish translation, "because they saw clearly that God willed the destruction of Africa."¹⁰ For Gómez in 1538, Charles' device made no reference at all to the exploration of the Indies. It pledged a thrust to the south and east against Islam in Africa. The central place of that continent on the globe over the fireplace would have led many contemporaries to the same conclusion.

A variant of this device, carved about 1537, is found on the pedestals of the upper story of the new palace, begun in 1533 (Fig. 60).¹¹ The device is composed of two Ionic columns placed against the sea and bound together by a banderole incised with the motto PLUS OULTRE; between them is a globe surmounted by a fierce single-headed eagle, the imperial eagle of the ancient Roman emperors. The globe on which it rests is sectioned by equatorial and quartering bands—a well known abstraction for the world map identified as

the "T-O" or "wheel map." It embodied the belief of early geographers that the world was a disc composed of three large land masses, with Europe and Africa each forming a quadrant and Asia occupying the other half. Dating from the Roman period and accepted by Isidore of Seville, it was the dominant type in the Middle Ages.¹² It was often depicted in the hand of Christ when he was represented as the Lord of the Earth and, also, in portraits of the Holy Roman Emperor in Majesty; but in these cases the quartering band was placed at the top and surmounted by a cross. The unusual banding of the globe on the pedestal of Charles' palace makes it clear that the talons of the imperial eagle spread possessively over the Antipodes, the hemisphere of Asia, still generally called the "Indies" by the Spaniards of the mid-16th century. Of course, the motif of the eagle atop a globe was used on the coins of Roman emperors, especially those of Augustus, Vespasian, and Domitian. That ancient precedent was even more closely followed in several medals struck for Charles from 1547 to 1554, most notably the reverse of a silver medal dated 1552 (Fig. 61).¹³ The eagle on this medal, unlike the one on the pedestal, was given thunderbolts and an olive branch, and the imperial mitre crown of the Habsburgs was placed over his head. The inscription on the medal makes the meaning of its imagery perfectly clear. It reads SUUM CUIQUE (To each his own). If this meaning is transferred to the device on the pedestals, Charles (in the guise of the imperial eagle) is laying rightful claim to the Antipodes as his grandfather, Ferdinand the Catholic, had charged him to do.¹⁴ In the medal of 1552, the T-O format is turned so that the eagle hovers over Europe and Asia, with Africa out of reach in the lower quarter. These later examples contrast with the device over the fireplace of 1531, in which Africa was located in the center of the globe (Fig. 59). By the late 1530's few contemporaries believed that Charles would ever dominate Africa and he himself had long before abandoned the title "Emperor of Africa." Only in the Indies were the Imperial banners carried ever *plus outre*, and that is the area of expansion celebrated in the pedestal reliefs.

The most elaborate example of the global version of the device on the Alhambra is found in a mid-century marble relief which was repeated in mirror images on the pedestals of the central portal of the west facade of the new palace (Fig. 62).¹⁵ Though badly worn, the iconographic program of this relief by Juan de Orea is still clear. Twin personifications of Peace hold an olive branch in one hand and a column in the other. The two columns are joined by a banderole bearing the motto PLUS OULTRE, and between them

is a globe surmounted by the imperial crown, distinguished by the side mitres and (better preserved in Antonio Leval's copy of Orea's relief) the single longitudinal arch, topped by a globe and a cross. The twin figures of Peace in this strictly symmetrical relief are seated on piles of war trophies, while geniuses on either side advance with torches to set them afire and, above, figures of Fame sound long trumpets. This panel is paired with a battle scene by Orea on the outer left pedestal (Fig. 63). The battle is dominated by an august equestrian figure with bodily and facial traits like those of Charles V, while at the far right, a youthful page sounds a horn and carries a banner with the columnar device. Manuel Gómez-Moreno y Gonzalez, in 1885, recognized that it was a battle among Christians and, believing that this *portada* was designed in 1527, suggested that the relief represented the Battle of Pavia, fought in February, 1525.¹⁶ He identified the equestrian figure as the Marqués de Civita de Santangel, who (according to Sandoval) fought his way to Francis I with an iron mace and captured him. Gómez-Moreno explained that the French king was omitted in the relief "out of respect for his person." Most modern writers continue this interpretation in spite of the incongruities it presents. Fortunately, newly found documents reveal that the western *portada* was not designed until 1549,¹⁷ shortly before the reliefs were carved. At that time there was no reason to celebrate the short-lived peace that followed the Battle of Pavia in 1525.

The panel itself provides ample internal evidence that the battle depicted in Orea's relief was one that occurred closer to mid-century. The best clue is provided by the laminated body armor worn by the equestrian figure and the standing man seen from the back. Though riveted lames on the tussets (thigh pieces) and on the shoulder cops were introduced at the end of the fifteenth century in trotting armor (*arneses de trote*), the highly developed forms in this relief, notably the type of breastplates called *anime*, belong to the 1540's and after.¹⁸ This very new type was also given a prominent place among the trophies in the Peace panel and also in the narrow reliefs (dominated by the cannon) on the sides of those pedestals. We know that a suit of this kind was made for Charles in 1539 by the Negroli brothers in Milan (now no. A 139 in the Royal Armory, Madrid), and Laking described it as a very advanced example of laminated body armor because it provided the flexibility of seven lames beneath the gorget of the breast plate.¹⁹ The one represented in our relief (rather crudely, it must be admitted) has ten lames. More to the point is the contemporary notice that Charles wore a new suit of laminated armor

(*armaduras de fangas anchas*) made by Desiderius Colman of Augsburg on the occasion of the Battle of Mühlberg on 24 April 1547.²⁰ It was depicted in Titian's famous equestrian portrait "Charles at Mühlberg," painted in 1548 and now in the Prado.²¹ Loukomski in 1944 assumed that the main figure in the Alhambra relief represented Charles,²² and certainly the bodily proportions and the gravity of his bearing and also the prognathism (or at least the shape of the beard) are reminiscent of the emperor at this time. Of course, in Titian's portrait Charles carries a spear (or, as Panofsky has observed, an ancient *hasta*) as a symbol of supreme authority. Apparently by the 1540's the mace carried by our equestrian figure had also become a symbolic weapon that functioned as a commander's baton.²³ Another feature inappropriate for a representation of the Battle of Pavia is the double-headed eagle with the mitre crown on the shield of the equestrian soldier carved in the reliefs on the sides of these pedestals. Those imperial symbols were not normally used for Charles before the coronation of 1530. The reliefs on the sides of the pedestals fronted by the "Triumph of Peace" offer another clue. Huge field cannon dominate the scattered trophies. Evidently they refer to the most prized booty at Mühlberg—the fifteen pieces of artillery captured in the field.²⁴

The extraordinary importance of the Battle of Mühlberg in April of 1547 made it an event worthy of commemoration on a *portada* ordered by the emperor in 1549. That victory did, indeed, promise to secure peace. The Emperor, by means of superb generalship and also diplomacy, had defeated the Schmalkaldic League of Lutheran princes, who had led his Germanic states in rebellion. Many historians have considered it his greatest victory because it saved both the Holy Roman Empire and the Catholic Faith in Germany.²⁵ In the months following that battle, a five year treaty was signed with the Turks and ratified by the Diet at Augsburg; and in June of 1548, the ordinance known as the Augsburg *Interim* was declared to hold open the possibility for the reconciliation of the reformers with the Emperor and the Church. In 1549-1550 it seemed to many that they had reached a period in which the weapons Christians had used against one another could be turned into plowshares and, indeed, it appeared that peace would reign over the earth.²⁶

While this seems to have been the specific reference of the "Triumph of Peace," there is more to be said about the device itself. On the globe between the columns, the sculptor carefully delineated the continents of Europe and Africa on the upper half and the tip of Brazil on the lower right. In addition, an incised line indicates a longitude close to that of modern Greenwich, while

another defines the Equator and yet another forms a complete circle around the North Pole. Thus, the columns held by the figures representing Peace are placed alongside the poles of the earth. This placement implies a meaning comparable to that found in a silver medal often identified with Charles' abdication in 1556 (Fig. 64).²⁷ In this case, it is a celestial globe that occupies the center field, and the columns are set on a plinth with no indication of the sea. Against one column, Charles (the "New Hercules") has laid aside his club and, on the other, he has hung up his lion's skin. The inscription encircling this unique imagery reads: NOMINE CAESAREO PLENUS UTERO POLUS (The glory of Caesar covers the earth from one pole to the other). It would seem that Hercules' columns were removed from the hillocks framing the Straits of Gibraltar and placed by Charles at the ends of the earth. In this medal, he seems to have declared that his task was done. A somewhat similar reference was made by Ariosto in the third version of his *Orlando furioso*, published in 1532. In canto xv, verse 26, he described Charles' empire as surpassing that of ancient Rome because it extended "from pole to pole" (*quinci e quindi estrema*).²⁸ Seen in this context, the device on the west facade of Charles' palace celebrated the peace that reigned within his wide-spread realms as a result of his Victory at Mühlberg.

In 1547 Charles V evidently believed he had finally unified Christian Europe for the holy war against the Infidel and the continued propagation of the Faith among the pagans in the newly discovered land. These aims were first stated in 1516 by Luigi Marliano in the opening oration of the eighteenth Chapter of the Order of the Golden Fleece in Brussels,²⁹ the meeting at which Charles first displayed the columnar device, and they continued to be his primary goals throughout his lifetime. Of all the variants formulated during the following years, none conveys this *idea imperial* as effectively as the global version found in his palace on the Alhambra in Granada.

Notes

1. Earl E. Rosenthal, "Plus Ultra, Non Plus Ultra and the columnar device of Emperor Charles V," *The Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XXXIV, 1971, 204-228.

2. Earl E. Rosenthal, "The Invention of the Columnar Device of Emperor Charles V

at the Court of Burgundy in Flanders in 1516," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XXXVI, 1973, 199-211.

3. The four-year budget for work on these rooms was approved by Charles V on 22 April 1528; the document is now in the Archivo General de Simancas, Contaduría Mayor, 1ª Época, Legajo 1278.

4. No other examples of this device are known to me. Before her marriage, Isabel used the motto "O Cesare o nulla." Later she used a sphere with the motto, "Si más tuviera, más me diera" (If he had had more, he would have given me more), which was reported by Marino Cavalli (1550), *Informatione dell'offitio dell'ambasciatore*, Florence, 1935, 48, apparently drawing the information from reports and letters written from Spain by Andrea Navagiero in 1526.

5. For a discussion of the two-arch crown and the mitre crown during this period see Earl E. Rosenthal, "Die 'Reichskrone,' die 'Wiener Krone' und die 'Krone Karls des Grossen' um 1520," *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien*, N.F. XXXI, 1970, 7-48.

6. Armando Cortesão and Avelino Teixeira da Mota, *Portugaliae Monumenta Cartographica*, Lisbon, 1960, I, Pls. 12, 14, 37-40, 44. Many contemporary German and Italian world maps, beginning with Waldseemüller's Ptolemaic world map of 1507, are thought to be based on Portuguese models.

7. Pedro Aguado Bleye, *Manual de Historia de España*, 9th ed., Madrid, 1964, II, 281.

8. Aguado Bleye, II, 108-109, published a plan of the proposed campaign.

9. Max Bernhart, *Bildnismedaillen Karls V*, Munich, 1919, 73, No. 158 (in the Münzsammlung, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna).

10. Alvaro Gómez de la Ciudad Real, *De Militia principis Burgundi quam Velleris Aurei vocant*, Toledo, 1540, V, Fols. xxi verso and xxii. Juan Bravo, *El Vellochino dorado y la historia de la Tusón*, Toledo, 1546, Fol. ciii. Similar references were made on the occasions of Charles' entries into Burgos in 1520 and Sevilla in 1526.

11. Though 1527 is usually given as the beginning date for the palace, the budget was not approved by Charles until May 1533; see Royal cedula of 23 May 1534 in the Archivo General de Simancas, Contaduría Mayor, 1ª Época, Legajo 1278.

12. For the type, see Leo Bagrow, *History of Cartography*, Cambridge, Mass., 1969, I, 42-43. For the use of the T-O world maps during the Middle Ages in Spain, see G. Menéndez-Pidal, "Mozárabes y Asturianos en la cultura de la Alta Edad Media en relación especial con la historia de los conocimientos geográficos," *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, CXXXIV, 1954, 137-291.

13. Giulio Capaccio, *Delle Imprese*, Naples, 1592, Fol. 96v; William Stirling-Maxwell, *The Chief Victories of the Emperor Charles V*, London, 1870, 57, n. 15, dated one medal of this sort 1547.

14. A letter written by Ferdinand to young Charles was published in Augsburg, apparently in 1516. A unique copy is preserved in the New York Public Library under the title *Epistola Ferdinandi Catholici Regis Arragonum, etc., ad Carolum Regum Castiliae, etc., Nepotem* [leaves 2 and 3]; see also Ferdinand's testament in Alonso de Santa Cruz, *Crónica del Emperador Carlos V*, Madrid, 1920-1925, 389.

15. Antonio Gallego y Burin, "Unas obras conocidas y un maestro desconocido," *Cuadernos de Arte*, VII-XI, 1942-1944, 63-65.

16. Manuel Gómez-Moreno y Gonzalez, "Palacio de Carlos V en la Alhambra," *Revista de España*, XVIII, 1885, pp. 216-217.

17. Construction on the first western entry in sandstone was stopped by order of the emperor in December of 1542 and there is no mention of the present marble *portada* until 16 December 1550, when several of the stone-cutters who had contracted to provide the marble were accused of moon-lighting. In the process of defending themselves, they stated that the specifications for the marble of the *portada* were drawn up by Pedro Machuca shortly before his death in July 1550. Various factors make it likely that the design was first presented for approval the previous year. The pertinent documents will be published in my forthcoming book on the palace of Charles V.

18. G. C. Stone, *A Glossary of the Construction, Decoration and Use of Arms and Armor*, New York, 1934, 143-145.

19. Guy Francis Laking, *A Record of European Armour and Arms*, London, 1920, III, 307, Fig. 1065.

20. Eberhart Lutze, "Armaduras alemanas," *Archivo Español de Arte*, XVI, 1944, 301.

21. Harold E. Wethey, *The Paintings of Titian, II The Portraits*, London, 1971, 87, Cat. No. 21. Perhaps the extensive repairs required after the painting was blown against a tree in 1548 and damaged by fire in 1734 explain the lack of clarity in some features of the armor, notably the laminated tussets over the thighs. The armor, still preserved in the Royal Palace in Madrid, is illustrated in Wethey's Pl. 242.

22. Georges Loukomski, "Palace of Charles V at Granada," *Burlington Magazine*, LXXXIV, 1944, 123.

23. Laking, *Record of European Armour*, III, 89.

24. Luis de Avila y Zuñiga, "Comentario de la Guerra de Alemania hecha por Carlos V," *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, XXI, Madrid, 1858, 413.

25. Maria Luisa Serra Belabre, "Mühlberg," *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, LXIV, 1958, 527-30.

26. The Alhambra reliefs were designed shortly before the illusory peace of Mühlberg was shattered by the revolt of the Germanic States under Moritz of Saxony in 1552 and the recognition of Protestantism by the Diet of Augsburg in 1555; see Peter Rassow, "Carlos V," *Carlos V (1500-1558) Homenaje de la Universidad de Granada*, Granada, 1958, 18.

27. Bernhart, 87, No. 209.

28. Lodovico Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso*, ed. E Vittorini, Turin, 1962, I, 433.

29. Luigi Marliano, "De Ordine Velleris Aurei. Oratio," *Rerum Germanicarum Scriptores*, ed. Marquand Freher, Strassburg, 1717, III, 146-149; see Rosenthal, "The Invention of the Columnar Device," 221-224.

Christ in Gethsemane:

Sculpture in the University of Kansas Museum of Art

By MARILYN STOKSTAD

University of Kansas

In the parish churches of Navarre splendid retablos still rise above the altars for which they were carved in the 16th or 17th century. Contracts, appraisals, and records of law suits concerning many of these works have been discovered; and the foundation has been laid for a documented history of the Renaissance in Navarre. Nevertheless when a fine piece of sculpture of unknown provenance such as the *Christ in Gethsemane* (Fig. 65) is acquired by an American museum, its authorship and date can rarely be established with any degree of certainty. If this hitherto unpublished sculpture in the University of Kansas Museum of Art¹ is to be associated with a workshop and dated, it must be studied in relationship to a series of documented retablos,² the most important of which are the Briviesca retablos by Pedro López de Gámiz, Diego Guillén and possibly Juan de Anchieta dated 1551-69, the retablos of San Juan in Estella from the workshop of Pierres Picart with sculpture by Fray Juan de Beauves (sometimes called the "fraile") and others (including Lope de Larrea?), dated 1563-68; the three retablos in the parish church of Ochagavía by Miguel de Espinal assisted by two and possibly three other sculptors (one of whom had a style very similar to Lope de Larrea's early Anchietaesque manner) dated 1574-78; and the retablo of Santa María in Salvatierra by Lope de Larrea, dated 1574-87.

All the artists knew each other. Miguel de Espinal may have been married to Fray Juan de Beauves' sister, and Lope de Larrea married Pierres Picart's daughter. Lope looked after Fray Juan's affairs when the "fraile" was imprisoned by the Inquisition, and he was given a statue of the Virgin and Child by Fray Juan which he admired so much he refused to give it up to the "fraile's" heirs. (The sculpture is mentioned in the law suit which provides us with some of this personal information.) No wonder difficulties arise when art historians in the 20th century try to establish artistic responsibility for individual pieces of sculpture in a retablo.

The master of *Gethsemane* in the University of Kansas Museum of Art is indebted to the workshop of Miguel de Espinal for his composition and to the shop of Picart or Lope de Larrea for his figure style. In fact, so close are

some resemblances between the Kansas sculpture and the Ochagavía Gethsemane (the figures of Christ are almost line for line copies) that either one must copy the other or both must be based on a third model (Fig. 66). An analysis of the style suggests, however, that two different sculptors executed the reliefs. The sleeping Apostles in the Kansas relief seem much closer to some of the sculpture from Estella and Salvatierra, and thus of the Picart shop, and more specifically Lope de Larrea, than they do to the work of Miguel de Espinal. Since a connection can be established between the Espinal and the Picart shops through Fray Juan, who may have worked in both, it is possible that Lope de Larrea himself also may have been involved. At this point it is appropriate to raise the hypothesis that Lope, or a companion, or a later member of his Salvatierra shop, may also have worked at Estella, Ochagavía, and on the Kansas relief.

To review briefly, sculptured retablos in upper Navarre in the 16th century illustrate the transition from the mannerist style of Alonso Berruguete to the classical or "Romanist" style which was introduced into northern Spain by López de Gámiz and Diego Guillén in retablos of Santa Clara and Santa María, 1551-69, at Briviesca. Juan de Anchieta, the most influential individual sculptor of Navarre, and one of the leaders of the Spanish Renaissance, may have worked at Briviesca; however, he first appears in documents in Valladolid as a friend and colleague of the Hispanicized Frenchman, Juan de Juni. Like most sculptors in the middle of the 16th century, he had fallen under the spell of Michelangelo; and he may have studied in Italy. His preference for heroic figures and dramatic action was reinforced by association with Juni. Juan de Anchieta made his home in Pamplona from 1576 until his death in 1588. In his mature work, such as the Trinity retablo for the Cathedral of Jaca (before 1578), the impact of Italian sculpture, and particularly the Moses of Michelangelo, on Anchieta is clear. Anchieta also studied Italian architecture; and in the design of his retablos, he abandoned the exuberant and decorative Spanish Plateresque style for the classical mannerism of Vignola.

Other important shops specializing in the production of retablos and operating in Navarre at this time were headed by Miguel de Espinal, the Frenchman Pierres Picart, and the Basque Lope de Larrea. The Navarese masters seem to have worked closely together; and some sculptors such as the "fraile," Juan de Beauves, moved from shop to shop. Their exact relationship and the chronology of their work is being established by the diligent archival work of María Concepción García Gainza and José Uranga.

Miguel de Espinal lived in Villava, Pamplona, and Lanz, and was active as a sculptor and designer of retablos from 1553 until his death in 1590. Espinal's finest work was done for the Church at Ochagavía, where three retablos and church furniture were commissioned on May 18, 1574, and were to be finished by Christmas, 1575.³ In the contract Miguel de Espinal is called an "*imaginer*o," or figure sculptor, rather than an "*entallador*." The retablos are described in detail; and although assistants are not named in the documents, their work is not specifically excluded. An analysis of the style indicates that three or four men must have worked on the sculpture. The retablos were appraised at 4,150 ducados on December 6, 1578, by Juan de Anchieta. The parish thought the evaluation was too high, and the work was reappraised in 1581. This second appraisal was even higher, 4300 ducados, to little avail; for in 1617 Miguel's heirs were still trying to collect the money owed them by the parish. García Gainza discovered a list of Espinal's works made by his heirs in 1614.⁴ Of the fifteen retablos mentioned, only six and a few figures from two others survive in Navarre today.

Apparently the Kansas *Gethsemane* was based on the same model as the Gethsemane of Ochagavía. In both, Christ, confronted by the angel with cross or cross and chalice, kneels in the upper part of the composition, while three Apostles sleep in the foreground.⁵ The juxtaposition of looming but passive foreground figures with tiny figures who carry the action of the scene in the far distance is a typical 16th-century composition.

The Kansas Christ and angel in a landscape are almost copies, even to details of drapery folds, of the Ochagavía sculpture, although in the Kansas relief the composition has been revised into a narrower space. The sleeping Apostles have also been changed, although the idea of two men leaning to the right balanced by one to the left—an unusual arrangement—is maintained. The similarities between the two figures of Christ—for example, the distinctive angular pattern of the cloak—cannot be accidental.

The placement of Christ and the emphatic movement of the composition to the right is not entirely a product of mannerist eccentricity. These reliefs were never intended to be seen as independent entities. They formed part of large, imposing retablos. Although scenes from the passion were commonly placed in the predella, the vertical format of the Kansas relief indicates that it was probably in the first or second bank on the left side of the altar, thus accounting for the more emphatic left hand framing devices and the general movement of the composition to the right. At Ochagavía the retablo remains

in situ, and the Gethsemane panel is found on the lower left side (practically obscured by a candle in the only available photo of the retablo, Fig. 67).

The Ochagavía Gethsemane is carved in low relief; the drapery breaks over the figures in sharp folds which tend to fill the entire area uniformly rather than to emphasize salient forms. The relief is less three dimensional, less curvilinear, less broad than some others in the retablo and was probably not done by the Miguel de Espinal himself.⁶ The University of Kansas Apostles are similar in proportion, breadth, and statuesque idealism to the large standing figures (as opposed to the reliefs) of the Ochagavía altar. Their draperies are laid in the same broad planes, and folds fall at each side emphasizing the body masses and breaking in slightly rectangular folds. Musculature is idealized in Michelangelesque fashion; faces are almost classical, with deep eyes, high cheeks, broad brows, high bridged noses, and hair in locks at once decorative and realistic. Hands and wrists are placed in elegant, mannered positions, yet realistically support and grasp objects. In the Kansas sculpture the Apostles are slightly more slender, the draperies broader and folds simpler and more rounded than in the Ochagavía Gethsemane. The relief varies markedly in height from the Apostles in the foreground, whose arms are actually cut free of the background and whose legs project out into space, to the very low relief of Christ and angel in the background. (An effect of space is achieved which is not apparent in a photograph.)

The idealism of the figures contrasts markedly with the stylized setting. The rectangular rocks on which Christ kneels, the large trees with heavy trunks, short branches, knot holes and curious downward pointing diamond leaves in oval clusters, and finally the rectangular, brick-like rocks in the foreground which provide convenient foot rests, seem to be drawn from the same patterns. The master sculptor may have carved the Apostles and left the setting to an assistant.

Turning to the Estella retablo, an examination leads to the conclusion that at least two excellent artists with important individual styles were employed on its execution. The disparity in style was first noted by Weise.⁷ Pierres Picart was an architect, a designer, and the business manager of a large shop producing retablos for provincial churches. The retablo ordered from him in 1563 for the Church of San Juan in Estella is one of his shop's best.⁸ The contract stipulates that the sculpture must be done by "the hand of the fraile" (surely Juan de Beauves, active in Navarre 1563-91) and by the best workers to be found in the Kingdom (possibly including Lope de Larrea,

although he is not mentioned). By comparing other work documented or attributed to Fray Juan with Estella, we may conclude that the more flowing, elegant, elongated, and "mannerist" sculptures are his. The quality is very high, and these figures are some of the finest of the later 16th century in Spain.

A second group of figures, somewhat more straightforward and realistic than Fray Juan's work, could have been carved by the young Lope de Larrea, who in the 1560's was still seeking his own style—a style which was to combine elements borrowed from both Anchieta and Fray Juan. Lope de Larrea, who was to become the leading sculptor of the Basque province of Alava,⁹ was closely associated with Picart, his son-in-law and heir, during the time the Estella retablo was underway. Furthermore he seems to have provided a home for Fray Juan at least from time to time in the 1570's. If Lope worked on the retablo of the church of San Juan (1563-68) at Estella, he must have carved the realistic figures in which the bones, muscles, and tendons in the exposed bodies or hands are emphasized; and faces are not entirely idealized and may be contorted with emotion. Draperies lie in smaller, finer folds although they still emphatically and effectively define the figures. Relief panels are packed with figures, landscape or architecture; Christ's agony, for example, seems to take place in a forest. In spite of the power of the individual forms, when compared to the Kansas or Ochagavía sculpture, the reliefs seem crowded and overactive.

In 1583 Lope de Larrea joined the older sculptors Anchieta and Fray Juan as an appraiser in San Sebastian. In the next year (1584) Lope received an important commission outside the Picart workshop, the retablo for the high altar of Salvatierra. Among the single figures Lope carved for the first bank of the retablo of Salvatierra are to be found close parallels with the figures in the Kansas *Gethsemane*. Comparisons may be made with the facial types, the loose but generalized locks of hair, the muscular but graceful arms and mannered gestures, the voluminous draperies whose broad curving folds are broken by angular turns and pockets, and the very high relief approaching sculpture in the round of the foreground figures. The commission was an ill-fated one, and in 1587 Anchieta was brought in from Pamplona to appraise the work and to settle the differences between the artist and his patrons. Lope de Larrea's style became more classical in his later years; however, the sculpture at Salvatierra is still in his mature Renaissance manner. The retablo was incomplete at Lope's death in 1623.

With these comparisons in mind we may then suggest that Lope may have

worked for a time with Espinal. Either Lope's Anchietaesque style dominates Espinal's Ochagavía work or Espinal evolved a similar interpretation of Anchieta's forms. The large standing figures at Ochagavía resemble the Apostles of Salvatierra, and the figure sculpture in the University of Kansas *Gethsemane* also seems close to Salvatierra or to those Ochagavía figures which are similar to Salvatierra. In any case the Kansas *Gethsemane* is part of the Anchietaesque tradition in Navarre and must date after Anchieta's arrival in Pamplona in 1576 and probably after Espinal's Ochagavía altarpiece in 1578. On the other hand it is earlier than Lope's Salvatierra commission in 1584 and certainly was done before Espinal's death in 1590. Thus we need no longer call this sculpture simply "Navarre, School of Anchieta, second half of the 16th century," but may with reasonable confidence assign it to the workshop of Miguel de Espinal or Lope de Larrea and date it between 1578 and 1584.

Notes

1. *Christ in Gethsemane*, University of Kansas, Museum of Art, Ac. no. 67.3, Patrons and Benefactors Fund, 45½ x 31 inches, wood with original polychrome.

2. The most important studies of 16th century sculpture in northern Spain are:

Tomás Biurrun Sótíl, *La Escultura religiosa y bellas artes en Navarra durante la época del Renacimiento*, Pamplona, 1935.

José Camón Aznar, *El Escultor Juan de Anchieta*, Pamplona, 1943.

José Uranga Galdiano, *Retablos Navarros del Renacimiento*, Pamplona, 1946.

José Ramón Castro, "Escultores navarros, Fray Juan de Beauves," *Príncipe de Viana*, IX, No. 31, 1948, 153-164.

José María Azcárate, *Ars Hispaniae*, XIII, *Escultura del Siglo XVI*, Madrid, 1958.

Georg Weise, *Die Plastik der Renaissance und des Frühbarock im Nordlichen Spanien*, II, *Die Romanisten*, Tubingen, 1959.

María Concepción García Gainza, "Miguel de Espinal y los retablos de Ochagavía," *Príncipe de Viana*, XXVIII, Nos. 108-109, 1967, 339-51.

María Concepción García Gainza, *La Escultura Romanista en Navarra, discípulos y seguidores de Juan de Anchieta*, Pamplona, 1969.

3. Before García Gainza's discovery and publication of the contract, appraisal, and other documents in 1967, the retablos were dated in the 1590's.

4. García Gainza, "Miguel de Espinal," 341.

5. The scene with sleeping Apostles is usual in the 16th century. In earlier repre-

sentations Christ may be represented twice, once speaking to the Apostles and then again in prayer, while later versions commonly depict the solitude of Christ or His betrayal by Judas.

6. Although García Gainza suggests Miguel Marsal, the style of his retablo at Echarri does not seem to be convincingly similar to Ochagavía.

7. Weise, 17-19.

8. For documents from parish archives see Uranga, 21-25 and 43-51. See also Castro, 103-164; and Biurrun Sótíl, 159-165.

9. García Gainza, *La Escultura Romanista*, 67-73; Castro; Camón, 84; Biurrun Sótíl, 226-227, 351-353; Uranga, 29-33; and Weise, 17-27.

El Greco's *Holy Family with the Sleeping Christ Child and the Infant Baptist*: an Image of Silence and Mystery*

By ENRIQUETA HARRIS FRANKFORT

The Warburg Institute, University of London

The "strangeness" and "singularity" of El Greco's art, as remarkable today as to his contemporaries, do not manifest themselves only in his style and his interpretation of new or unusual subjects—often treated in a highly individual way—such as *St. Maurice and the Theban Legion*, the *Allegory of the Holy League*, *Laocoön*, or the *Apocalyptic Vision*. They are equally evident and perhaps even more startling in his variations on popular and traditional themes, which are sometimes difficult to interpret. One such treatment, of the *Holy Family with the Sleeping Christ Child and the Infant Baptist*, of which El Greco painted several versions, is the subject of this article.

So far as we know all El Greco's paintings of the Holy Family were made after he had settled in Toledo. There is no record of his having attempted the subject while he was in Italy, where many more models and many more notable examples would have been available to him. His Italian experience has naturally left its mark here as elsewhere, both on the general cast of his painting and, as we shall see in our particular example, on details of iconography. But difficult though it is to establish an exact chronology, there can be no question that his surviving Holy Family compositions belong to his Spanish oeuvre.

The composition of the *Holy Family with the Sleeping Christ Child and the Infant Baptist* is the fourth and final type of the Holy Family in Harold Wethey's *Catalogue*. Under this subdivision are listed two authentic works, and four versions, two of them fragments, among school works and copies.¹ The two authentic works are the signed painting with under life-size figures in the Prado (Fig. 68) and the much smaller canvas, probably a sketch or *modello*, in the National Gallery in Washington (Fig. 69). They are dated by Wethey c. 1595-1600 and by other critics between 1594 and 1605. Both paintings illustrate the highly original qualities of El Greco's mature Spanish works and his remarkable virtuosity in the handling of several versions of a composition. As compositions they are nearly identical, varying only in minor details.

* I wish to thank Mr. J. B. Trapp, Librarian of the Warburg Institute for his help in the preparation of this article.

In the Prado painting, for example, St. Joseph is dark-haired, the Christ Child's eyes are open, and St. John, with a thin piece of animal skin round his waist, looks out at the spectator; while in the Washington picture St. Joseph is an old man,² the Christ Child's eyes are closed, and St. John, wearing a skin over one shoulder, looks down towards the ground. A third version of the subject, without the figure of St. Joseph, a large signed painting in the Museo de Santa Cruz, Toledo, is listed by Wethey under Madonna and Child.³ In his opinion, this is an earlier composition (c. 1580-85) to which El Greco later added St. Joseph; but other critics believe the St. Joseph has been painted out, in which case it was probably originally a large version of the Washington picture, to which it otherwise corresponds.

As Wethey points out, "the important iconographic factor here is the sleep of the Infant Jesus, which symbolizes His future sacrifice and death, while the lifted veil prefigures the shroud." El Greco's image of the sleeping or recumbent Christ Child was a familiar theme in both Italian and Spanish painting in his time.⁴ The association of the Infant Baptist with prefigurations of the Passion is also common; often he stands or kneels in adoration or points to the Infant Christ as the Redeemer.⁵ What is particularly strange and unfamiliar in El Greco is the way in which he represents the Infant Baptist. Standing in a prominent position, at the Virgin's knee, by the head of the Christ Child, nude except for the skin round his waist or over his shoulder, he holds in one hand a bowl of fruit and with the other puts a finger to his lips, his head turned away from the central group. What is the origin and what is the significance of this striking and unusual attitude?

The answers to both questions are, I suggest, to be looked for in a famous invention of Michelangelo's, the master for whom El Greco expressed a lack of reverence that shocked Pacheco but for whom, nevertheless, he showed his admiration in several of his paintings. Michelangelo's drawing of the *Holy Family with the Sleeping Christ Child* in the Duke of Portland's collection (Fig. 70),⁶ widely known through numerous 16th century copies, painted and engraved, displays a number of iconographic novelties, among them the half-length figure at the left looking down at the sleeping Child. His head and shoulders are covered with an animal's skin and he raises his right hand in blessing while he places his left forefinger to his lips in the gesture that has given this drawing the title by which it is usually known: "Il Silenzio." The solemnity of the principal group, the majestic figure of the Virgin, with a book in one hand and the other held above the Child's head, the melancholy pose of

St. Joseph, the attitude of the Christ Child, His body lying on the seat, His head and shoulders on the Virgin's lap (an attitude more suggestive of death than of sleep), the hour-glass with the sand running out beneath Him, all combine to emphasize the dimension of this Holy Family by which it also becomes a prefiguration of the Passion. It would seem, therefore, that the gesture of Michelangelo's Baptist—as it seems we must identify the figure with the animal's skin—is also to be interpreted symbolically: he is not only guarding the Child's sleep but is commanding silence before the mystery of His future sacrifice. Perhaps the gesture carries a reference to the silence that is associated with religious meditation, or even to liturgical silence, as in the recital "submissa voce" of the Canon in the sacrifice of the Mass (a traditional practice that was upheld at the Council of Trent).⁷ This possibility gains some support from the suggestions made by Miss Firestone that the Virgin lifting the veil in Raphael's *Madonna of the Diadem* (Louvre) and the Infant St. John spreading a cloth on a ledge in Luini's *Sleeping Christ Child* (Louvre) are both images that recall the ceremony of the Mass.⁸

The gesture of Michelangelo's St. John has a long tradition in Christian iconography and has been shown to have its origin in the image of the Egyptian child god Horus, whom the Greeks misinterpreted as the god of Silence and called Harpocrates. In numerous Graeco-Roman sculptures of all sizes, he is represented as a boy holding his finger to his lips, admonishing silence during religious rites, warning the faithful not to divulge the mysteries of which he is the guardian. In a recent article in which she surveys the history of the images of *Silentium*, Karla Langedijk has identified the St. John in Michelangelo's drawing with Harpocrates, not only because of his gesture but also, on the evidence of the description of him in the first edition of Cartari's *Imagini* (1556), because of the wolf-skin covering his head and shoulders.⁹ It is, in her opinion, Harpocrates himself who is represented in Michelangelo's *Holy Family*, and given the same meaning as the god of Silence. That Michelangelo represented the Baptist—not, by his looks, an infant—in the guise of Harpocrates seems to me more likely: the pagan god provided a prototype for his image of the Saint, who calls for silence in the presence of the mystery of the Christian religion. Certainly Giulio Bonasone, in his engraving of 1561 (Fig. 71), the earliest dated record of Michelangelo's drawing, and other copyists, identified the figure as the Baptist, making him an infant, replacing his animal-skin cowl by a cape of indeterminate material, and placing near him

or in his hand the cross which is both his attribute and a symbol of the Crucifixion.

Although the image of Harpocrates as a symbol or personification of Silence had already been adapted to other Christian subjects, the association of this image with St. John the Baptist appears to be a new invention. El Greco could have known Michelangelo's image either in Italy or in Spain, through one or other of the copies, most probably the engraving by Bonasone, some of whose other prints he is known to have used. He could also have seen a later version of the theme which came to Spain from Italy shortly before the date given as the *terminus post quem* for the paintings in Madrid and Washington. This is the large canvas by Lavinia Fontana in the Escorial, signed and dated at Bologna in 1589 (Fig. 72).¹⁰ Here the figure of the Infant Baptist is taken from Michelangelo's, while the group of the Virgin and Child is evidently based on Sebastiano del Piombo's *Holy Family with the Sleeping Christ Child* ("Madonna del Velo," Naples),¹¹ which in turn reflects Raphael's *Madonna di Loreto*. The painting was sent to the Escorial in 1593, where it was greatly admired. According to Pacheco, it was acquired by Philip II for 1000 ducats¹²—a high price considering that El Greco was paid 800 ducats for his *St. Maurice* a few years earlier. Padre Sigüenza (1605), who decried El Greco's *St. Maurice*, praised Lavinia Fontana's painting in glowing terms, as: "pintura tan alegre y hermosa, y de tan buen colorido y tan llena de dulçura que nunca se hartan de verla, y con auer en aquella pieça [capitulo del vicario] tantas y tan valientes pinturas, esta sola se lleva los ojos y enamora, especialmente a la gente ordinaria. . . . Deuense de auer hecho mas de diez o doze copias deste original, algunas harto ordinarias, y las que han sacado de aquellas son sin cuento vnas peores que otras."¹³

The tender expression of the Virgin and the protective gesture of St. Joseph, as they look down on the Christ Child, the comfortable bed with pillows and sheets on which He lies, combine to stress the intimate, domestic character of Lavinia Fontana's *Holy Family* so that the gesture of the Infant Baptist, as he looks out at the spectator, could be read as a command for silence for the sleeping Child. At the same time the reference to His future sacrifice is made clear by the large Cross held in St. John's hand, with its banner inscribed "Ecce Agnus Dei," and by the inscription on the sheet at the bottom of the picture: "Cor meum vigilat." "Ego dormio et cor meum vigilat," the line from the Song of Songs (v: 2), is quoted again and again by religious writers to describe the contemplative state, spiritual quiet, mystic sleep and ecstasy. It

is also quoted with reference to Christ's vigilance while He sleeps on some devotional prints representing the Infant Christ lying asleep on the Cross, offering Himself as Redeemer through his sacrifice and death.¹⁴ In Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia*, the "Bible of symbols" (Seznec) first published in 1593, the quotation is applied to the personification of *Vigilanza*, as a woman who has among her attributes a book held in her right hand—like Michelangelo's Virgin.

A few Spanish variants of Lavinia Fontana's composition known today testify to the popularity of its theme more than to the fame of the artist. Reduced to its simplest form, in an anonymous painting (Fig. 73)¹⁵ of which there exists a second version, it shows the Virgin in an attitude of adoration looking down on the sleeping Child, tucked up in bed with a tiny cross beside Him, while two angels hold a crown above her head; behind the Child, the Infant Baptist, nearly fully clothed, with a cross in one hand, admonishes silence with a feeble imitation of the gesture that goes back to Michelangelo, echoing the mystical meaning of his *Holy Family*. What is chiefly interesting about this humble derivative of Lavinia Fontana's painting is that it appears to reflect a popular devotion to the theme of "Il Silenzio" in Spain that may account for the several examples painted by El Greco. What it cannot account for is the strength and tenderness of El Greco's realization of the theme. Whether he took his inspiration from Michelangelo alone or was also influenced by Lavinia Fontana's composition, he transformed and transcended his models in his familiar way: even when he quotes directly from other artists his sources are often hardly recognizable.

In the paintings in Madrid and Washington, the attitude of the Virgin recalls the majestic seated figure in Michelangelo's drawing, while the figure of St. Joseph bending forward and the hands lifting the cloth on which the Child lies may have been suggested by Lavinia Fontana's painting.¹⁶ But whatever his pictorial sources, El Greco has refashioned them into a novel composition characteristic of his mature style. The compact group of figures is placed in an indeterminate outdoor setting, without any clear definition of space, perspective or conventional proportion, their elongated forms modelled in light and colour. The figure of St. Anne, introduced in the position of St. John in Michelangelo's and Lavinia Fontana's compositions, seems to merge with that of the Virgin as she bends down to tend the Child. The Infant Baptist now stands at the other side, a full-length figure stepping forward towards the Child but turning his head away (Fig. 74). It is this figure that, with his

finger to his lips, identifies the theme of El Greco's paintings with that of Michelangelo's "Silenzio," though as an image of St. John it is unlike Michelangelo's or any other. It is a figure that in both versions is imprecise in form but nevertheless gives the impression of a statue rather than of a human child.

That El Greco himself made small clay models to use as studies for his paintings is known from Pacheco, who was shown a collection of these models when he visited him in 1611; and one of them may have served him for his Infant Baptist.¹⁷ But whether he used a clay model, a drawing, or an engraving, the figure has its origin in sculpture. Like Michelangelo's Baptist, it is based on the image of Harpocrates but it is much more closely dependent on visual sources. One of these sources may have been Cartari's *Imagini*, of which he could have known the first illustrated edition, published in Venice in 1571, when he was still in Italy. There (Fig. 75) we find not only a representation of the god of Silence wearing a wolf-skin, but also a figure, much nearer to El Greco's, of an almost naked boy with a finger to his lips, his head turned away from an altar on which stands a statue of Angerona, but holding out towards it a branch of a peach tree. It may not be too far-fetched to suggest that this attribute of Harpocrates (the peach tree was said to be dedicated to him because its leaves resemble the human tongue) explains the bowl of fruit, with peaches, held by El Greco's St. John. The Infant Baptist, it is true, is sometimes represented offering wild fruit to the Infant Christ when he meets the Holy Family on the return from the Flight in Egypt. Here he stands behind the Child, unseen by Him, and enjoining silence with his Harpocratean gesture. If El Greco used the childish metamorphosis of the Egyptian god, gesture and all, to help him form his image of the Baptist, it seems likely that the peaches in the bowl are also a reminder of Harpocrates, even perhaps of the woodcut in Cartari.

The precise roles of woodcut, drawing, engraving, clay model or ancient statue in the formation of the figure of the Infant Baptist are almost impossible to distinguish. On the whole, however, El Greco's St. John represents quite faithfully the kind of figure that was the source of Cartari's illustration, a figure more accurately reproduced in later editions of the *Imagini* (Fig. 76): that is to say, one of the many statues or statuettes that existed in Italy, showing the god of Silence as a naked boy, with his weight on one foot, his head usually aside, and his finger to his lips, with a cornucopia in the other hand (Fig. 77). Little is known about El Greco as a sculptor and nothing at all is known of the models he made for his paintings. But it would not be surprising

if a Greek artist trained in Italy included among these models examples of antique sculpture, such as a Harpocrates figure. Versed as he was in classical literature, El Greco would probably have been familiar with the function of the pagan god as guardian of religion. As an image of Silence, Harpocrates had, moreover, gained wide currency in El Greco's time. Both formally and figuratively this image, then, provided a suitable if not an obvious prototype for his Infant Baptist guarding the mystery of the Christian religion, symbolized by the sleeping Christ Child. That El Greco represented him not merely in the guise of Harpocrates, as Michelangelo did, but as a hardly disguised classical statue is one of the strangest and most singular features of his paintings of the Holy Family.

Notes

1. H. E. Wethey, *El Greco and his School*, Princeton, 1962, II, 59-60, Nos. 87, 88; 189-90, Nos. X-105-X-109, under the heading "Holy Family with St. Anne and the Infant Baptist."

2. The age of St. Joseph when he married the Virgin was a subject of dispute in El Greco's time and the opinion that he was a young man was gaining favour. See E. Mâle, *L'Art Religieux après le Concile de Trent*, Paris, 1951, 315-16.

3. Wethey, 62, No. 93. No. 94, a variant of No. 93, cut down, according to Wethey, so that the figure of the Baptist has been eliminated, may originally have been another version of our subject. On the other hand, it is possible that El Greco painted other compositions of the *Sleeping Christ Child*. Three paintings of "Una imagen con el niño dormido" are listed in the inventory of his possessions at his death, but only one of them is described as including St. Joseph, St. Anne, and St. John Baptist (See F. de B. de San Román y Fernández, *El Greco en Toledo*, Madrid, 1910, 191, 192).

4. See G. Firestone, "The Sleeping Christ Child in the Italian Renaissance," *Marsyas*, II, 1942, 43-62. For further discussion of the subject in Venetian painting and its association with mythological and secular art, see Millard Meiss, "Sleep in Venice, Ancient Myths and Renaissance Proclivities," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, CX, 1966, 348-362. For Spanish examples see the chapter entitled "El niño sueña la cruz" in M. Trens, *Iconografía de la Virgen*, Madrid, 1946, 195-200.

5. Some examples are illustrated in Firestone. See also M. A. Lavin, "Giovannino Battista: A Study in Renaissance Religious Symbolism," *Art Bulletin*, XXXVII, 1955, 99-100 and n. 84; and Supplement, *Art Bulletin*, XLIII, 1961, 324 and n. 27. In two unusual examples, the Infant Baptist is represented asleep, beside the Virgin and Child with St. Anne, "Christ's precursor in death, as well as in life" (Supplement, 324, Figs. 9, 10).

6. See H. Thode, *Michelangelo, Kritische Untersuchungen über seine Werke*, II, Berlin, 1908, 434-39. Thode knew the drawing only from a reproduction and the copies that he lists. It was rediscovered by Cecil Gould: "Some Addenda to Michelangelo Studies. The original Drawing of the 'Madonna del Silenzio,'" *Burlington Magazine*, XCIII, 1951 279-92. See also Charles de Tolnay, *Michelangelo*, V, Princeton, 1960, 65, 193, who dates it, on stylistic grounds, c. 1536-40.

7. For Christian associations of silence, in religious writings and in the liturgy, see I. Cecchetti, "Tibi silentium laus," *Miscellanea liturgica in honorem L. C. Mohlberg*, II, 1949, 521-70. On the "silent" recital of the Canon, see also A. A. King, *Liturgy of the Roman Church*, London, 1957, 429 ff.

8. Firestone, 55, Figs. 35, 38.

9. Karla Langedijk, "Silentium," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, XV, 1964, 3-18, with full bibliographical references. Dr. Langedijk's thesis gives Michelangelo's drawing a much later date than Tolnay's.

10. R. Galli, *Lavinia Fontana*, Imola, 1940, 63, No. 43. A small replica, signed and dated 1591, includes the figure of St. Anne (P. della Pergola, *Galleria Borghese, I Dipinti*, I, Rome, 1955, No. 45, Fig. 44). A replica of this is in the Royal Castle, Stockholm (Photo in the Witt Library, Courtauld Institute, London).

11. L. Dussler, *Sebastiano del Piombo*, Basel, 1942, 136-7, No. 38, Fig. 52. Painted c. 1525, it was seen by Vasari in the collection of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, El Greco's patron, and was probably known to him. From Sebastiano's painting and the gesture of silence in Michelangelo, Annibale Carracci created, c. 1599/1600, a variation on the theme of the Sleeping Christ Child which became famous. See D. Posner, *Annibale Carracci*, London, 1971, I, 109-10; II, No. 122.

12. F. Pacheco, *Arte de la Pintura*, ed. Sánchez Cantón, Madrid, 1956, I, 148. It is described in the list of paintings sent to the Escorial 8 July 1593 as: "Otro lienço al ollio de Nuestra Señora con el niño Jesús hechado, dormido, y sanct Joan niño puesto el dedo en la boca guardandole el sueño con Joseph" (J. Zarco Cuevas, "Inventario," *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, XCVI-VII, 1930, No. 832).

13. José Sigüenza, "Historia de la Orden de San Gerónimo," in F. J. Sánchez Cantón, *Fuentes literarias para la historia del arte español*, Madrid, I, 1923, 423.

14. For example, the engravings by Jacopo Francia (d. 1557), cited by Mâle, 331, as one of the earliest representations of the subject. Reproduced A. M. Hind, *Early Italian Engraving*, VII, London, 1948, Pl. 819 (b). The engraving is also inscribed "IN SOMN[O] MEO REQUIE[SCEREM]" (Job iii:13). Meiss, 361-2, Fig. 59, cites an example of the *Virgin with the Sleeping Christ Child*, by Neri di Bicci, where the Child holds a banner with the inscription "Ego dormio. . . ." He also cites (on page 362) a related inscription on a painting by Tura that is an invocation to the Child to wake so that the process of redemption can unfold. Inscriptions on two of the engravings after Michelangelo's drawing are closer to the meaning of "Ego dormio. . . ." See Thode, 435, No. 4; and an earlier version, dated 1565, inscribed: "Ne excitetis puerum dormientem quidem corpore animo vero vigilantem" (British Museum).

15. Trens, Fig. 116; the other version is in the Wakefield Museum. Langedijk, 17, n. 37, suggests that the Baptist here and in Trens, Fig. 117, fills the role of Harpocrates.

16. El Greco's addition of St. Anne to the group, recalling the much earlier motif of *Anna selbdritt*, may be connected with the growing devotion to the Mother of the Virgin that culminated in her feast being made obligatory in 1584. See Mâle, 347ff.

17. Pacheco, II, 8. Many such models are also listed in El Greco's inventory, though not individually; see Wethey, II, 158.

Concerning the Date of Caravaggio's *Amore Vincitore*

By WARD BISSELL

University of Michigan

Faced with the challenge of finding a painting that was the equal of Caravaggio's *Amore Vincitore*, the Cavaliere who had approached the Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani with the hope of purchasing it quickly realized the futility of his offer.¹ As one of Caravaggio's most stupendous works, the *Amore Vincitore* (Berlin-Dahlem, Staatliche Museen, 1.54 x 1.10 m., Fig. 78) has also been received enthusiastically by contemporary art historians, who have sought with some notable success to possess the picture for what it reveals of the creative process of its artist.² Yet our understanding of this canvas—and of others which can be related to it—is in danger of being undermined by what I take to be increasing uncertainty as to its place within the master's brief career. If the reasoning in this essay is sound, the conclusion must be that the *Amore Vincitore* could only have been painted in the last years of the 1590's.

This proposition is not new, of course. Indeed, at one time Walter Friedlaender was alone among students of Caravaggio's art in assigning a date of 1603 to the *Amore Vincitore*; all others with the exception of Longhi, who insisted upon the impossibly early dates of 1592-1594, judged that the picture belonged to the period of approximately 1598-1599.³ In recent years, however, several scholars have again posited a later dating of *circa* 1602-1603,⁴ introducing a combined total of five major arguments in affirmation of their view: (1) the *Amore* is mentioned in September of 1603 during the course of a libel action brought by Giovanni Baglione against Caravaggio and his friends; (2) the pair of wings which Caravaggio borrowed from Orazio Gentileschi sometime within the six to eight months prior to the libel suit in September of 1603 might well have been used for the *Amore*; (3) Joachim von Sandrart's claim that because of Caravaggio's success with the *Amore* he was again allowed to walk the streets is supported by a legal act of September 25, 1603, which stipulates the terms of Caravaggio's parole from the imprisonment that followed upon the libel charge; (4) the *Amore* is the subject of a verse written in 1603 by Gaspare Murtoia; (5) stylistically the *Amore* belongs about 1602-1603, being close to Caravaggio's first version of *St. Matthew with the Angel* which is believed to have been painted in 1602 (Fig. 79). The particular relevancy of each of these arguments can be discounted or disputed.

The Reference to the Amore Vincitore during the Libel Suit of 1603. On August 28, 1603, the painter Giovanni Baglione, the target of some scurrilous sonnets, brought the charge of libel against Caravaggio, Orazio Gentileschi, Onorio Longhi and Filippo Trisegno.⁵ The verses, which had been circulating in Rome for at least two or three months, and probably since the unveiling on Easter Sunday of Baglione's huge canvas of the *Resurrection* at the Gesù, declare in the most forceful terms that iron shackles around Baglione's feet would be more appropriate than the honorary chain which he wore around his neck. The occasion at which the chain was bestowed upon Baglione was alluded to by the jealous Gentileschi in his testimony of September 14:

I am a friend of all these painters; but there is, actually, a certain rivalry, so to speak, among us. When I placed a painting of the Archangel Michael at San Giovanni de' Fiorentini, [Baglione] appeared as my competitor and placed a *Divine Love* opposite it. This *Divine Love* he had made in order to rival an *Earthly Love* by Michelangelo da Caravaggio, and had dedicated it to Cardinal Giustiniani. Although this painting did not please as much as Michelangelo's did, nonetheless, from what was reported, the Cardinal presented him with a chain. That work had many imperfections as I told him, since he had made an armoured and full-grown man, whereas it should have been a nude child. And thus he then made another one, which was then entirely nude.⁶

This reference to Caravaggio's *Earthly Love*, that is to the *Amore Vincitore* owned by Vincenzo Giustiniani, the Cardinal's brother, obviously supplies the *terminus ante quem* for that picture. Yet analyses of Gentileschi's comments here and of others made by those involved in the libel case demonstrate that under no circumstances could the picture have been executed in 1603 and, in fact, even raise the possibility that the *Amore Vincitore* pre-dates 1601.

First of all, Orazio's remarks indicate indirectly that the artistic and probably personal confrontation between him and Baglione occurred during an exhibition of paintings in the courtyard of San Giovanni Decollato, one of the churches of the Florentines in Rome.⁷ Every year on August 29, the Feast of the Decapitation of St. John the Baptist, festivities were organized at San Giovanni Decollato. Included in the celebration was an exhibition of paintings under the auspices of a member of a prominent Roman family. Important collectors might lend pictures, and artists who were anxious to estab-

lish competitive positions might send their own works. The responsibility for the show here in question obviously fell to Cardinal Benedetto Giustiniani, who had decided to award a chain to the "winner" of the inevitable competition. To Gentileschi's dismay, the prize went to Giovanni Baglione.

The immediate implications of the foregoing for the date of the *Amore Vincitore* are clear. Since the sonnets which mention the chain were in existence several months before the trial began in late August of 1603, the exhibition under consideration could not have taken place later than August 29 of the year before, and thus the picture could not have been begun later than mid-1602. Further evidence corroborates this statement as it raises other issues which bear upon the dating of Caravaggio's canvas. Specifically—The court records reveal that sometime in 1602 Orazio had written to Baglione: "I want you to do something for me—go hang an ox heart from that chain which you wear around your neck, as that would be an ornament befitting your grandeur."⁸ Then, in September of 1603, under questioning by the magistrate, to whom Baglione had secretly given this letter, Gentileschi noted that in the previous year Baglione had gone to Loreto with "la compagnia della Trinità" and had brought back from the shrine some souvenir Madonnas "of the kind that one wears on one's hat."⁹ On Orazio's request, Baglione had sent him two of them, of lead since he was out of the more expensive variety. Baglione apologized for this, hoping that Orazio would prize the Madonnas for their devotional value. Nonetheless Gentileschi, considering this to be an affront to a gentleman of his qualities, replied with his letter which satirizes the chain and which, to Gentileschi's surprise, was suddenly entered as a prime exhibit for the prosecution.

The question has now become: Was the particular *mostra* held earlier than August 29 of 1602 (of course one would have to move back one year at a time)? The answer must depend upon a specific identification of the Company of the Trinity and upon a determination of when in 1602 it took its (annual?) pilgrimage to Loreto, allowing too, enough time before the *mostra* of that year for the exchange of correspondence between Baglione and Gentileschi. My research into the problem suggests strongly, though certainly not conclusively, that Gentileschi's reference is to the Confraternity of the SS. Trinità dei Pellegrini, whose pilgrimage to Loreto would logically fall between March 25 (The Feast of the Annunciation and the date of one of the five major celebrations at Loreto) and the Feast of the Trinity in late May, a period of considerable activity for the Confraternity.¹⁰

If this proves to have been the case, the exhibition at San Giovanni Decollato which is of concern here need not have been held any later than August of 1601. Yet, in my opinion it could not have taken place earlier than that. This conclusion is dictated by the painting which Baglione exhibited, the *Divine Love* (also Berlin-Dahlem, Staatliche Museen, 1.79 x 1.18 m., Fig. 80), which in its pseudo-Caravaggesque manner represents an advance over Baglione's *Sts. Peter and Paul* of 1600 for Santa Cecilia in Trastevere, but which is stylistically compatible with his *Ecstasy of St. Francis* of 1601 (Chicago, Private Collection).¹¹

Yet what of Caravaggio's picture? It must be emphasized that while the date of the *mostra* might provide an approximate date for the paintings of Baglione and Gentileschi, it by no means need do so for the *Amore Vincitore*. A further consideration of Gentileschi's account of the competition should bear this out. Caravaggio's masterpiece was commissioned directly by the Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani, as Baglione and Sandrart said and as Enggass has demonstrated.¹² Baglione, for reasons to be explored shortly, was aware that Cardinal Benedetto Giustiniani was to be in charge of the next art show at San Giovanni Decollato. What better choice than a *Divine Love*, painted in the newest manner and dedicated to Vincenzo's brother? This seems sufficient to explain what Gentileschi meant by the rivalry between Baglione and Caravaggio. Now Gentileschi produced a *St. Michael*. Since, as has often been observed, the *Divine Love* is extraordinarily like an archangel, Orazio believed that Baglione was attempting to compete with him, especially after Baglione set up his canvas so as to encourage comparison. If as is likely, given Gentileschi's penchant for repeating basic compositional types, the *St. Michael* resembled that of Orazio's later version of the theme (Farnese, San Salvatore, 2.78 x 1.92 m., Fig. 81),¹³ the intensity of the competition can be fully appreciated. Not only are the artist's depictions of the devil closely related, but in both canvases the main figures were undoubtedly based upon an ancient statue of a gladiator (Fig. 82) owned by the Giustiniani!¹⁴ It is virtually certain, then, that Baglione and Gentileschi were aware of what the other was doing, and were cognizant also of Cardinal Giustiniani's role as sponsor of the forthcoming *mostra*.

There is no reason to believe, however, that Caravaggio's *Amore Vincitore* appeared in the exhibition. It is questionable whether a painting of such blatant sensuality, designed for private consumption alone, could have been displayed in these years in the cloister of a church. Moreover, Gentileschi does

not say that it was. To be sure, he commented that Baglione had received the chain even though his picture “did not please as much as Michelangelo’s did.” But clearly he could not have said that Baglione’s picture “did not please as much as mine did,” and thereby incriminate himself as one of the poets. Indeed, so that any criticism that he might have made would appear to be above suspicion, he added that Baglione had followed his advice, and even insinuated that his knowledge that the chain had come from Cardinal Giustiniani was from secondary sources.

To summarize this section: On August 29 of 1602 or, most probably, of 1601, Gentileschi and Baglione sent works to an art show in the courtyard of San Giovanni Decollato. Neither of these canvases could have been begun later than about June of the year of the show, and Baglione’s picture was done in full knowledge of Caravaggio’s *Amore Vincitore*. The *Amore Vincitore* in turn, which was surely not painted with the *mostra* in view, could thus conceivably have existed a considerable time before the 1601/1602 terminus.

The Pair of Wings. On September 14, 1603, Gentileschi told the court: “It must be six or eight months since I have spoken with Caravaggio, although he sent to my house for a Capuchin’s frock, which I lent him, and for a pair of wings, which frock he returned to my house about ten days ago.”¹⁵ Since the *Amore Vincitore* was not painted in 1603, the borrowed wings could not have been used for it. Orazio’s comment suggests that as of September, 1603, Caravaggio might still have had the wings in his possession. And the simultaneous mention of the wings and a Capuchin habit intimates that in 1603 Caravaggio was working on another canvas of *St. Francis and an Angel*.

Sandart’s Statement and the Legal Act of September 25, 1603. “Because of this picture [*Amore Vincitore*],” says Sandart, “it came about that Caravaggio was again permitted to go about the streets and behave as a free man.”¹⁶ On September 25, 1603, upon the urging of the French Ambassador, the Governor of Rome signed Caravaggio’s release from the prison where he had been since Baglione’s charge. Friedlaender linked the two statements, but as the *Amore* does not belong to the year 1603, this is impossible.¹⁷ Sandart may have had in mind another one of Caravaggio’s several dealings with the law, the first recorded one being November 19, 1600.¹⁸

Murtola’s Rime of 1603. It has been claimed that a verse concerning Caravaggio’s picture is included by Gaspare Murtola in his *Rime . . . cioè sonetti, gli occhi, le lacrime, i pallori, i nei, i baci, le veneri, gli amori ecc.*, the dedication page of which is dated “di Venetia il 16 di lug. 1603.”¹⁹ In actual fact,

Murtola composed four madrigals (473-476) on *L'Amore, pittura del Caravaggio*, but it was not the *Amore Vincitore* owned by Giustiniani which inspired them. Of the four rhymes, the last indicates to the painter how Love should be depicted (specifically as "il pargoletto e vago Giulietto"), and asks him to think upon how languidly the sweet child sleeps. The first two reveal only that the figure had wings and arrows, and that it was rendered with fresh and vivacious colors. It is the third of the verses which is conclusive. There Murtola insists that "Love is neither blind nor nude as you have painted him, as you have feigned him, painter" ("Non è cieco, nè nudo / Amor come il dipingi / Non pittor come il fingi") and, drawing upon his own amorous experiences, proceeds to explain why to him Love simply does not exist in that guise. The reference, then, is to a now-lost early painting which depicted a closed-eyed or blindfolded Cupid, probably belonging to Cardinal del Monte, not to Giustiniani, since the lines written to it are followed by *madrigali* on the *Fortune Teller* and the *Head of the Medusa*, both then in del Monte's collection.²⁰

The Stylistic Position of the Amore Vincitore with Respect to Other Works by Caravaggio, including the first St. Matthew. The recent attempts to seek a date for the *Amore* on the basis of external evidence, including that first introduced by Friedlaender, have been made with a certain disregard for the picture's stylistic character. With the "documentation" now invalidated, we are free again, ironically, to re-consider the position which the *Amore Vincitore* occupies in the evolution of Caravaggio's style. In this regard, its unquestionable relationship to the so-called *St. John the Baptist* in the Capitoline Museum (Fig. 83) is crucial.²¹ Both paintings represent smiling youths, perhaps even the same model,²² who in their nudity confront the viewer with unabashed directness. The smooth, solid modelling of the flesh and the precise rendering of the textures of cloth, feathers and accompanying objects, combine with the overt expressions to produce an extraordinarily aggressive physicality. Needless to say, the poses, the manner in which the *Amore's* wing flicks against his leg, and the youth's action in embracing the lamb, are sexually suggestive. In their erotic overtones alone, these paintings cannot be separated by too great a span of time from such earlier works as the *Uffizi Bacchus* and the *Boy Bitten by a Lizard*. Furthermore, and for whatever reasons, the forms of both youths were adapted from Michelangelo.²³ Caravaggio's two paintings were specifically linked in the mind of at least one 17th-century personality, Francesco Scanelli.²⁴ Friedlaender found the stylistic relationships between

the *St. John* and the *Amore Vincitore* to be “very strong.”²⁵ So also did Mahon, who has dated both to the years 1598-1599.²⁶

This, in my opinion, is precisely where they belong. In an indirect way Bellori assigned the *St. John* to this period by placing it in the stage during which Caravaggio “had begun to deepen his shadows,” at a time when he was “day by day making himself more known for the method of coloring which he was introducing.”²⁷ To my knowledge, no scholar has assigned the *St. John* in the Capitoline Museum to the years after 1600, and the playfulness of both it and the *Amore* is inconceivable after the pictures of 1600-1601 for Santa Maria del Popolo.²⁸

In dating the *Amore Vincitore* to circa 1598-1599, I realize that I am in particular conflict with Herwarth Röttgen, who places it in 1602 on the basis of its stylistic similarities to Caravaggio's first version of *St. Matthew and the Angel* for the Contarelli Chapel in San Luigi dei Francesi, which Röttgen believes was executed in 1602 (having previously accepted the usual date of 1598).²⁹ There is little doubt but that the *Amore* and the first *St. Matthew* belong to approximately the same phase of Caravaggio's development. The disagreement, then, involves the date of the latter picture. Röttgen, whose views on the matter are well known, believes that the contract for the altarpiece which Caravaggio signed on February 7, 1602, was for the first *St. Matthew*, which the artist agreed to complete before Pentecost, while the final payment of September 22, 1602, was for the second *St. Matthew*.³⁰ Quite aside from what I find to be irreconcilable differences in style, and the fact that the first *St. Matthew* does not fit at all comfortably after Caravaggio's lateral canvases for the Contarelli and Cerasi Chapels, there are other major objections to Röttgen's thesis. For example, the belief that Caravaggio respected the terms of his initial contract for the altarpiece is more optimistic than logical; he was one-half year later in delivering the paintings for the walls of the Contarelli Chapel and again for the Cerasi Chapel. Secondly, Bellori comments that the first *St. Matthew* was “the first of his works displayed in a church.”³¹ It seems wholly unlikely that Bellori would mistakenly claim that the picture was Caravaggio's first public commission had it been painted after the two canvases for San Luigi dei Francesi (which Bellori subsequently describes) and the two for Santa Maria del Popolo (which he later mentions). Bellori either knew that it was not, or judged on the basis of its style that it could not have been. Thirdly, as Röttgen was the first to argue, the angel in the first *St. Matthew* was adapted from Giuseppe Cesari's *St. Barbara*, which was unveiled at Santa

Maria in Traspontina on September 29, 1597.³² And the prophet which Cesari painted at the right in the right compartment of the Contarelli vault was, I think, a major source for Caravaggio's figure of St. Matthew, especially as regards the placement of the hands. In 1598, at the beginning of his "public" career, confronted with the prospect of producing a monumental religious painting and with Cesari's vault frescoes and recently executed *St. Barbara* fresh in his mind, Caravaggio might be expected to have employed such borrowings. In 1602, however, having firmly established his reputation, with some major religious paintings behind him, and protective of his own manner, he might scarcely have remembered the *St. Barbara* and, in any case, would have consciously transformed beyond recognition any derivations from his Roman contemporaries.

Speaking of the necessity of seeking firm dates for Caravaggio's pictures, Mahon has commented: "A difference of a few years one way or another . . . would hardly be material in nine cases out of ten; but in that of Caravaggio, a short-lived genius with a restlessly experimental mind, it is essential to both understanding and connoisseurship as it is controversial."³³

Notes

1. The story is told by Joachim von Sandrart, *Academie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste von 1675*, ed. Peltzer, Munich, 1925, 277.

2. See particularly W. Friedlaender, *Caravaggio Studies*, Princeton, N.J., 1955, 91-94; and R. Enggass, "L'Amore Giustiniani del Caravaggio," *Palatino*, XI, 1967, 13-20, where a level of the painting's meaning as *Omnia vincit Vincentius* is ingeniously revealed.

3. Friedlaender, 93-94, 182-183. The uniqueness of Friedlaender's position was immediately noted by D. Mahon, *Artists in 17th-Century Rome* (Wildenstein), London, 1955, 22.

4. H. Röttgen, "Die Stellung der Contarelli-Kapelle in Caravaggios Werk," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, XXVII, 1965, 61, 64; Enggass, 14; A. Moir, *The Italian Followers of Caravaggio*, Cambridge, Mass., 1967, I, 31, n. 38; M. Kitson, *The Complete Paintings of Caravaggio*, London, 1969, 7, 96.

5. The specifics of the litigation have been accessible since the publication of S. Samek Ludovici, *Vita del Caravaggio dalle testimonianze del suo tempo*, Milan, 1956, esp. 145-166 (147-148 for Baglione's opening statement). This text was not available to Friedlaender, who thus had to rely upon the incomplete and often inaccurate transcriptions of A. Bertolotti, *Artisti lombardi a Roma nei secoli XV, XVI e XVII*, Milan, 1881,

II, 18, 50-76. V. Martinelli ("L'Amor divino 'tutto ignudo' di Giovanni Baglione e la cronologia dell'intermezzo caravaggesco," *Arte antica e moderna*, No. 5, 1959, 84ff.) has discussed the libel action in detail but with certain misunderstandings which will be noted below.

6. Samek Ludovici, 158-159: "Io sono amico de tutti questi pittori, ma c'è bene una certa concorrenza fra noi, come a dire, che havendo'io messo un quadro di S. Michele Arcangelo a S. Giovanni de Fiorentini, lui [Baglione] se mostrò mio concorrente e ne mise un altro all'incontro che era un Amor devino che lui haveva fatto a concorrenza d'un Amor terreno de Michelangelo da Caravaggio; quale Amor devino lui l'haveva dedicato al cardinale Giustiniano, et se bene dicto quadro non piacque quanto quello de Michelangelo, nondimeno per quanto s'intese, esso cardinale gli donò una collana: quale quadro haveva molte imperfezioni che io gli dissi che aveva fatto un huomo grande e armato che voleva esser nudo e putto et così lui se ne fece poi un altro quale era poi tutto ignudo."

7. My understanding of the exhibitions at San Giovanni Decollato is derived from information supplied by: G. Celio, *Memoria delli nomi dell'artefici delle pitture che sono in alcune chiese . . . di Roma*, ed. E. Zocca, Milan, 1967, 17, 60, n. 99; P. Totti, *Ritratto di Roma moderna*, Rome, 1638, 161; G. Bottari and S. Ticozzi, *Raccolta di lettere*, Milan, 1822, I, 457, and V, 324; L. Ozzòla, "Nota dei quadri che stettero in mostra nel cortile di S. Giovanni Decollato a Roma nel 1736," *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria*, XXXVII, 1914, 637; L. Salerno, "The Picture Gallery of Vincenzo Giustiniani," *Burlington Magazine*, CII, 1960, 22, 103; F. Haskell, *Patrons and Painters*, N.Y., 1963, 127-128. Martinelli, 88, 95, n. 25, mistakenly, though understandably, searched for information in the archives of the other Florentine church in Rome, that which is indeed more properly called San Giovanni de'Fiorentini.

8. From a letter addressed to him by Gentileschi which Baglione produced in court on September 13. Transcribed by Bertolotti, II, 61-62, but omitted by Samek Ludovici. See also R. and M. Wittkower, *Born Under Saturn*, New York, 1969, 198-199.

9. Samek Ludovici, 160ff.

10. The Confraternity of the Santissima Trinità dei Pellegrini is the only Confraternity of the Trinity which is discussed (425-427) by M. Maroni Lumbroso and A. Martini in their densely documented book, *Le confraternite romane nelle loro chiese*, Rome, 1963. See also P. Totti, 207-209.

11. Martinelli, especially 87-89, has dated to 1603 the *Divine Love* in the Berlin Museum, and argues that this is not the painting for which Baglione received the chain. The "prize" picture, in Martinelli's view, was dedicated to Benedetto Giustiniani in late 1601 or early 1602 and is, specifically, the *Divine Love* formerly in the Italian Embassy at Berlin and now in the Palazzo Corsini at Rome. Unfortunately, Martinelli was not aware of the circumstances under which the pictures were exhibited. The question as to how the Giustiniani came to own both of Baglione's allegorical pictures, as Baglione himself says they did (*Le vite de' pittori, scultori et architetti*, Rome, 1642, 403), cannot be explored here.

12. Baglione, 137; Sandrart, 276; for Enggass, see note 2 above.

13. Neither Schleier, who discovered the canvas at Farnese, nor I believe that it is to be identified as the *St. Michael* which Gentileschi exhibited. For the arguments see E.

Schleier, "Panico, Gentileschi, and Lanfranco at San Salvatore in Farnese," *Art Bulletin*, LII, 1970, 172-173.

14. It is engraved as Pl. 117 in Vol. I of *Galleria Giustiniana del Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani*, Rome, 1631. J. Hess in his *Kunstgeschichtliche Studien zu Renaissance und Barock*, Rome, 1967, I, Addendum, 393, saw the Giustiniani statue as a possible source for certain details in Baglione's painting.

15. Samek Ludovici, 159.

16. Sandrart, 277.

17. Friedlaender, 183; Enggass (14, 19, n. 9), while strongly inclined to accept Friedlaender's dating of 1603, questioned Friedlaender's conclusion regarding Sandrart's statement; and Friedlaender himself, in another place (229), characterized Sandrart's biography of Caravaggio as "extremely confused and inexact."

18. Bertolotti, II, 50.

19. A. Ottino della Chiesa, *Tout l'oeuvre peint du Caravage*, Milan and Paris, 1967, 93; and by Kitson, *The Complete Paintings of Caravaggio*, 96, who uses this "fact" to support his belief that as of 1603 the *Amore Vincitore* was a "recent work." I am grateful to Prof. Luigi Salerno for providing me with transcriptions of the *Rime* in question. See also L. Salerno, "Poesia e simboli nel Caravaggio: I dipinti emblematici," *Palatino*, X, 1966, 107, 111, 117, n. 4.

20. Del Monte's taste for the iconography of Love is attested to by Baglione (136), who says that Caravaggio painted for that Cardinal a *Divine Love Overcoming the Profane*.

21. For full discussions of the Capitoline *St. John* see Mahon, 20-24; and L. Salerno in G. Mancini, *Considerazioni sulla pittura*, Rome, 1957, II, 115-116, n. 891. Also H. Röttgen, "Caravaggio-Probleme," *Münchener Jahrbuch der Bildenden Kunst*, 3rd series, XX, 1969, 168, n. 66.

22. Suggested by R. Jullian, *Caravage*, Lyon and Paris, 1961, 94, who also reasoned that the libel suit of 1603 provided no more than a *terminus ante quem* to the execution of the *Amore Vincitore*.

23. Friedlaender, 89-92; E. Benkard, *Caravaggio-Studien*, Berlin, 1928, 164. A print after the *Ignudo* above Michelangelo's *Persian Sibyl* was, I think, Caravaggio's immediate source.

24. Francesco Scanelli, *Il microcosmo della pittura*, 1657, from R. Longhi, "Alcuni pezzi rari nell'antologia della critica caravaggesca," *Paragone*, No. 17, 1951, 53-54.

25. Friedlaender, 170, where, in a curious moment of inconsistency, the *St. John* is dated "around 1600."

26. Mahon, 21.

27. Pietro Bellori, *Le vite de' pittori, scultori et architetti moderni*, Rome, 1672, 204.

28. The attributed *St. John the Baptist* in the Galleria Doria-Pamphili at Rome, identical in composition to the Capitoline example, has sometimes been dated to 1600 or 1601 because of its deeper chiaroscuro and somewhat freer handling. However, a recent restora-

tion of the Doria picture has considerably reduced the differences between the two versions.

29. H. Röttgen, "Giuseppe Cesari, die Contarelli-Kapelle und Caravaggio," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, XXVII, 1964, 216, 220ff.; "Die Stellung" (note 4 above), 54ff.; and "Caravaggio-Probleme" (note 21 above), 143ff. I have no desire to minimize the importance of Röttgen's many contributions to our understanding of Caravaggio's art, and thus must apologize for the sketchy and incomplete manner in which, by necessity, the counter-arguments are presented. I have, however, given some thought to the entire problem, with the considerable help of Mr. Norman R. Parks, a graduate student at the University of Michigan, who is preparing a detailed study on this topic.

30. P. Rotondi, "Una nuova proposta per il Caravaggio nella Cappella Contarelli," *Bollettino dell'Istituto Centrale del Restauro*, Rome, 1966 (publ. in 1968), espec. 24ff., finds the dating of 1602 for the first *St. Matthew* to be "inconfutabile," although he would relate the payment of September 22 to it, and the carpenter's report of February 1603 (discovered by J. Bousquet, "Documents inédits sur Caravage," *Revue des arts*, III, 1953, 105) to the second *St. Matthew*.

31. Bellori, 205-206.

32. Röttgen, "Giuseppe Cesari," 219ff.

33. Mahon, 22.

A Late Painting by Giovanni Battista Caracciolo: *The Judgement of Solomon**

By MICHAEL STOUGHTON
University of Minnesota

When Caravaggio fled from Rome to Naples in 1606, Giovanni Battista Caracciolo (1575/80-1635)¹ was presumably already an established artist working in the late-Mannerist tradition that extended well into the 17th century in Naples.² However, with Caravaggio's arrival, Caracciolo was among the first of the Neapolitans to assimilate the realism and *chiaroscuro* light effects and, more importantly, to grasp adequately the significance of Caravaggio's art. After a period of experimentation when Mannerist ambiguities in pose or lack of finesse in handling light and shade occur (for example, in the *Madonna and Child with St. John the Baptist*, Naples, Museo di S. Martino; the *St. Joseph with the Christ Child*, Lausanne, Musée Cantonal des Beaux-Arts; and the *Christ Carrying the Cross*, Naples, Quadreria dei Gerolamini), Caracciolo produced masterpieces such as the *Liberation of St. Peter* (1615, Naples, Monte della Misericordia) and *Christ Washing the Feet of the Disciples* (1622, Naples, Certosa di San Martino) which both in style and content mark him as one of the most faithful of the *caravaggisti*.

Nonetheless, it should also be noted that late in his career Caracciolo painted numerous works in which realism gave way to more generalized figure types and intense *chiaroscuro* softened with a more even distribution of light and shade. This change in style is noted by De Dominici, Caracciolo's biographer, who writes: "E la dipinse con dolcissimo, anzi vago colorito; usando in questa pittura più tosto maniera chiara, che la sua solita oscura . . . quasi volesse imitare la maniera Guidesca."³ The specific painting to which De Dominici refers is the *Assumption of the Virgin*, 1631⁴ (formerly the altarpiece, Chapel of the Assumption, Certosa di San Martino), an important work in a discussion of Caracciolo's *oeuvre* because it is his last securely dated painting and also one of the first produced during the final phase of his career, a period which lasted from around 1630 until his death in 1635. The *Assump-*

* The paintings of Caracciolo are the subject of my doctoral dissertation (University of Michigan). A Ford Foundation Fellowship administered through the Rackham School of Graduate studies (1968-69) and a Kress Foundation travel grant (Summer 1970) made research in Italy possible.

tion reveals the direction in which his art had turned, a stylistic evolution which culminated in such pictures as the *Judgement of Solomon* (Fig. 84).⁵

No documents for the *Judgement* have come to light; neither is a painting of this subject mentioned by the early writers. However, there can be no doubt that it is by Caracciolo because of the many hallmarks of his style incorporated in it. The use of a repoussoir figure (boy holding a silver urn seated in the immediate foreground) is almost a constant in Caracciolo's *oeuvre* as are the upraised shoulders of the executioner, the soldier, and one of the harlots. Even the somewhat ambiguous placement of the old man at Solomon's right recalls Caracciolo's early difficulty in arranging certain figures.

Stylistically, there are telling similarities between the *Assumption* and the *Judgement* (the latter probably dating from shortly after 1631). In contrast with earlier works, there is in these two the same lighter tonality with a more general illumination. In particular, the faces of the two harlots and body of the child have the same softness of modeling found in the face of the Virgin and her attendant cherubs.⁶

Compositionally, the *Judgement* is closely related to a fresco in the Certosa di S. Martino, *St. Januarius Restoring Sight to Timothy*, one of a series of the life and martyrdom of St. Januarius in the vault of the chapel dedicated to one of the protectors of the city of Naples.⁷ Timothy, the Roman Governor responsible for condemning the Saint to death, is seated on a raised throne facing Januarius and accompanied by a soldier in armor and a bald, bearded man; all three are very similar to the corresponding participants in the *Judgement*. The compositional link between the two works is further strengthened by a drawing of a *Soldier with Heads of Two Other Figures* (Fig. 85),⁸ which, however, is more closely related to the *Judgement* for both soldiers have one arm akimbo and the old man inclines his head at the same angle. The study represents an intermediate step between the composition of the *Judgement* and that of the fresco which is probably earlier. In the *Judgement*, the soldier takes on a significant role as the transitional figure between Solomon on his throne flanked by the prescribed lions at the right⁹ and the group of executioner, harlots and children at the left.

The *Judgement of Solomon* stands as a prime example of Caracciolo's shift from the initial impetus of Caravaggio toward a more classicizing style. This is perhaps surprising if we recall that Caravaggio's influence lingered longer in Naples than in any other place in Italy or that Caracciolo was working in a milieu where artistic theory was of little consequence. On the other

hand, painters there were not immune to outside influences. For example, Reni had been to Naples in 1612 and produced some works there a decade later, Domenichino was principally in Naples from 1630 until his death in 1641, and the impact of Vouet must have been felt through his two altarpieces of the 1620's which were in the city.¹⁰ Caracciolo himself had travelled at least to Rome and Florence,¹¹ and the change in his style is also witnessed in the work of other Neapolitans at about the same time. From this point, *c.* 1630, Caracciolo's importance as leader of the local *Caravaggisti* waned as Naples was drawn into the main stream of Baroque painting.

Notes

1. Because baptisms were generally not recorded in Naples before very late in the sixteenth century, it is unlikely that Caracciolo's birth date can ever be established with certainty. The earliest known date we have for him is 1598 when he married (unpublished document, Archivio Arcivescovile, Naples, *Matrimonii*, 1598) and on the assumption that he could have been around 20 years old at that time, perhaps he was born *c.* 1575/80. The year of Caracciolo's death, 1635 (not 1637, the commonly accepted date), can be determined from an examination of his last testament and accompanying notarial papers in the Archivio di Stato, Naples (Notaio Diego De Crescenzo, *Testamenti sciolti*, Scheda 193, XXVI).

2. No paintings by Caracciolo before he came under the influence of Caravaggio have been identified. His earliest dated work, the frescoes of *Cherubs* on the exterior façade of Monte della Pietà in Naples, executed in 1601, has been almost completely cancelled by the elements.

3. Bernardo De Dominici, *Vite dei pittori, scultori, ed architetti napoletani*, Naples, II, 1743, 283.

4. Reproduced in Alfred Moir, *The Italian Followers of Caravaggio*, Cambridge, 1967, II, Fig. 201. The picture was in the Museo di Capodimonte for a while and is now located in the chapel of the Palazzo Reale. The document of payment (251 ducats) was published by Nunzio F. Faraglia, "Notizie di alcuni artisti che lavorarono nella chiesa di S. Martino sopra Napoli," *Archivio storico per le province napoletane*, XVII, 1892, 660-61.

5. I Kings iii:16-28. Oil on canvas, 1.97 x 2.65 meters. I am grateful to the Marchesa Serlupi Crescenzi for the photograph of and permission to publish the picture in her collection at the Villa le Fontanelle, Florence. It was purchased in Rome shortly before Roberto Longhi saw it in the family's palace in Rome ("Ultimi studi sul Caravaggio e la sua cerchia," *Proporzioni*, I, 1943, 45; mentioned and dated *c.* 1620-25, which is somewhat too early). It had been folded horizontally and vertically and was relined during restoration at the time of acquisition. Restored again in 1968, it appears to be in good condition

except for the awkward right hand and arm to the elbow of the upper of the two harlots. This area was damaged and has been repainted.

6. The faces of the harlots are remarkably close in physiognomy to the similarly late *St. Barbara* (Barcelona, Collection Milicua) and *Unidentified Female Saint* (San Sebastián, Museo de San Telmo) published by Alfonso Pérez-Sánchez, *Pittura italiana del s. XVII en España*, Madrid, 1965, 381, Figs. 127a and b.

7. The entire ceiling is reproduced by Roberto Longhi, "Battistello," *Scritti giovanili*, Florence, 1961, II, Fig. 96. (The article was first published in *L'arte*, XVIII, 1915, 58-75, 120-37.) Dating the decorations in the chapel of St. Januarius presents a problem. The commission document for *Christ Washing the Feet of the Disciples* (1622, Faraglia, 660) provides also for the frescoes in a chapel *difora* (i.e., away from the choir where the *Washing* was to be located). Although it is not certain, the reference is probably to the chapel of St. Januarius and not to that of the Assumption, also decorated by Caracciolo. For stylistic reasons, I believe the project extended over a long period. The two lateral oils and the oil sketches (Museo di San Martino, Naples) for the four frescoes of the vault are executed with strong *chiaroscuro*, and date from 1622 or shortly thereafter. The style of the altarpiece, *St. Januarius and Other Bishop Saints* (now in the chapel of the Rosary in the same church), is clearly later, and similar to that of the *Judgement of Solomon* and *Assumption of the Virgin*.

8. Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (1748/1863). 179 x 251 mm., black chalk with touches of white on gray-green paper. Alfred Moir, "Some Caracciolo Drawings in Stockholm," *The Art Bulletin*, LII, 1970, 181, Fig. 12; and Walter Vitzthum, *Disegni dei maestri*, IX, *Il barocco a Napoli e nell'Italia meridionale*, Milan, 1971, Fig. 1; Moir, 185, associates the drawing with the fresco in question.

9. I Kings x:19. Caracciolo treated Solomon in a similar fashion in his fresco, part of a large cycle, in the chapel of the Immaculate Conception, San Diego dell'Ospedaletto, Naples, also from this late period.

10. See: Ferdinando Bologna, "Un documento napoletano per Guido Reni," *Paragone*, XI, No. 129, 1960, 54-56; Rudolf Wittkower, *Art and Architecture in Italy: 1600 to 1750*, 2nd ed., Baltimore, 1965, 230-32; Moir, *The Italian Followers*, I, 153ff.

11. He was called to Florence in 1617. See Evelina Borea, *Caravaggio e caravaggeschi nelle gallerie di Firenze*, Florence, 1970, 10-11. He was also a member of the Accademia di San Luca, Rome, although the date of membership is uncertain. Melchior Missirini (*Memorie per servire . . .*, Rome, 1823, 464) published the now-lost document, but his date, 1596, is erroneous.

Pen Drawings by Herrera the Younger

By JONATHAN BROWN

Institute of Fine Arts, New York University

The process of sifting and sorting that occurs during the study of a major artist often serves as well to bring his pupils and followers into prominence. Harold Wethey's definition of the artistic personality of Sebastián de Herrera Barnuevo, which resulted from his monograph on Alonso Cano, is a classic example of this process.¹ Through Wethey's researches, Cano's follower recovered an *oeuvre*, an identity, and a high place in the history of Spanish Baroque art. Thus Herrera Barnuevo's work can be separated not only from Cano's but also from that of a contemporary who shared his versatility as painter, architect and draftsman, and part of his name—Francisco de Herrera, the Younger. Because he is an important but relatively unknown artist, it may be helpful to begin by reconstructing his biography before considering his personality as a draftsman.

Only a few documented facts have been discovered about Herrera's life and works.² Palomino, who knew the artist, is the most important source of knowledge on Herrera, although his account is the usual potpourri of fact and fiction. According to Palomino, Herrera was born in Seville in 1622, a plausible date for the event. His father was Francisco de Herrera, the Elder, a fine but uneven painter who was as renowned for his bad temper as for his art. In Palomino's biographical sketch, it was the elder Herrera's irascibility that drove his son to escape to Rome, where he spent a long period of time. Though this Italian sojourn has never been documented, it does not seem reasonable that Palomino would have invented it. During his stay in Rome, Herrera was supposed to have studied architecture and to have been a still-life painter. Later Herrera was to practice architecture, but no still-lives have yet been convincingly attributed to him.³ The date of his return to Seville is uncertain. Palomino states that it coincided with his father's death, which has usually been placed in 1657. However, there is now reason to believe that the elder Herrera died on December 29, 1654.⁴ If the son chose this moment to come back to Seville, there is no record of it. But a few years later there is a documented work, *The Stigmatization of Saint Francis*, which was installed in the chapel of Saint Francis in the Seville Cathedral in June 1657.⁵ Another work from the same time is *The Glorification of the Eucharist and the Immaculate Conception* in the Sala de Juntas of the Hermandad del Santísimo,

adjoining the Cathedral. These two paintings, especially the *Saint Francis*, reveal Herrera as a mature, accomplished master of a dynamic Italianate Baroque style, and it has been suggested that Herrera's example was a catalyst for the development of Murillo's later style.⁸ On January 11, 1660 these two painters became the founding co-presidents of a drawing academy that was established in the Lonja;⁷ perhaps Herrera, with his experience of Italian academies, was a moving force behind the project. The nomination as co-president with Murillo indicates that Herrera enjoyed considerable prestige in his native city. Furthermore, his reputation also had spread to the court. Lázaro Díaz del Valle mentions Herrera briefly but favorably in his notes.⁸ Herrera must have been eager to capitalize on his renown, because he seems to have gone to Madrid soon after the academy was established. In November 1660, Murillo appears alone as president while Herrera is missing even from the membership roster. Presumably he had departed for Madrid in search of the greater glory of the royal court, where he was ultimately to make his mark as a painter and architect.

There are only a few fixed points in his career during the 1660's; according to a statement in his last will and testament he executed a catafalque on the occasion of the death of Anne of Austria in 1666.⁹ In addition, there is a drawing of Charles II and his mother in the Albertina, dated 1668.¹⁰ However, according to Palomino, Herrera was busy as a painter in oil and fresco. Shortly after his arrival in Madrid, he executed *The Triumph of Saint Hermenegild* (Fig. 86) which Ceán Bermúdez saw on the main staircase of the monastery of the Carmelitas Descalzos; it is the only surviving painting from the 1660s that can be dated with reasonable certainty. Another commission that came in the early 1660's was a fresco (1664; destroyed) of *The Assumption of the Virgin* in Nuestra Señora de Atocha, where the two Herreras crossed paths. Palomino recounts an anecdote in which Herrera Barnuevo recommended Herrera the Younger to Philip IV for the job. The loss of this fresco is particularly regrettable because Herrera painted the Apostles standing behind an illusionistic balustrade at the base of the dome, proof that he had mastered the complexities of Baroque fresco painting during his Italian period. Besides this work, Palomino credits him with paintings in San Felipe el Real in the church of the Agustinos Recoletos and in the chapel of Nuestra Señora de los Siete Dolores in the Colegio de Santo Tomás. None of these works survives, though a drawing in the Prado is perhaps a preliminary study for *The Triumph of the Cross* in the Colegio de Santo Tomás.¹¹ Palomino also men-

tions two Passion scenes in the same chapel which may be identified with the *Ecce Homo* and the *Road to Calvary* in the Museo Cerralbo, Madrid. The only paintings by Herrera in Madrid that remain in their original location are the five pictures in an altar in the convent of Corpus Christi (Las Carboneras).¹² Other known works include *St. Peter* in the Prado; a fragmentary ceiling painting in the Museo Cerralbo; and *Saint Nicholas of Tolentino*, *Saint Theresa*, and *The Education of the Virgin*, all in the Museo, Gerona. To this handful of paintings may be added an important canvas in The Chrysler Museum, Norfolk, Virginia—*The Dream of Joseph*, which was originally in the chapel of San José in the Colegio de Santo Tomás.¹³ Even from this small *oeuvre* it is possible to see the quality of Herrera as a dynamic Baroque painter, whose influence on the late Baroque style in Madrid, as Pérez Sánchez has also observed, must have been considerable.¹⁴

As a result of his bold talent, Herrera was drawn into the orbit of the royal court, though his status there during the 1660's is unclear. According to Ceán Bermúdez, he was appointed as *pintor del rey* by Philip IV, which would date his royal service before 1664. And in a document of July 30, 1670 he is referred to as "*pintor de su magd.*"¹⁵ However, the document which appointed Herrera to a vacant place as a court painter is dated November 1672, which would seem to preclude an earlier appointment to the position.¹⁶ Nevertheless, there is evidence that Herrera was employed by the court before 1672—namely, the previously mentioned catafalque of 1666 for the body of Anne of Austria. This commission, however, might have been done on a free-lance basis. Just prior to his court appointment, Herrera executed his sole surviving print, the engraved titlepage for Torre Farfán's sumptuous festival book published in Seville in 1671.¹⁷ It is a masterly work which seems to indicate previous experience of the medium, though no other prints have come to light.

Herrera's activity during the 1670's is better documented, but it is difficult to identify any paintings of the period, perhaps because, as Palomino states, he gradually abandoned this art in favor of architecture. In 1674, he designed the retablo for the church of the Hospital de Montserrat (destroyed in 1903) and during the next three years supervised its construction by José Rates and José Churriguera, whose name now designates the style of Baroque decoration that Herrera helped to invent.¹⁸ He also designed, at an unknown date, the altarpiece for the church of the Hospital de los Aragoneses, for which he claimed payment in his will.¹⁹ In 1677, Herrera received further recognition at court; on July 27, he was appointed as Assistant Keeper of the Palace Keys (*Ayuda de*

la Furriera) and on August 25 he became *maestro mayor de las obras reales*.²⁰ This appointment virtually put an end to Herrera's career as a painter; its demands entailed considerable travelling between the royal palaces, plus the supervision of construction and maintenance projects. In 1679, he oversaw the decoration of the Queen Mother's house and began the plans for the Cathedral del Pilar in Zaragoza.²¹ Before his departure for Zaragoza, Herrera again joined in planning an art academy. He was chosen by ten Spanish students of painting, sculpture and mathematics, resident in Rome, to direct the organization of a Spanish academy in Rome. In addition to providing further confirmation of Herrera's stature, this event again shows his interest in academic training. His petition to the king, though unsuccessful, is an important statement of his artistic credo.²² He arrived in Zaragoza on October 4, 1680, and stayed there until early in 1682, when quarrels with the *cabildo* forced him to resign the commission. On August 19, 1684, he drew up his last will and testament; and just over a year later, on August 25, 1685, he died.²³

From this brief account certain parallels between Herrera and Herrera Barnuevo emerge. Besides being contemporaries who practiced architecture as well as painting, both men excelled as draftsmen. Given their shared name and interests, it was almost inevitable that their work would become confused. But now that Herrera Barnuevo's style has become known it is easier to separate their styles.

As Wethey observed, Herrera Barnuevo was at his best as a draftsman. His careful but energetic pen, with its emphasis on strong outline, is now clearly recognizable, so that a glance at the pen and wash drawing of a *Glory of Angels* (Fig. 87) in the British Museum is sufficient to permit us to reject it as an autograph work. Indeed in 1958 Professor Wethey dismissed the attribution with these words: "parece guardar muy poco relación con Herrera Barnuevo."²⁴ If the drawing is remote from Herrera Barnuevo's style, it immediately brings to mind the painting by Herrera the Younger already mentioned, *The Triumph of Saint Hermenegild* in the Prado (Fig. 86). Behind the soaring figure of the saint is a glory of angels and putti, which is clearly related to the drawing. Besides the similar composition of the group, there are figures that appear in both drawing and painting, notably the lute-playing angel in the right-hand part of each work and the angel-organist to the left. Although the drawing is probably not a preparatory sketch, the similarities are otherwise so striking that this impressive drawing can be dated with the painting to the

early 1660's. It is, therefore, the earliest datable work in Herrera's corpus of drawings.

The *Glory of Angels* is one of Herrera's most ambitious and successful drawings.²⁵ The sheet has been prepared with a thin layer of brown wash which is applied unevenly to produce contrasts of light and dark. Small touches of red and blue watercolor anticipate Herrera's later mastery of the medium. Herrera's restless pen draws innumerable short, curved strokes that activate the composition. The lines are then bonded by wash, which provides volume and contrast. The transitions between light and shadow are frequent and abrupt, heightening the surface movement. The dappled effect adds brio and verve to the drawing and demonstrates Herrera's usual way of working with pen, ink, and wash in the 1660's.

At the same time, the drawing illustrates Herrera's characteristic figure-type. It is especially visible in the putti and seraphim which are often found in his drawings. They have round faces and full cheeks with wisps of curly hair on their heads. The eyes are drawn as tiny circles, a convention that Herrera used for all his figures. Other mannerisms are evident. For example, the hands are spread wide with the two middle fingers pressed together. This delicate motif exemplifies a certain elegance in pose and gesture that pervades the pen drawings. Herrera's love for complicated foreshortenings is another sign of the refinement that marks his energetic manner.

A group of vigorous pen and wash drawings are closely related to the *Glory of Angels*. *The Triumph of the Cross* in the Prado, which is probably a sketch for the fresco formerly in the chapel of Nuestra Señora de los Siete Dolores, Colegio de Santo Tomás, was earlier published by Sánchez Cantón.²⁶ A second member of the group is *The Coronation of the Virgin* (Fig. 88), which is somewhat rougher in treatment.²⁷ Here Herrera's line is more angular and jagged, and wash is applied broadly to unify the drawing. *A Baptism of Christ* (Fig. 89), inscribed with an unlikely attribution to Vincencio Carducho, is in the same vein.²⁸ The typically elegant poses and gestures of the two figures are sketched with a loose technique of thick, wavy lines and shaded with patches of wash. A delightful drawing of a *Gentleman in a Landscape* in Hamburg (Fig. 90), attributed to a follower of Murillo, is in the same vein as the *Baptism*, although the lines are less forcefully drawn.²⁹ Herrera's love of a theatrical pose finds an ideal subject in this 17th-century dandy. His small, round eyes repeat this favorite device of the artist. Two drawings in the Uffizi exhibit the same manner: the *Saint Elias*, published some years ago by An-

gulo, and a full-length *Saint Peter*, attributed to Herrera the Elder.³⁰ In the latter work (Fig. 91), the wash plays an even more significant role, being used to draw outlines and to strengthen pen lines.³¹ The result is a stronger, somewhat rougher style, although many passages are similar to other drawings (i.e., Peter's left foot, which is almost identical to Christ's left foot in the *Coronation*).

Towards the end of the 1660's, Herrera's style started to become more refined and delicate. The work that signals the transition is the allegorical portrait of Charles II and Mariana of Austria in the Albertina, which is signed and dated 1668.³² From a technical standpoint, the most important change is the use of a finer-pointed pen, which is usually employed hereafter. The breadth and vigor of earlier drawings is now replaced by a more elaborated, detailed manner. The figure style changes as well, with tiny heads placed on large, long bodies. The study for the engraving in *Fiestas de Sevilla . . .* of 1671 further demonstrates the new direction in Herrera's drawing style, though its purpose as a study for a print called for an unusual degree of linear precision.³³ A closely related sheet in the Uffizi may also have been intended for use as an engraving, perhaps for a book of martial content (Fig. 92).³⁴ Like the previous drawing, it is executed entirely with a sharp pen and brown ink. The putti in this charming composition have the same insect wings that appear in the Albertina drawing. This sheet, with its improbable juxtaposition of military paraphernalia and putti, is typical of the increasing Rococo spirit that filters into Herrera's style in the last decade of his life.

In fact, at times Herrera seems to have crossed the threshold of the eighteenth century, especially in several watercolors of the later period. The five watercolors that illustrate the 1672 performance of Vélez de Guevara's play, *Los celos hacen estrellas*, are remarkable for their airy grace and courtly elegance.³⁵ In a similar mode are two decorative compositions in watercolor (in the British Museum) which provide further evidence of Herrera's talent in a medium seldom used by Spanish draftsmen of the seventeenth century. The watercolors, which are inscribed "A" and "B" on the versos, probably served as preparatory studies for a pair of over-mantle decorations. In the drawing lettered "A" (Fig. 93), Herrera depicts four putti, with characteristic insect wings, playing with instruments of war.³⁶ Its counterpart (Fig. 94) shows the putti frolicking among bunches of fruit, which symbolize Peace.³⁷ The cheerful pastel colors of red, blue, and yellow mix with the pink bodies of the putti and add delicacy and charm to the drawings.

These two watercolors provide a fitting conclusion to this introduction to Herrera as a draftsman.³⁸ They indicate that in his later years the vigorous energy of the earlier drawings gave way to an intimate playfulness that brings artists such as Boucher and Fragonard to mind. Like these eighteenth century artists, Herrera was a virtuoso draftsman with an inherent taste for the theatrical. The late watercolors also realize the coloristic tendencies that are always present in his style, and that are expressed by his skillful use of wash. Herrera emerges as a draftsman of considerable talent and as an artist who continually developed throughout his career, thus remaining in the vanguard of late Spanish Baroque painting.

Notes

1. H. E. Wethey, "Herrera Barnuevo's Work for the Jesuits of Madrid," *Art Quarterly*, XVII, 1954, 335-344; "Decorative Projects of Sebastián de Herrera Barnuevo," *Burlington Magazine*, XCVIII, 1956, 40-46; "Sebastián de Herrera Barnuevo," *Anales del Instituto de Arte Americano e Investigaciones Estéticas*, II, 1958, 13-41; and "Herrera Barnuevo and His Chapel in the Descalzas Reales," *Art Bulletin*, XLVIII, 1966, 15-34 (with A. S. Wethey).

2. The main accounts of Herrera's life are: A. Palomino, *El Parnaso español pintoresco laureado*, 2nd ed., Madrid, 1796 (1st ed., 1724), 610-615; A. Ceán Bermúdez, *Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de las bellas artes en España*, II, Madrid, 1800, 279-285; A. L. Mayer, s.v. "Herrera," in Thieme-Becker, XVI, Leipzig, 1923, 539; J. López Navío, "Testamento de Francisco de Herrera, el joven," *Archivo Hispalense*, XXXV, 1961, 261-274; and J. Brown, "Herrera the Younger: Baroque Artist and Personality," *Apollo*, LXXXV, July 1966, 34-43.

3. For a typical selection of still lifes attributed to Herrera, see J. Cavestany, *Exposición de floreros y bodegones*, Madrid, 1935, Nos. 73-75.

4. J. Thacher, "The Paintings of Francisco de Herrera, the Elder," *Art Bulletin*, XIX, 1937, 331, published an entry from the *libro de difuntos*, San Ginés, which mentions the death of a Francisco de Herrera on September 5, 1657. But López Navío, 274, n. 1, has advanced convincing reasons why this Herrera is not identical to the painter. He also publishes an earlier entry, dated December 29, 1654, which, though not specific, seems more likely to refer to Herrera the Elder.

5. J. Gestoso y Pérez, *Sevilla monumental y artística*, II, Seville, 1890, 562-563, gives the date of June 1657 for the installation of the *Saint Francis*, citing a document which he mentions but does not reproduce.

6. C. Pemán, "La restauración de la visión de San Antonio de Murillo, y el estilo murillesco," *Archivo Hispalense*, XXVII, 1957, 45-49.

7. J. Gestoso y Pérez, *Biografía del pintor sevillano Juan de Valdés Leal*, Seville, 1916, 66-68, for the minutes of the charter meeting.

8. L. Díaz del Valle, "Apuntes varios," in F. J. Sánchez Cantón, *Fuentes literarias para la historia del arte español*, II, Madrid, 1933, 391.

9. J. López Navío, 263, and 270.

10. Reproduced in O. Benesch, *Master Drawings in the Albertina: European Drawings from the 15th to 18th Century*, New York, 1967, 375, Pl. 230.

11. For documents of the 1660's, see M. del Saltillo, "Efemérides artísticas madrileñas del siglo XVII," *BAH*, CXX, 1947, 628 and 663.

12. J. López Navío, 263.

13. G. Kubler and M. Soria, *Art and Architecture in Spain and Portugal and Their American Dominions*, Harmondsworth, 1959, Pl. 153A, where the painting is attributed to Escalante.

14. A. E. Pérez Sánchez, "Don Matías de Torres," *Archivo Español de Arte*, XXXVIII, 1965, 32. Torres was a follower of Herrera.

15. The document is published by J. López Navío, 266-268.

16. F. J. Sánchez Cantón, "Los pintores de cámara de los Reyes de España," *Boletín de la Sociedad Española de Excursiones*, XXIII, 1915, 140-141. There is no proof of Mayer's assertion (Thieme-Becker, XVI, 539) that Herrera was the drawing master of Charles II.

17. F. de la Torre Farfán, *Fiestas de la Santa Iglesia de Sevilla al culto . . . al Señor Rey San Francisco III de Castilla y Leon*, Seville, 1671.

18. For the documentation, see A. García Bellido, "Estudios del barroco español. Avances para una monografía de los Churriguera," *Archivo Español de Arte y Arqueología* (hereafter *AEEA*), V, 1929, 51-54, 79.

19. J. López Navío, 270.

20. E. Llaguno y Amirola, *Noticias de los arquitectos y arquitectura de España . . . con notas, adiciones y documentos por D. J. A. Ceán Bermúdez*, IV, Madrid, 1829, 78, n. 3; and Sánchez Cantón, 140-141.

21. T. Ríos, "Algunos datos para la historia de las obras del actual santo templo metropolitano de Nuestra Señora del Pilar de Zaragoza," *Boletín del Museo Provincial de Bellas Artes de Zaragoza*, 1925, 6-13.

22. The documentation was first published by the Conde de la Viñaza, *Adiciones al diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de las bellas artes en España de Don Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez*, Madrid, 1889-1894, II, 271-278.

23. J. López Navío, 261.

24. H. E. Wethey, *Anales*, 30, n. 42.

25. The British Museum 1846-5-9-184, 190 x 295 mm. (measured from top of arch), pen and brown ink with brown wash, heightened with red and blue watercolor, on brown tinted paper.

26. Museo del Prado, inv. 54, 235 x 178 mm., pen and brown ink with brown wash on white paper (soiled and damaged); published by F. J. Sánchez Cantón, *Dibujos españoles*, Madrid, 1930, V, Pl. CCCLXXVI. A pen inscription in the left hand corner that read "Herrera el viejo" was removed during a recent cleaning.

27. Whereabouts unknown, Mas photo No. 35088. Archivo Mas catalogues the drawing as belonging to the former Jovellanos Collection, Gijón. However, it is not mentioned by A. E. Pérez Sánchez in his recent catalogue of the vanished collection (*Catálogo de la colección de dibujos del Instituto Jovellanos de Gijón*, Madrid, 1969).

28. Private collection, Barcelona, 230 x 155 mm., pen and brown ink with brown wash on white paper. Inscribed in ink, lower left: "Vicencio Carduche fec."

29. Kunsthalle, Hamburg 38577 (as follower of Murillo), 200 x 130 mm., pen and brown ink with brown wash on white paper.

30. *Saint Elias*: Uffizi 10367 S, 138 x 94 mm., pen and brown ink with brown wash on white paper, inscribed "erera 8 Rs" by later hand; cf. D. Angulo, "Dibujos españoles en el Museo de los Uffizi, *AEAA*, IV, 1928, 46-47. *Saint Peter*: Uffizi 10245 S (as Herrera the Elder), 215 x 135 mm., pen and brown ink with brown wash on white paper, inscribed in bottom center by later hand: "Fran^{co} de erera" (subsequently reproduced by A. E. Pérez Sánchez, *Disegne spagnoli*, Uffizi, 1972, Fig. 77).

31. Herrera also made drawings in brush and wash alone; for instance, the *Apostolado* with twelve drawings in Hamburg, Nos. 38553-63; and the thirteenth in the Metropolitan Museum of Art 1970.57.85.

32. Albertina 13093, 315 x 220 mm., pen and brown ink with brown wash over preliminary indications in pencil, on white paper restored in lower left corner; repr. by Benesch, above, note 10.

33. Houghton Library, Harvard, 284 x 205 mm., pen and brown ink on white paper; reproduced by F. J. Sánchez Cantón, *Dibujos españoles*, V, Pl. CCCLXXVII, where the date is incorrectly given as 1676.

34. Uffizi 10243 S (as Herrera the Elder), 339 x 249 mm., pen and brown ink on white paper.

35. The watercolors are published and reproduced in color as illustrations to J. Vélez de Guevara, *Los celos hacen estrellas*, ed. J. E. Varey and N. P. Shergold, London, 1970. They are included as part of a manuscript of the play, now in the Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Cod. Vindob. 13.217. A related drawing is Uffizi 10244 S, published by Angulo, 47-48, Fig. 10.

36. The British Museum 1914-9-1-2 (as 'Anonymous, Spanish School'), 135 x 477 mm., pen and brown ink and watercolor on white paper, inscribed on verso "A" and "*Siete aras*" (horizontally) and "*Don V Aras*" (vertically).

37. The British Museum 1914-9-1-3 (as 'Anonymous, Spanish School'), 135 x 380 mm., pen and brown ink and watercolor, inscribed on verso "B" and "*Siete varas*" (horizontally) and "*Dos Varas*" (vertically).

38. A number of pen drawings have been attributed to Herrera in addition to the ones mentioned in the previous pages. I would like to offer my opinion only on those that have been illustrated.

- a. *Molding with Angel's Head*, Uffizi 10162 S; F. J. Sánchez Cantón, *Dibujos españoles*, V, Pl. CCCLXXIX—probably by Herrera the Elder.
- b. *Molding with Small Angel's Head*, Uffizi 10161 S; Sánchez Cantón, *Dibujos españoles*, Pl. CCCLXXX—identical in style to a.
- c. *Martyrdom of Three Jesuits*, Albertina; A. L. Mayer, *Dibujos originales de maestros españoles*, Hispanic Society of America, New York, 1920, I, Pl. 44—by Sebastián de Herrera Barnuevo; cf. H. Wethey, *Art Quarterly*, XVII, 1954, 339.
- d. *The Immaculate Conception*, formerly Gijón, Instituto Jovellanos; A. E. Pérez Sánchez, *Catálogo*, 1969, 78, No. 315, Pl. 155—not by Herrera.
- e. “*Apoteosis de la Redención*,” formerly Gijón, Instituto Jovellanos; A. E. Pérez Sánchez, *Catálogo*, 1969, 78, No. 316, Pl. 156. The photograph is not sufficiently legible to permit judgment.
- f. *Head of a Young Man*, Prado F.D. 225; A. E. Pérez Sánchez, *Gli spagnoli da El Greco a Goya (I disegni dei maestri)*, Milan, 1970, Fig. 23—by Herrera.
- g. *Study of Monument with Saint John the Evangelist*, Pierpont Morgan Library, 1960-12; F. J. Sánchez Cantón, *Great Drawings of the World: Spanish Drawings of the 10th to 19th Century*, Shorewood Press, 1964, Pl. 58—by Herrera. Other drawings in this style are *An Allegory of Faith*, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, Barcia 381 (repr. E. Lafuente Ferrari, *Historia del Arte Labor XII: El realismo en la pintura del siglo XVII: Paises bajos y España*, Barcelona, 1935, Pl. LXV); *Apotheosis of Seville*, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, Barcia 380 (repr. J. Brown, *Apollo*, 1966, Fig. 4) and *Study for Monument to Immaculate Conception*, Uffizi 8765 S, as Herrera Barnuevo (subsequently reprinted by Pérez Sánchez, *Disegna spagnoli*, Fig. 79).

Domenico Castelli's Façade for San Girolamo della Carità in Rome

By JOHN VARRIANO

Mount Holyoke College

In an architectural survey of the Roman *Seicento* the name of Domenico Castelli (d. 1657) is frequently encountered in connection with a variety of endeavors which are seldom of more than secondary importance.¹ It is clear from his long tenure in such positions as architect of the *Popolo Romano* and the *Camera Apostolica* that much of his career was spent as an assistant or supervisor of a great many municipal and papal projects ranging from the upkeep of public fountains to the restoration of the Lateran baptistery.² His reliability as an executive architect likewise yielded a number of private commissions which occasionally allowed him to play a more important designing role.³ The reconstruction of San Girolamo della Carità was probably the most important of these opportunities.

Located on the via Monserrato, one block from the Palazzo Farnese, San Girolamo della Carità occupies a site traditionally thought to have been the location of the dwelling in which St. Jerome himself once lived. A church dedicated to this saint existed on the site at least since the end of the fifteenth century and in the sixteenth century it became the first home of St. Philip Neri's oratory.⁴ In 1631, a fire destroyed the oratory and several adjoining houses and shortly thereafter the confraternity undertook a total reconstruction of the church and its related buildings.⁵ The campaign was well underway by 1647 when the Apostolic Secretary, Fantino Renzi, offered 24,000 *scudi* in his testament for the erection of a façade for the church and another 6000 *scudi* for the construction of a family chapel. Just nine days after the document was written, Renzi died (March 30, 1647) and his legacy went into effect.⁶

The bequest called for a façade bearing a dedicatory inscription to the patron saint as well as the name and the coat-of-arms of Renzi himself. Apart from his further wish that four marble angels be placed above the doorway, no additional information is provided, either concerning the intended design or the identity of the architect who was to be selected by the congregation. The earliest knowledge of who the architect might have been comes from Giovanni Battista Mola's usually reliable catalogue of Roman architecture written in 1660: "The restoration of the church with its travertine façade is by Gaspar

Solaro and Domenico Castelli.”⁷ Three years later Mola wrote in a manuscript of the same subject that “the new fabric of the church is the design of Domenico Castelli, and Gaspar Solaro, his son-in-law.”⁸ From this one might assume that Castelli, assisted by his totally unknown relative, was the designer of both the interior and the exterior of San Girolamo della Carità. Although a few contemporary guidebooks make no assignment at all, those that do such as Filippo Titi’s *Studio di pittura* (1674) repeat the attribution to Castelli with no mention of a collaborator.⁹ Among the scant evidence to be found in the archive of the confraternity is the reference of July 20, 1654, to “Domenico Castelli n[ost]ro architetto.”¹⁰ This notice follows by two years a payment to two stonemasons who were “to make with every diligence and care the façade of the church . . . conforming to the contract and conforming to the design made by the architect.”¹¹

While the evidence for an attribution to Castelli is not overwhelming, there is certainly no contemporary source which can refute it. The confusion which exists is rather the product of our own times. One respected scholar has reiterated that Castelli was “an official rather than a creative master,” thereby implying that he played no creative role in the rebuilding of San Girolamo.¹² Curiously enough, the very writer who discovered the archival reference to Castelli has been the most importunate in refuting the traditional attribution. He has claimed in more than one instance that the façade should most likely be assigned on stylistic grounds to Martino Longhi the Younger,¹³ while a few modern guidebooks attribute the work to Carlo Rainaldi.¹⁴ The recent discovery of an important piece of contemporary evidence fortunately precludes any further detraction from Castelli’s traditional reputation as the designer of the façade of San Girolamo.

In the Bertarelli Collection in Milan there exists an engraving of the façade (Fig. 95) which bears a dedication to the Cardinal Protector Francesco Barberini followed by two columns of commentary, both of which are signed by Domenico Castelli.¹⁵ Much of the text is Baroque hyperbole, but in the column at the left, Castelli relates that “the author of the work, like an old servant dedicates it to you,” while at the right he states that “The new building of the church of S. Girolamo della Carità which I, at the application of the most illustrious and venerable sponsors have designed and carried to perfection in fulfilling the legacy of the late Fantino Renzi. . . .” Castelli’s expression of gratitude to the Cardinal Protector was soon to exceed mere rhetoric, for in

his last testament of September 16, 1657, the architect named Francesco Barberini an heir to his own modest estate.¹⁶

As a result of this new graphic evidence, the authorship of the façade is indisputable. It was probably designed in 1647 or shortly thereafter and construction was certainly going on in 1652 when the stonemasons received their payment. When Castelli died on October 13, 1657,¹⁷ the interior and possibly the façade were still not completed, for an inscription on the inside wall of the façade gives 1660 as the year of dedication.¹⁸ When one compares the engraving with Vasi's view of the church published in 1756¹⁹ or with the present façade (Fig. 96), it is apparent that Castelli's plan was carried out without modification, at least as far as the architecture is concerned. Nearly all of the planned sculptural decoration, however, was omitted. Although it is no longer in place, Fantino Renzi's coat-of-arms did exist above the second storey window at the time Vasi's print was made, but apparently the two statues in the lower storey niches, the two freestanding figures flanking the scrolls on the second storey, and the two pair of putti above the portal and the window were never executed. Their absence may in part account for the rather dry appearance presented by the façade today. In connection with these lesser aspects of the design, one might also consider a newly identified drawing in the Ashmolean Museum which probably represents a preliminary study that Castelli made for the project (Fig. 97).²⁰ The drawing agrees with the engraving in most important respects but there are several details which differ. The earlier project shows the lower storey niches as round-headed and the upper storey window as square-headed while the reverse is true of the final design. The drawing also indicates a simpler aedicule over the door (although the over-drawing seems to show the final solution in an evolutionary stage) with a pair of rather unsuitable shell motives placed above the door aedicule and within the crowning pediment of the lower storey. Other minor differences include the *Caritas* cross insignia above the niches and the vases above the attic acroteria which in the engraving were replaced by simple festoons and statues of the virtues Faith and Charity respectively. Some change in the design of the scrolls connecting the two storeys was also made, but on the whole, the Ashmolean study reflects the basic architectural conception which carried over into the finished work.

In composition the façade follows the traditional Roman model which was introduced in the church of Santo Spirito in Sassia, modified in Il Gesù, and from there disseminated to nearly every large longitudinal church built

within the city during the seventeenth century.²¹ The upper storey repeats the articulation of the lower tier but is two bays narrower, with broad scrolls joining the two levels. Perhaps as a result of the cramped location of the church on the narrow via Monserrato, Castelli was compelled to articulate the façade with a thin overlay of pilasters rather than employ a more dynamic and up-to-date columnar system. At the time of its construction, few architects in Rome remained faithful to the pilaster (although it did achieve renewed popularity later in the century), but Castelli demonstrated his awareness of contemporary architectural trends in two important ways. Not surprisingly, he organized the plan of the façade on a series of stepped planes advancing from the sides to the center, thereby providing the central bay with an increased emphasis within the total composition. Such an arrangement was almost standard practice by the middle of the seventeenth century, but the multiplication of crowning pediments reveals an interest in more progressive architectural currents. Although an encased pediment made its first appearance in Roman church architecture on Della Porta's Gesù façade (1571), its employment there seems relatively insignificant when compared with the bold resolution of the motive on Martino Longhi the Younger's façade of Santi Vincenzo ed Anastasio, erected 1646-50.²² Longhi was the first Roman architect to organize the composition of an entire façade around the problem of real or imaginary support for an arrangement of coaxial compound pediments. Castelli's design for San Girolamo della Carità shared the significance of this invention with some of the most inspired architecture of the time. If it is taken for granted that either the Ashmolean drawing or the dedicatory engraving was the basis of the construction taking place in 1652, one realizes that the façade of San Girolamo, while following that of Santi Vincenzo ed Anastasio, at the same time anticipates the more successfully baroque façades of Santa Maria della Pace, Sant'Andrea della Valle, and Santa Maria in Campitelli. San Girolamo della Carità was the most ambitious private commission that Domenico Castelli ever received. With no unexpected inventiveness, but with an eye for good proportion and pleasing design, he created a typically Roman work of tasteful respectability.

Notes

1. The substance of this essay derives from material first presented in Chapter 16 of my doctoral dissertation, "The Roman Ecclesiastical Architecture of Martino Longhi the

Younger," University of Michigan, 1970. The architect under discussion here is Domenico di Bernardo Castelli di Melide, who should not be confused with an eighteenth-century Sicilian sculptor of the same name, or with Borromini's brother Giovanni Domenico Castelli, who was also known as Domenico. Borromini is the sobriquet given to the branch of the Castelli family that originated in Bissone (Lake Lugano). Some genealogical history is provided in M. Del Piazzo, *Ragguagli Borrominiani*, Rome, 1968, 159ff., 303, and 55, where the correct date of Castelli's death is given as October 13, 1657.

2. His first official position charged him with the maintenance of the Roman aqueducts in 1621 (E. Rossi, "Roma ignorata," *Roma*, XIV, 1936, 319). After 1629, he received a regular commission as Architect of the Roman People (F. Fasolo, *L'opera di Hieronimo e Carlo Rainaldi*, Rome, 1961, 271). His activity in the papal service under Urban VIII has been documented by O. Pollak, *Die Kunsttätigkeit unter Urban VIII*, I, Vienna, 1928. In 1646, his name is found in a list of the architects who served the Presidenza delle strade (Del Piazzo, 22).

3. Space does not permit a cataloging of the more than two dozen public and private commissions that Castelli received. A number of documented works are known from the above-mentioned books by Pollak, Fasolo, and Del Piazzo, and a few additional attributions are given by G. Baglione, *Le vite de pittori, scultori, et architetti*, Rome, 1642, 179-182. Other commissions not cited in this bibliography include work in Sant'Agata dei Goti, Sant'Anastasia, Sant'Isodoro, San Lorenzo in Fonte, the Duomo and municipal palace at Monterotondo, the Biblioteca Angelica, the fountain in Piazza Colonna, houses belonging to the hospital of San Giacomo degli Incurabili, and the undertaking of an illustrated inventory of buildings begun under Urban VIII (Biblioteca Vaticana, Cod. Barb. Lat. 4409).

4. For the early history of the building see C. Huelsen, *Le chiese di Roma nel medio evo*, Florence, 1927, 532-533; M. Armellini, *Le chiese di Roma*, Rome, 1942, I, 504; and B. Capogrossi-Guarna, "La chiesa di S. Girolamo della Carità," *Il Buonarroti*, XV, 1882-84, 428-440.

5. The fire took place on December 26, 1631, and lasted for three days. It was described by G. Gigli, *Diario romano (1608-1670)*, Rome, 1958, 126. In 1633, Francesco Peparrelli was the architect of the confraternity (Pollak, I, 246).

6. The contents of the testament are revealed by Fasolo, Appendix VI, 275. The document is contained in the Archivio della confraternita di San Girolamo della Carità, *Paragrafo D*, Tomo 69, and its pertinent parts read as follows: "item lascio per ragion di legato et in ogni melior modo scudi 24000 moneta di 10 giuli p. scudo acciò si faccia la facciata della sud. a chiesa di S. Girolamo della Carità da quella parte che parerà alli S. ri deputati che venghi meglio et si si resarcischi di dentro la chiesa conforme il disegno più volte stabilito nella d. congregazione et dopo che sarà ridotta a perfezione la detta facciata vi devano mettere l'iscrizione del Santo et il nome e cognome mio et arme et il simile debbono fare sopra la porta di dentro di d. chiesa con adornamento di quattro angeli di marmo fino. Il pagamento delli d. i 24,000 scudi da spendersi in d. facciata et resarcimento ordine che il mio herede debba farlo in cinque anni et la prima paga cominci otto mesi dopo la mia morte. Dopo che la d. facciata et detti resarcimenti saranno stati redatti a perfetione delego l'inf. to mio herede a fare una cappella in d. chiesa con spesa di seimila scudi. . . ." An *avviso* recording Renzi's death is cited by E. Rossi, "Roma ignorata," *Roma*, XVI, 1938, 478.

7. "Opere di diversi architetti, pittori, scultori et altri bellingegni fatti in Roma sin al presente giorno 1660." (Biblioteca Vaticana, Cod. Urb. Lat. 1707, Fol. 184).

8. K. Noehles, *Roma l'anno 1663 di Giovanni Battista Mola*, Berlin, 1966, 98.

9. F. Titi, *Studio di pittura, scoltura et architettura nelle chiese di Roma*, Rome, 1674, 121.

10. Fasolo, Appendix VI, 278; from Archivio della confraternita di San Girolamo della Carità, *Paragrafo E*, tomo 236, Fol. 58.

11. Archivio della confraternita di San Girolamo, *Paragrafo D*, tomo 264, Fol. 56.

12. R. Wittkower, *Art and Architecture in Italy: 1600-1750*, Baltimore, 1965, 366, n. 36.

13. F. Fasolo, 97-98, 337, n. 11; and "La 'fabbrica' della chiesa di S. Nicola da Tolentino," *Fede e Arte*, XI, 1963, 84.

14. For example, Touring Club Italiano, *Roma e dintorni*, 6th ed., Milan, 1965, 236. The attribution to Rainaldi (who designed the high altar of S. Girolamo) probably derives from Capograssi-Guarna, 434.

15. Milan, Castello Sforzesco, Raccolta Bertarelli, cartella M, 18-36; 375 x 210 mm. The print, whose significance has until now gone unnoticed, is No. 929 in the catalogue of P. Arrigoni and A. Bertarelli, *Piante e vedute di Roma e del Lazio conservate nella raccolta delle stampe e dei disegni, Castello Sforzesco*, Milan, 1939. The commentary reads as follows:

All Emin.mo e Rev.mo Sig.re il Sig.re Card.le Barberino Protettore[:] Devesi al Padrone del terreno l'albero che vi nascie et il frutto. Gode la chiesa di S. Girolamo di esser posta sotto la protetione di V.E. Onde guanto di ornamento colla nuova fabrica vi si è aggiunto e con quello di più che vis si aggiungerà col vero intaglio della med.ma da me mandato alla luce tutto di ragione a V.E. si appartiene. Si raddoppia il Suo titolo di padronanza, mentre l'autore dell'opra come Servitore antico di V.E. glie la dedica. Supplico hum.te V.E. a gradire più l'affetto divoto, che le piccola offerta di cosa, che per tante ragioni è Sua, e per fine baciando le Sacre vesti me l'inchino. Di V.Em.a

Devot.mo Serv.re

Dom.co Castelli

La nuova fabrica della Chiesa di S. Girolamo della Carità che io ad istanza delle Sig.rie V.V. Ill.me ho disegnata e condotta a perfezione Per adempire il legato del q: Sig.re Fantin Renzi è piaciuta di modo al Popolo di Roma che si è stimato pregio dell'opra il parteciparne il godimento etiamdio a forastieri per mezzo dell'intaglio e delle Stampe La presento per tanto hora alle S.S.V.V. Ill.me accio possino havere innanzi à gli occhi à tutte l'hore un effetto della grandezza del loro animo, et acciò insieme godino che questa machina immobile vagando intorno delle Carte porti per l'Italia un testimonio autentico della loro magnificenza Alla quale mentre io mi professo eterna mente obbligato dell'occasione data di esercitare il mio povero talento bacio per fine alle S.S.rie V.V. Ill.me hum.te le mani Delle S.S.rie V.V. Ill.me.

Hum.mo Serv.re

Dom.co Castelli

16. Del Piazzo, 54-55. The testament is found in the Archivio di Stato di Roma, Collegio dei trenta notari capitolini, Ufficio 36, Vol. 97, Fols. 443-446, 515-517.

17. Del Piazzo, 55.

18. IN HONOREM D. HIERONYMI ECCL. DOCT.
TEMPLUM HOC IN HANC FORMAM PERFECIT
SACELLUM MAGNUM MIRIFICE CONSTRUXIT
ET FACIEM TEMPLI AEDIFICAVIT
ANN. SAL. MDCLX

19. G. Vasi, *Delle magnificenze di Roma antica e moderna*, 1756, VI, Pl. 111; reproduced in P. Armellini, I, 503.

20. Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Talman Album X, Fol. 14.

21. The morphology of this façade type has been carefully analyzed by N. Whitman, "Roman Tradition and the Aedicular Façade," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, XXIX, 1970, 108-123.

22. I have discussed this façade at some length in my recent study "The Architecture of Martino Longhi the Younger (1602-1660)," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, XXX, 1971, 101-118.

Sébastien Bourdon's *Acts of Mercy*: Their Significance as a Series

By GERALDINE E. FOWLE

University of Missouri—Kansas City

About 1666-68, shortly after Louis XIV assumed personal control of France's government, Sébastien Bourdon painted a series of seven scenes representing the *Acts of Mercy*.¹ This series presumably passed into the collection of the Duke of Yarborough during the eighteenth century and from there into the Ringling Museum in Sarasota, Florida. The paintings arrived in such bad condition that the attempt at restoration was abandoned after only two of them had been cleaned. For all practical purposes it would seem that this series must now be counted as one more item in an unfortunately large list of Bourdon's highly-prized works that have disappeared or been destroyed.²

The virtual loss of the series is, in fact, a double loss. First, the quality of the individual paintings can no longer be appreciated. Second, we have lost the effect that the paintings were intended to have as a *unit*, rather than as separate, isolated entities. This second loss is quite as serious as the first, for enough remains of the paintings for us to know that Bourdon did, indeed, think of them as a series and that the full impact was to be felt from the viewing of each painting in relation to the others around it.

It is this second aspect that I wish to discuss more fully here since, fortunately, several sets of the etchings that Bourdon made after the paintings still survive. With the aid of these prints, it is possible to gain some knowledge of the artist's original statement. We can partially reconstruct, on paper for the reader, that which has been irreparably lost for the museum visitor: the total impact of the paintings as a unified group.

At the time that Bourdon painted his *Acts of Mercy* series, Nicolas Poussin's second series on the *Sacraments*,³ painted in the 1640's for Paul Fréart, Sieur de Chantelou, was still in Paris. The similarities between the two series in terms of style, subject matter and general dimensions leave little cause to doubt that Poussin's series must have been partially responsible for the commission given to Bourdon. Both sets consist of seven canvases and are virtually the same size, differing in measurements by only an inch or two. Furthermore, in both series, Biblical or Biblical-type events have been used to illustrate the specific ideas. Finally, the scenes in both sets are presented in a classicizing

fashion with the figures placed in the foreground of a well-ordered setting. The gestures of these figures play an important role in helping to convey the action and hold together the various parts of the pictures.

Comparisons such as these with the art of Poussin have, in the past, inevitably been the means of illustrating the basic inferiority of Bourdon's work to that of the older master. Nor do I intend to dispute the superior position assigned to Poussin in terms of his abilities and the heroic quality of his conceptions. Rather, I believe that the problem lies in the other direction. The brilliance of Poussin's reputation has obscured the fact that Bourdon, too, had something to say—something different from Poussin's message. In modeling his style on Poussin (just as Poussin himself had modeled his style on that of Raphael), Bourdon also transformed the impact of his style. A better knowledge of the nature of this difference can help us to understand not only the set of paintings in question but also the whole thrust of Bourdon's style better than heretofore. This I hope to demonstrate in the discussion that follows.

The Acts of Mercy that Bourdon has illustrated are the Corporal, rather than the Spiritual, Works of Mercy as they are given in Matthew xxv:35-36. "For I was hungry, and you gave me to eat: I was thirsty, and you gave me to drink: I was a stranger, and you took me in: / Naked, and you covered me: sick, and you visited me: I was in prison, and you came." Bourdon has substituted Liberating the Captive for the last Act mentioned by Matthew—something that occurs fairly frequently in representations of this theme, especially in France. The seventh Act, the Burial of the Dead, was added in the thirteenth century.⁴ All of the Acts are illustrated by appropriate events from the Old Testament: 1. *To Feed the Hungry*: Abraham feeds the angels; 2. *To Give Drink to the Thirsty*: Obadiah and his sons give water to the prophets persecuted by Jezebel; 3. *To Welcome the Stranger*: Lot entertains the angels; 4. *To Clothe the Naked*: Job distributes clothes to the poor; 5. *To Comfort the Sick*: David prays the Lord to lift the pestilence from his people; 6. *To Liberate the Captive*: Jeremiah is freed from his chains; 7. *To Bury the Dead*: Tobias buries the dead.

Poussin's *Sacraments* are illustrated by events taken from the New Testament and from the Early Christian tradition: 1. *Baptism*: the baptism of Christ; 2. *Confirmation*: a generalized scene of the event in Early Christian times; 3. *Eucharist*: the Last Supper; 4. *Penance*: the Magdalene washing Christ's feet; 5. *Extreme Unction*: a dying man attended by an Apostle; 6.

Ordination: delivery of the keys to Peter; 7. *Matrimony*: a generalized Early Christian scene.

Before looking further at the series as a unit, let us compare one of Bourdon's paintings to one of Poussin's. I will select the third episode in the *Acts: To Welcome the Stranger* (Fig. 98), and compare it with Poussin's *Ordination* (Fig. 99). The comparison in terms of painting technique will necessarily be limited to what can still be seen of Bourdon's style but, except for color, this style is essentially the same as in his etchings.

In viewing the two paintings together, one is immediately aware of basic differences in palette, figure style and, above all, organizational procedures. Bourdon's colors—what remains of them—are high-keyed and varied in hue. His execution is swift and somewhat illusionistic. Enough highlights remain on some of the bowls, vases and garments to show that the transitions are fairly abrupt. Poussin, by the 1640's, had turned to a palette that was more limited, concentrating on the primary colors in deep, intense hues. His brushwork had also become more controlled with more gradual transitions between values.

Bourdon's figures are distinguished by a delicacy of feature and sweetness of expression. The faces are softly modeled and gently rounded, the noses narrow and somewhat pointed, the chins small, the eyebrows graceful arcs, and the eyes small. They stand in gracefully relaxed positions communicating through gentle touches of the hands. Their clothing enhances the sense of the delicacy of features and stances. The folds tend to be fairly numerous and the ridges are highlighted, giving the effect of many small lines that bend and arc gently before reaching the ground. Poussin's figures stand more firmly on their feet and their garments are heavier, composed of numerous folds that are broader in contour and fall more emphatically to the ground. Their faces, while sharing some characteristics with those of Bourdon's figures, are slightly longer and do not have the same fineness of feature. They are, in sum, more monumental in appearance.

The format of Bourdon's scene in this, as in all of the paintings in the series, is horizontal, and Bourdon has reinforced this directional emphasis by laying out a horizontal framework of architectural elements throughout the scene: the squared pavement, the couch, the table, two layers of ledges, the tops of the cooking area, arbor and buildings. These elements extend for varying lengths across the scene, but are not disposed according to any obvious pattern. They meet and/or overlap at different levels and degrees of recession.

The figures are disposed amid the architectural framework in two main horizontal bands, the most extended band being that formed by the figures in the immediate foreground. Some of the figures are seated, others kneeling or bending, others standing. These latter provide vertical accents that are echoed by an occasional vertical in the architectural framework.

The visual result is that there is a great complexity of spatial treatment, resulting in a compositional type unlike anything that Poussin ever did. Let us see how he arranged the *Ordination* scene. As in all of Bourdon's scenes, the action takes place outdoors. Here, too, the figures occupy a broad band parallel to the picture plane. Christ stands slightly isolated in the center of the group and the vertical of his upraised left hand is echoed by the verticals of the principal architectural elements in the setting. These verticals also help to isolate and enframe the central group of Christ and St. Peter, as does the land which rises on either side into low hills crowned by buildings. Poussin, however, avoids the effect of a deep corridor into space behind Christ by introducing a low arched bridge which spans the valley between and, at the same time, establishes a strong horizontal that balances the vertical of Christ's figure. The setting is thus clearly laid out and relatively simple in its arrangement, serving primarily to reinforce the figures and emphasize the main group. It is more rigorously organized, tending basically toward a classic simplicity of presentation, a balance of horizontals and verticals.

Bourdon's painting, as we have seen, tends toward a more picturesque type of complexity. His broad band of figures does not have the compactness of Poussin's grouping. It is, instead, a wavy band that rises and dips, and its movement is sometimes paralleled by, sometimes played off against, the varying levels of the architectural setting. There is thus a sense of flow across the scene that is contrary to the effect produced by Poussin's work. Bourdon's painting, in other words, does function as part of a *series*, more so in this respect than Poussin's.

To see this, we must turn to the prints that Bourdon etched after the paintings. Only through them can we now get the sense of the interrelationship of the scenes as originally seen in the paintings. The prints are all reversed from the paintings, so the reader must bear in mind that the original effect was that of a left-right flow of movement corresponding to the reading direction of the printed page. Looking at them, then, in the order suggested by the quotation from St. Matthew, we can see that the grouping of motifs in each is such that the eye is led smoothly from one scene to the next (Figs. 100-106).

Thus, in the first *Act, To Feed the Hungry* (Fig. 100), the figures are placed in the foreground in a frieze-like arrangement that curves down and forward toward the center and then up and back again toward the left to where Sara eavesdrops from behind a thick, square post. The main interest in the scene is at the left side where Abraham stands greeting one of the three angels. There are enough verticals at this point to cause a slight pause; then the eye is encouraged to follow the slight bend of Sara's body out of the picture to the next episode.

Similar arrangements, with variations, characterize the next scenes in the series. Sometimes the principal character is at one end of the scene, sometimes at the other. Always the grouping of figures forms a curving line that moves up and down, back into the scene or toward the front again. The most notable variation is that in the fourth episode, *To Clothe the Naked* (Fig. 103), where there seems to be more of a hiatus in the flow, evidently because this is the center scene in the group. There is a slightly greater amount of vertical emphasis caused by the elevated position of Job's seat and the outstretched arms of the supplicants. The general leftward flow, however, is only momentarily halted by the vertical accents in the right half of the scene. In the left half, the anecdotal interest caused by the by-play among the two boys and the admonishing woman helps to re-establish the movement of attention toward the next picture.

The flow of interest from one scene to the next is finally halted in the last scene, *To Bury the Dead* (Fig. 106). Here the figures are arranged in a shallow ellipse that slants diagonally up and back toward the left. At the far left of the group, Tobias and two young boys stand near a column and a slender tree. This combination of motifs—rising ellipse and repeated verticals—stops the gentle leftward flow and provides an effective sense of termination to the series.

Bourdon's interrelation of the seven scenes in this manner tends to stress the sense of narrative flow—not that the scenes are related chronologically to each other, but that the tendency is to *read* them. This can be seen also in the tendency to multiply anecdotal interests within each scene. Frequently the anecdotes take the form of what may be called "ironic analogy." Thus, in the first episode, while Abraham is having food placed before the newly seated angels, a dog near the table places his paws on a bone and snarlingly warns away a smaller dog. In the fourth *Act*, an older boy pulls off the garments of a younger lad even while Job's servants are distributing clothes. In the last

scene, Tobias' pious deed is set against a view of Sennacherib's soldiers brutally killing more victims and pushing them off a bridge. This type of contrast does not occur in every painting, but there seems to be a conscious desire to contrast the rational human being with the irrational animal, the mature with the immature, the workings of divine grace with the inspiration of the devil.

Let us look again at Poussin's series. Limitations of space prevent the reproduction of all the paintings in his series, but the *Ordination* is typical of his general approach. Basically his conception is one of monumental grandeur that partially belies the cabinet size of the paintings. His scenes are essentially static in presentation, with the parts in each picture carefully related to each other with geometric precision. There is no particular sense of flow from one to the other. The viewer is encouraged to dwell long and meditatively on each one (as indeed Bernini did when he visited Paris in 1665).⁵ All this is appropriate to Poussin's subject as well as reflecting his personal inclinations. By emphasizing the solemnity of the events depicted, he has given added weight and significance to the idea of Sacraments.

With Poussin, then, the problem of looking at his scenes in isolation from each other is not as serious. His presentation is, to be sure, enhanced when all seven paintings are seen together, but the sense of the sacramental is individually present in each of the scenes. For Bourdon, one scene alone does not allow us to grasp the full nature of his ideas. His statement is essentially a narrative one that depends in part on the cumulative effect of the sequential viewing by the observer. Only when the eye wanders freely from one scene to the next does the meaning of the ironic analogy become gradually evident.

Finally, the prints themselves are important as an independent group apart from the paintings, for Bourdon was a printmaker as well as a painter. Not only did he make etchings after his paintings, but he also invented compositions which he then etched without having first painted them. There is thus every reason to believe, although proof is lacking, that Bourdon had in mind from the first the idea of producing a series of prints of these scenes. Such a series would most likely have been bound into a book as part of a larger collection and, in such a case, the specific left-right reading flow of the paintings would not have been as important as the general tendency within each print to suggest a flow of movement across the page and an indication of more to come. Furthermore, the prints re-emphasize the idea of a series, for each is identified by means of a number and the title, in Latin, of the specific Act. The moral significance of the event shown is then pointed out by means of a

four-line verse describing the event.⁶ The importance of the iconography in Bourdon's mind is clearly evident.

The history of the *Acts* series does not stop here however. Bourdon's prints were obviously intended for an educated audience—hence the use of Latin and the dedication to Colbert—but their popularity extended beyond this upper-class elite. A generation after Bourdon's death they were reproduced once again by Louis Audran.⁷ Audran's prints were based on Bourdon's etchings rather than on the paintings, for they are re-reversed in direction, going once again in the same direction as the paintings. The Latin inscriptions, however, have been replaced by actual quotations from the Bible taken, for the most part, from sections other than those referred to in Bourdon's prints. They are, in fact, specific moralizing excerpts and are written in French rather than Latin. Furthermore, the prints are noticeably smaller in size than Bourdon's etchings. Clearly, this series was intended to be bought by a wider, more middle-class range of buyers.

The decision by Audran to reproduce Bourdon's prints for a more extensive audience is, I believe, of significant interest to us in our evaluation of the seventeenth-century artist, for Audran was only one of many artists in the eighteenth century to make prints after Bourdon's works. It was not just the moralizing content of Bourdon's paintings that appealed to the buyers of this era; it was also his style. The more relaxed, informal, spontaneous, and often picturesque aspects of his works were such as to make them, more than Pousin's works, particularly attractive to the Age of the Rococo.⁸

Notes

1. Oil on canvas (Sarasota Cat. Nos. 366-72), each 48" x 69" (122 x 175 cm.). They were painted for a M. LeClerc, about whom nothing else is known. The series was mentioned and described by André-Georges Guillet de Saint-Georges, in a lecture delivered before the Royal Academy on June 7, 1692 and reprinted in L. Dussieux, *et al*, eds., *Mémoires inédits sur la vie et les ouvrages des membres de l'Académie Royale de peinture et de sculpture*, Paris, 1887, 100-101. Guillet says that they were done after Bourdon's return (in 1658) from his last visit to Montpellier, but we can fix the date more precisely. Bourdon etched this series (each print being about 16" x 23" or 40 x 58 cm.), and probably did so shortly after he finished the paintings. The prints are dedicated to Colbert, who is described as Marquis of Seignelay. The barony of Seignelay, which Colbert had purchased in 1657, was elevated to a marquisate in April 1668. By January of 1671 this title had been given to Colbert's oldest son.

2. A painting related to this series, *Abraham and the Angels*, is in the Musée municipal, St.-Germain-en-Laye. It is different in format and combines motifs from Nos. 1 and 3 of the series.

3. Oil on canvas, each 46'' x 70'' (117 x 178 cm.). The paintings are now in the collection of the Duke of Sutherland, presently on loan to the National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh.

4. For the iconography of the Acts of Mercy, see M. Didron, "Les oeuvres de miséricorde," *Annales archéologiques*, XXI, 1861, 195-209.

5. Curiously enough, Bourdon seems to be the only French artist, besides Poussin himself, about whom Bernini had any kind words to say, Chantelou reports: "Il a entré à la pointe de l'île, chez M. de Bretonvilliers . . . Il y a vu une galerie peinte par Bourdon, laquelle il a trouvé belle" (ed. L. Lalanne (pseud.), "Journal du voyage du Cavalier Bernin en France, par M. de Chantelou," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 2nd Ser., XV, 1887, 194). The visit occurred early in Bernini's stay in Paris, on June 5, 1665.

6. The verses are evidently bits of doggerel composed specifically for the prints. The verses correctly describe the scenes depicted, but the Biblical citations given after the titles on the prints are not always correct.

7. Louis Audran, one of a large family of engravers and etchers, was born in Lyon in 1670, the year before Bourdon's death, and died in Paris in 1712. Each of his prints of the *Acts of Mercy* is approximately 10'' x 13½'', or 25 x 34 cm.

8. Limitations of space prevent further elaboration of this point. Suffice it to say that all eighteenth-century biographers of Bourdon make a point of referring approvingly to the picturesque aspect of his paintings, especially his landscape.

An Important *Vanitas* by Juan de Valdés Leal

By D. T. KINKEAD

University of Cincinnati

Juan de Valdés Leal (1622-90) is generally esteemed as the last of the great Baroque painters of Seville.¹ His modern fame is due in large part to his highly original treatments of the *vanitas* theme. In 1962, the Uffizi purchased a previously unknown *Vanitas* (Fig. 107) by Valdés Leal.² This painting is important in understanding not only his development of the *vanitas* theme, but also, his maturation into a fully High Baroque artist. The Uffizi *Vanitas* was dated to the decade of the 1660's by Dr. Silvia Meloni.³ It is the hypothesis of this essay that the painting dates from the last half of the 1650's, and that it supplies important evidence that Valdés Leal made a hitherto unsuspected journey to Madrid in the mid-1650's. This is almost a decade before it was previously assumed that Valdés Leal first went to Madrid.⁴

The development of Juan de Valdés Leal's style follows a familiar pattern in Sevillian Baroque painting. His first works are characteristic of Early Baroque Realism. They are dark in color, hard in their brush technique, and peopled with static, humble figures. But by 1661 his fully mature style is that of the High Baroque. It is characterized by a daring sense of color, a dazzlingly light and fluid touch, and an extravagance of activity and emotion.⁵ A useful comparison may be made with the stylistic evolution of his townsman Bartolomé Esteban Murillo,⁶ the development of whose art toward the High Baroque is closely associated with his exposure to the great European masterpieces in the Royal collections at Madrid.⁷ As there were no comparable trips to Madrid by Valdés Leal for which we have documentary evidence, critical opinion looked to influences within his native Seville to explain his artistic growth.⁸ Several patent allusions to the art of both his Spanish contemporaries in Madrid and paintings in the Royal collections now make it possible to posit a similar crucial experience for Valdés Leal. One of the strongest impressions of his stay in Madrid is found in the Uffizi *Vanitas*.⁹

A comparison of the Uffizi canvas with the *Allegory of Perishability*¹⁰ (Fig. 108) by Antonio de Pereda¹¹ in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna shows at once Valdés Leal's indisputable debt to the older artist. The alignment and forms of the two tables are identical. The types and groupings of the symbolic objects are similar. The location and function of the angels are

comparable. This is not to say that Valdés Leal merely copied Pereda's painting. The Uffizi *Vanitas* is a variation on the theme and form of the Vienna canvas, which the Sevillian could only have seen by traveling to Madrid¹²

The differences between the two works are less striking than the similarities, but they are no less significant. Valdés Leal added a Last Judgement scene to the rear wall, and a lively print to the front edge of the smaller table. He also sacrificed the ordered precision of Pereda's still-life composition for more animated groupings. On the smaller table, Valdés Leal significantly increased the number of items as well. The spirit of the painting is thus enlivened, but the aesthetic effect is somewhat lessened by the concomitant clutter. Finally, the technique shows evidences of his more painterly, mature style. Before an analysis of the Uffizi *Vanitas*, however, one should compare it with another Valdés Leal *Vanitas* (Fig. 109) in the Wadsworth Atheneum in Hartford.¹³

The Hartford *Vanitas* is clearly related to the Uffizi painting, but it shows no debt to Pereda's art. One notices immediately that the more awkward horizontal format of the Uffizi canvas which tended to disperse one's attention has been resolved into a more forceful vertical composition. This builds up to the symbolic climax of the painting, the angel's revelation of the *Last Judgement* to the viewer. The angel's gesture shifts from the earthly vanities to the religious judgement, indeed the actual moment of justice. Valdés Leal has thus dramatically integrated the angel and the painting-within-the-painting. These shifts of emphasis have the effect of intensifying the religious impact, just as the newly vigorous pose of the angel adds visual interest to the work.

The Hartford painting also reveals a more lively concern with spatial composition. Converging diagonals recede upwards within strong vertical enframements. This is in marked contrast to the tendency to arrange clusters of objects parallel to the picture plane noticeable in the Uffizi piece. With the more assured composition, one observes also that miniature spatial conceits have been discarded.

When all of this evidence is considered, along with the fact that the technique of the Hartford *Vanitas* is fully the brilliant painterly style of Valdés Leal's maturity, it becomes obvious that the Uffizi *Vanitas* is an earlier work than the 1660 Hartford canvas. This establishes the necessary chronology of these paintings. The Uffizi *Vanitas* may now be examined.

The scene is simply composed. An angel stands behind two tables which are piled with objects symbolic of Vanity, Vice, and Death.¹⁴ On the wall behind the angel, a drawn drapery reveals a painting of the Last Judgement.

The general choice of objects follows from the subject of Pereda's painting, but the individual items are identical in only a few instances. On the longer, lower table are three books, five skulls, a wheel-like object (perhaps an astrolabe), a crown, armor, a pistol. There are also flowers from an overturned vase, cards, and a ring. These have spilled down from the higher table. This smaller table is covered with a rich cloth, decorated at the corners in the Spanish fashion. On this table are cards, dice, money, two medals (one on a chain), a watch, jewelry, a jewel chest, a miniature of a lady, a statuette, a glass vase of roses, a stringed instrument on some sheet music, and a large terrestrial globe, on top of which the angel holds an ornately framed miniature. An unusual print is attached to the front of this smaller table, upon which the more interesting and precious objects have been crowded.

Returning to the longer table, one encounters little that is unusual for a *Vanitas*. The fading flowers and skulls are familiar symbols of the transience of Beauty and Death.¹⁵ The crown, armor, pistol, and the astrolabe, may all be understood as emblems of worldly power,¹⁶ remarkable primarily for the uncanny animation of the death's-heads and the skill with which their reflected images have been painted in the unornamented armor. The unidentified books refer to the vanity of worldly knowledge and fame. The ring, the cards, and the vase and flowers all belong to the smaller table, from which they have fallen.

With the exception of the dice and cards,¹⁷ all of the items on the smaller table may be identified with Luxury and Vanity. These objects may be related not only to abstract concepts, but also to specific contemporary vanities. Thus the violin-like instrument and the sheets of music connote the art of music and the waste of courtly amusement.¹⁸ The miniature of a lady presents the art of painting and the vanity of human beauty.¹⁹ The statuette of Mercury would accordingly represent the sculptor's art and the all-too-worldly concerns of commerce.²⁰ The watch, a luxury item, symbolizes the passage of time, and suggests the unheeded moral of a life of moderation,²¹ to which neglect, the dice and cards add their evidence. The vanities of worldly power and fame are indicated by the medals, the globe, and the money. These symbols too have their specific connotations. The prominent medal of Philip II bears on its obverse the scene of Hercules at the Crossroads, the famous allegory of man caught between Virtue and Vice.²² The globe is turned towards the northern half of the Western Hemisphere, which bears the proud inscription that it was discovered in 1492 by Columbus. The map from which this globe was

invented was then out-of-date.²³ The medals and the globe thus harken back to the years when Spain was the most powerful nation in all of Europe, with the greatest empire that the world had ever known. Perhaps the man whose portrait the angel holds atop the globe is one of those all-powerful monarchs.²⁴ The total symbolism of all these objects, while more complex than those of the lower table, is still quite clear: all the arts, riches, power, and majesty of even the largest empire in history, will fade before time, like the beauty of the rose.²⁵ The role of the print, however, is more problematic.

This unusual graphic is certainly Valdés Leal's invention. The obscure setting may be either an interior or a street scene. At least five allegorical figures are present. In the right foreground a figure wearing a toga and crowned with laurel leaves, reads from a book, while writing, surprisingly, on the margin of the print itself.²⁶ Behind him are three other people. The two closest are an embracing couple of uncertain costume. The female holds what appears to be a palette. The male seems to grasp an arrow. The third figure is almost entirely obscured. In the left foreground, an oddly garbed figure, perhaps a woman, wields a baton while glancing backwards into the scene. Any attempt at interpretation of so shadowy a depiction would be dangerous. The inscription seems to partially read *virtus non*, and the print thus relates in all probability to the *vanitas* idea. It may be argued that there are five people visible in the scene and that there are five skulls in the painting. One print figure and one skull are crowned with laurel. It is tempting, thus, to connect the antique poet, at least generically, with the wreathed skull. The remaining death's-heads might be mute reminders of the transience of glory in other realms of fame as well.²⁷ Whatever its symbolism, it is clear that Valdés Leal has used the print in a capricious manner. As noted, the poet writes on the border of the print, thus confusing the spatial boundaries of this medium. Similarly, all worldly distinctions will be broken by the ravages of Time. Another such willful play with traditional perspective is found in the Last Judgement painting.

Valdés Leal shows Christ standing with the banner of the Resurrection, a motif which is unusual for this theme.²⁸ More striking is the very light, painterly style of the scene, almost misty in comparison to the harder realism of the still-life. The intrusion of such an unearthly prefiguration into the solid reality of the Baroque *vanitas* is Valdés Leal's own contribution. The resulting contrast between the visionary presence of the *Last Judgement* and the solid reality of the still-life objects of vanity is quite effective. One may feel tem-

poral if not spiritual distinctions between the shadowy world of the past, as suggested in the print, the solidly depicted data of quotidian reality, and the visionary insolidity of the life beyond.

At the central base of the *Last Judgement*, the animated figure of a skeleton is seen. Hand placed firmly out onto the picture frame, he gazes wildly past his insensate brothers, the death's-heads. The skeleton seems to be attempting to escape his fate by trying to flee back in time to a period when he could have altered his chances. This extension of the life of one visionary entity into a scene which purports to represent reality, is a fanciful conceit indicative of the artist's inventive powers.

While this miniature spatial play helps to connect the painting-within-the-painting and the primary image, the concept is too artificial to be satisfactorily integrated. In the future, Valdés Leal would rely upon more immediate and more powerful forms and ideas to animate his *vanitas* themes, culminating in his masterpieces for the Brotherhood of Charity in Seville, *Finis Gloriae Mundi* and *In Ictu Oculi*.

Notes

1. The most valuable monograph on Valdés Leal is José Gestoso y Pérez, *Biografía del pintor sevillano Juan de Valdés Leal*, Seville, 1916. See also Elizabeth du Gué Trapier, *Valdés Leal Spanish Baroque Painter*, New York, 1960, and Diego Angulo Iñiguez, *Pintura del siglo XVII*, in *Ars Hispaniae*, XV, 1971, 366-383.

2. Oil on canvas, 163 x 205 cm., Inventory No. 9435. The painting was attributed to Valdés Leal by Professor Luciano Berti, Director of the Uffizi. I am grateful to the *Soprintendenza* for this information, for the bibliography, and for their kind permission to publish their painting.

3. *Dipinti salvati dalla piena dell'Arno*, Florence, 1966. This "small catalogue" of an exhibition that took place in the Uffizi in December of 1966 is the only known publication of this work. I have been unable to locate a copy of this catalogue.

4. There is no documentary evidence for a stay in Madrid. Palomino, who met Valdés Leal in 1672, stated that the artist went to Madrid in 1664 "in order to see the celebrated paintings." Antonio Palomino de Castro y Velasco, *El museo pictórico y escala óptica*, Aguilar, Madrid, 1947, 1055. Ceán Bermúdez changed the date to 1674, without saying why (Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez, *Diccionario histórico de los mas ilustres profesores de las bellas artes en España*, Reales Academias de Bellas Artes de San Fernando y de la Historia, Madrid, 195, V, 111). Travels by artists between Seville and Madrid were quite common. The attractions in Madrid were the Royal collections and

the hopes of court patronage. Very little is known about Valdés Leal's early career. The discovery that the commission for the retablo of the Shod Carmelites of Cordova was signed February 18, 1655 is important for dating this journey. José Valverde Madrid, "Dos pintores sevillanos en Córdoba: Sarabia y Valdés Leal," *Archivo Hispalense*, CXX-CXXI, 1963, 18-19 & 57-58. On November 15, 1655, Valdés Leal moved his family to the parish of the Magdalen in Cordova (Gestoso, 21). This church is only a matter of yards from the Shod Carmelite church. The move signifies that Valdés Leal was ready to begin work on the larger canvases of the retablo. The finest works of his early style are the smaller predella pieces here: all but one of the larger pieces are in his mature style. Thus the trip to Madrid would have been in 1655 or early 1656. Accordingly the Uffizi Valdés Leal would date from 1655-1656 to, as will be shown, 1659.

5. Compare, for example, his *Saint Andrew* of 1647, in San Francisco, Cordova, and his *Immaculate Conception with Donors* of 1661 in the National Gallery, London (Trapier, Figs. 1, 89).

6. Sebastian Montoto de Sedas, *Bartolomé Esteban Murillo*, Seville, 1923, is still the most useful monograph.

7. For a convenient summary of this view see Neil MacLaren, *National Gallery Catalogues: The Spanish School*, ed. & rev. by Allan Braham, London, 1970, 60.

8. The most common theory involves the return of Francisco de Herrera the Younger to Seville in 1655-1656 from Italy. For a summary and refutation, see Gestoso, 44-46.

9. Only one other example will be noted. The schema of Valdés Leal's painting for the monastery of San Jeronimo de Buenavista outside of Seville was obviously related to that by Zurbarán for the monastery of Guadalupe of 1638-1639. However, a comparison of their treatments of *The Temptation of Saint Jerome* shows that the differences between the two are more important than the similarities (Trapier, Fig. 20; and Martin S. Soria, *The Paintings of Zurbarán*, New York, 1953, Pl. 82). Valdés Leal's version is remarkable for its robust activity and dynamic brushwork. One of the treasures of Seville's Museum of Fine Arts, the painting is signed and dated 1657. A juxtaposition of this work with Titian's magnificent *Penitent Saint Jerome*, then, as now, in the Escorial, explains the vigorous pose of Jerome, specific elements of the composition (e.g. the arched rock form), and, most importantly, the appearance of the bravura brushwork and the brighter, more saturated hues. Harold E. Wethey, *The Paintings of Titian; I: The Religious Paintings*, London, 1969, 136 and Pl. 195. In all probability, the Buenavista commission was the reason for Valdés Leal's 1656 move from Cordova to Seville. As two of the large canvases of this series are dated 1657, work must have begun in 1656. This therefore serves as a *terminus post quem* for the Madrid journey.

10. Oil on canvas, 139.5 x 174 cm., inventory number 771. This title is given in *Kunsthistorisches Museum: Katalog der Gemäldegalerie*, Vienna, 1965, I, 94. The painting is dated about 1650 (George Kubler & M. S. Soria, *Art and Architecture in Spain and Portugal and their American Dominions: 1500-1800*, Baltimore, 1959, 281).

11. The basic study on Pereda is Elías Tormo y Monzó, "Un gran pintor vallisoletano: Antonio de Pereda," *Pintura, escultura, y arquitectura en España. Estudios, dispasos de Elías Tormo y Monzó*, Madrid, 1949, 247-336.

12. Pereda's *vanitas* paintings interested Valdés Leal most. A drawing attributed to

Pereda, *El sueño de la vida*, provenance unknown, has suggestive correspondences with the art of the Sevillian. The famous *Dream of a Knight*, in the Academy of Saint Ferdinand in Madrid, also may have appealed to Valdés Leal, because of the picturesque clutter of objects, the baroque drapery on the wall, and the indication of motion in the angel's pose. In addition, Valdés Leal and Pereda were both probably aware of Reymerswaele's *Saint Jerome* of 1551, and Jan Brueghel's *La Vista* of 1617. These two works, now in the Prado, were then in the Royal collections.

13. Oil on canvas, 130 x 99 cm., inventory number 1939.270. This and its presumed pendant, now in the City of York [England] Art Museum, were first published by Tancred Borenius, "An Allegorical Portrait by Valdés Leal," *The Burlington Magazine*, LXXIII, 1938, 146-151. See especially Trapier, 30-34, and Julian Gallego, *Vision et symboles dans la peinture Espagnole du siècle d'or*, Paris, 1968, 200-201. For the sake of brevity, the York canvas will not be discussed.

14. The most important study of Spanish Baroque allegory is Gallego's *Vision et symboles*. An important discussion of the *vanitas* genre is included in Ingvar Bergström, *Dutch Still-Life Painting in the Seventeenth Century*, London, 1956, 154-191. An invaluable introduction to, and study of, the rich language of Baroque symbolism is that by Mario Praz in *Studies in Seventeenth Century Imagery*, 2nd ed., Rome, 1964. A massive compilation of emblems can handily be found in Arthur Henkel and Albrecht Schöne, *Emblemata. Handbuch zur Sinnbildkunst des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart, 1967. Also useful is Guy de Tervarent, *Attributs et symboles dans l'art profane: 1450-1600. Dictionnaire d'un langage perdu*, Geneva, 1958. See also I. Bergström, *Maestros españoles de bodegones y floreros del siglo XVII*, Madrid, 1970, 74-78.

15. Pertinent bibliography for these two points respectively has been handily gathered together in Richard W. Wallace "Salvator Rosa's *Democritus* and *L'Umana Fragilità*," *The Art Bulletin*, L, 1968, 22, n. 10; 30, n. 74. For flower symbolism in Spain see Gallego, 190-193. It has been suggested that the skulls in the Pereda are reminders of the victims of the wars provoked by the vanity of Charles V (Angulo, 223).

16. The pistol is a wheel-lock type, which was still produced, although the invention of the flintlock about 1635 made it obsolete. Small astrolabes were used not only by travelers for astronomical sightings, but also by "learned men" for astrological purposes (M. L. Huggins, "Astrolabe," *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 13th ed., New York, 1926, II, 795). Thus this functional instrument also carries overtones of vanity.

17. The emblem of dice and cards in Sebastián de Covarrubias Orozco, *Emblemas morales*, Madrid, 1610, for example, was a strong anti-gambling warning (Henkel & Schöne, 1123). Despite such moral condemnation, card playing was extremely popular in Spain (C. P. Hargrave, *A History of Playing Cards*, New York, 1966, 68).

18. Tervarent, 404. A. P. Mirimonde, "La musique dans les allégories de l'amour," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, Ser. 6, LXVIII, 1966, 264-290; and LXIX, 1967, 317-346.

19. The woman holds a mirror (Tervarent, 273).

20. Mercury's usual symbolic role is the protector of commerce, although he has also been connected with art. See Goltzius's *Mercury* of 1611, in the Frans Hals Museum, Haarlem.

21. The watch is one of the few objects which is not antiquated. For similar watches

made during this period see Ernst von Bassermann-Jordan, *Uhren*, Braunschweig, 1961, Pls. 96 a,b,c. For moderation symbolism see Tervarent, 220, and Bergström, 189-190. The proximity of the watch to the cards, dice, and money should be noted in this context.

22. For the medal of Philip II and its obverse see Eugene Plon, *Leone Leoni sculpteur de Charles-Quint et Pompeo Leoni sculpteur de Philippe II*, Paris, 1887, 259-260, Pl. XXX, 9-10. For the application of this allegory to the *vanitas* idea see Erwin Panofsky, *Hercules am Scheidewege*, Berlin, 1930. The other medal is not by the Leoni.

23. Dr. Roman Drazniowsky, Map Curator of the American Geographical Society of New York, gave me his opinion that such a globe did not exist to his knowledge. He also stated that the type of cradling shown may be of the artist's own invention. The globe would thus be a creation of Valdés Leal, based upon the hemispheric world map of Gérard and Rumold Mercator of 1587 (Leo Bagrow, *History of Cartography*, rev. by R. A. Skelton, London, 1964, Pl. XCV). One globe does exist which may be compared with that in the painting. This is the small, beautifully handcarved ivory globe in the Morgan Library, New York. Antonio Spano carved it in 1593 for his patron Philip II, to whom the globe is profusely dedicated, "Princeps felicissime totus orbis ad se gubernandum te vocat et expectat" (Edward Luther Stevenson, *Terrestrial and Celestial Globes*, New Haven, 1921, II, 201-203). The globe by Spano is derived from Abraham Ortelius's *Atlas*, which was dedicated to Charles V. It is clear that the turn of the painted globe, showing North America, is emblematic. The challenge to Spanish ownership of the New World was there a *fait accompli*. The placement of the sphere on the richer table relates to the fabled wealth of the Americas. However, as suggested by the small pile of coins, even the incredible riches of the New World were fading with time. Imports of treasure for the period 1591-1595 were more than ten times the amount brought back in 1656-1660, the period of the Uffizi *Vanitas*. J. H. Elliott, *Imperial Spain 1469-1716*, New York, 1966, 181.

24. The man's identity is uncertain. He appears to be one of the Hapsburgs, perhaps Philip II. If so, the Uffizi *Vanitas* may be considered a *vanitas* of the reign of Philip II, while Pereda's is a *vanitas* of the rule of Charles V.

25. The angel who points out the vanities of the world also suggests the absolutes necessary to avoid such blameworthy follies. The angel wears a sun medallion on its chest. According to Ripa this is an emblem of Virtue (Cesare Ripa, *Iconologia*, Padua, 1611, 541-542). In his description of Wisdom, Ripa states that this allegorical figure expresses faith in God, a contemplation of God, and a repudiation of all earthly things (Ripa, 468). In a 1603 edition of Ripa's widely used book, Wisdom too wore the sun medallion on its breast (C. Ripa, *Baroque and Rococo Pictorial Imagery*, trans. & ed. by Edward A. Maser, New York, 1971, 136). Thus, Virtue and Wisdom are the means of rising above earthly Vanity.

26. The dramatic extension of form in space is a familiar Baroque trait, e.g., Rembrandt's print *Cornelis Sylvius*; but Valdés Leal's usage is conceptual here. Thus a Northern Mannerist source seems likely, such as Aegidius Sadeler's engraving of Spranger's *Bartholomaeus Spranger with an Allegory on the Death of his Wife* of 1600. Valdés Leal may also have known the portrait of 1650 by Pedro de Villafranca that serves as the frontispiece of J. de Casanova's *Primera parte del arte de escribir*. The print shows Casanova writing on the oval frame of the portrait.

27. The idea of equating the skulls in the Pereda with people referred to in the painting was suggested by I. Bergström in "L'Egalité Suprême," *L'Oeil*, XCV, 1962, 30.

28. The theme is not common in Spanish Baroque art. For this scene in the Hartford *Vanitas*, Valdés Leal adapted Martin de Vos's *Last Judgement* of 1570, then in an Augustinian convent in Seville. The painting is now in Seville's Museum of Fine Arts (Trapier, 31). Herrera the Elder's *Last Judgement* of 1628-1629, then, as now, in Saint Bernard, Seville, also uses Resurrection imagery. By 1681, Valdés Leal's dependence on earlier versions of this scene had ended. In his *Portrait of Mañara* (1681) in the Brotherhood of Charity in Seville, the painting-within-the-painting of the Last Judgement had all but vanished in a spectacular blaze of color and whirl of energy (Trapier, 66, and Figs. 148, 152, where the scene is identified as a Crucifixion). For Last Judgement iconography see Louis Réau, *Iconographie de l'art chrétien*, Paris, 1957, II, Pt. 2, 727-757.

Giacinto Brandi's Paintings at the Palazzo Taverna

By FRANCIS H. DOWLEY

University of Chicago

Too few studies have been made of the Roman painter Giacinto Brandi (1623-1691) in view of the reputation he enjoyed in his lifetime and the quality of his paintings which have survived. Amongst those who expressed admiration for him as an artist the most notable perhaps was Mattia Preti when responding to a query from Don Antonio Ruffo, the distinguished collector who resided in Messina. In a letter dated February 27, 1665, Preti compares Brandi favorably to such leading painters of Rome as Carlo Maratti, Ciro Ferri, and Salvator Rosa, declaring that "Brandi è più Pittore di tutti tre e meglio."¹ Coming from the great Neapolitan painter who had had important commissions in Rome, and had seen so much in other parts of Italy, this opinion carries some weight, although brief and unspecific. It can scarcely be asserted that Preti's support was distorted by local partisanship because no substantial evidence of any connection between Brandi and the Neapolitan School, of even of a visit to Naples by him, has so far been discovered or documented. On the other hand, Brandi's color has a depth and vigor that would have appealed to Preti, while the color schemes of his rivals like Maratti and Ferri probably left him indifferent. That Preti should have preferred Brandi to Rosa—a real, if expatriate, Neapolitan, and an excellent colorist—demonstrates a judgement that was neither narrow nor provincial. However, since Preti did not visit Rome after 1661, when he settled permanently in Malta, his estimate of Brandi's painting must have been based on early work done during the 1650's or before, much of which is lost or undocumented.

Another of Ruffo's correspondents in Rome Abraham Brueghel—flower painter, dealer, and last of a great family of artists—also had high esteem for Brandi, according to a letter dated November 15, 1669.² Like Preti, he compares Brandi to Maratti in reputation, declaring the works of both to be "assai rare et in grande estima." And he regards Brandi as superior to two other well known contemporaries, Ciro Ferri and Guglielmo Cortese, though expressing admiration for them as well. Better known than such direct testimony is the biography by Pascoli in the next century, which informs us that when the Jesuits were looking in 1672 for a painter for the vaults of the Gesù, one of the four principal candidates they considered was Brandi.³ That he was not chosen

may have been partly because of the commission he had received in 1671 to decorate the cupola in San Carlo al Corso, a commission that was to lead to several others in the same church.⁴

And yet Pascoli was perhaps not too prejudiced in judging Brandi to be often more eager for gain than for glory, since in 1687 he was given a commission by the Duke of Savoy in preference to Maratti and Ferri for reasons of adaptability of price and rapidity of execution.⁵ An uneven level of quality may indeed partly account for Brandi's somewhat moribund reputation, but perhaps the loss of many works painted especially for private collectors has damaged it even more because Francesco Scannelli includes Brandi with Mola and Fabrizio Chiari among artists "in giovanile età," of "non ordinarie aspettoni," whose paintings were already in various Roman collections.⁶ In recent years, a famous scholar has discovered in a private collection surviving from that time in the Palazzo Taverna at Monte Giordano a splendid series of seven paintings Brandi did for the Orsini of Bracciano, the former owners of that palace.⁷ Although the palace with its contents was sold to the Gabrielli by the Orsini in 1688 when they had gone bankrupt, the paintings seem always to have remained there down to the present day, when it has become the Roman residence of the Marchese Gallarati-Scotti.⁸ Unfortunately, no documentation whatever has been discovered, and the Orsini archives have so far yielded nothing, while the canvasses themselves have neither signatures nor inscriptions.

It is very rare for a series of as many as seven paintings to have survived intact, and presumably even in the same location, since the end of the 17th century (Figs. 110-116). All of the same size and shape,⁹ they were probably intended to suggest a kind of frieze on the upper part of the gallery wall in the same order which they still hang to-day. Brandi had frescoed a much more definitely datable frieze in the Palazzo Doria Pamfili al Piazza Navona during the years 1648 to 1653.¹⁰ Although the subjects are in both series drawn from the *Metamorphoses*,¹¹ similarities between the two, whether stylistic or iconographical, are surprisingly few. That some of the compositions in both series, like *The Minerva and the Muses* (Fig. 110), in the Palazzo Taverna, should display some influence from Lanfranco, Brandi's most important master, is less significant than that they should display so little. Indeed some compositions of the Taverna series reveal almost no trace of Lanfranco's style, thereby leading one to infer that Brandi painted them later in his career when he had entirely sloughed off his master's influence. The execution of the series may

have stretched out, then, over many years, a possibility that gains credibility in view of the deteriorating economic condition of his Orsini patrons. The clear cut linear form which is the basis of Lanfranco's influence seems to lose its sharpness in some of the pictures, which otherwise have a brutality and harshness quite alien to Lanfranco's style. Striking examples are *the Torments of Tityus, Ixion, Sisyphus, and Tantalus in Tartary* (Fig. 111)¹² or *The Confrontation of Phineus Perseus* (Fig. 112). But in *Venus at the Forge of Vulcan* (Fig. 113), the goddess has too little grace and charm to be an effective contrast to the ugly Vulcan and his brutish underlings in the lurid and murky chiaroscuro. One is struck in most of the series, and indeed in Brandi's paintings generally, with an atmosphere of violence, intense reaction or dramatic confrontation, whether with gods, saints, or condemned mortals. The heroes have little nobility or stature, the women lack delicacy and refinement. On the other hand, Brandi's figures never want vitality of expression nor vigor of movement in compositions the density of which is enhanced by glaring lights and oppressive shadows. But at the times he achieves more than just the verve and impact of pictorial effects. Among the tortured, the broken and dishevelled Tantalus crawling vainly towards a spring is a convincingly tragic figure. Likewise, on the left of the same composition, the torturer of Sisyphus has a satanic mien horrifying in its cruelty. And in his rendering of *Polyphemus and Galatea* (Fig. 114), Brandi has sacrificed Lanfranco's beautiful marine setting in the latter's *Galatea*,¹³ in order to draw closer the sensuous nymph and the blind giant in their ominous encounter. Brandi grasps better than his master the psychology of Galatea anxiously watching the terrifying and pitiful giant as he reaches out distractedly in her direction. It seems paradoxical that an artist capable of such harsh and pungent characterizations should have admired enthusiastically the grace and subtlety of a Guido Reni.¹⁴

Brandi's strong chiaroscuro in both the *Polyphemus* and *The Tormented of Sisyphus, et al., in Tartary* does not mark him, however, as a latter-day Caravaggisti. He does not share their interest in the costume of everyday life, nor in accessory detail, nor in the flagrant display of blood and gore. His chiaroscuro is less one of stark outlines and spot light focussing than of flaring lights and a coloristic atmosphere which obscures rather than emphasizes brutal details. Besides, Brandi shows great impetuosity and bravura of execution. Rapid to the point of being careless, his handling has none of the close-up study and solid texture of the Caravaggisti.

Vague reminiscences may indeed be discernible between Brandi's juxta-

position of Perseus carrying the Gorgon's head against the petrified Phineus, and famous prototypes of Annibale Carracci and Polidoro da Caravaggio, but the similarity is only very general. Yet this rendering is one of the best of the Taverna series, because, though wanting in Annibale's grandeur of proportion and depth of construction, yet Perseus' driving fury and Phineus' arrested thrust have gripping impact. Moreover, the figures are not the stunted helots of the Vulcan composition, nor do they have the congealed flesh of the centaurs in the *Struggle of the Lapiths and the Centaurs* (Fig. 115). These differences may well be indicative of a riper mastery achieved years after the series was first begun.

In regard to quality, the *Phineus and Perseus* approaches that painting which is perhaps the most beautiful is certainly the most enigmatic of the whole series the "Homo Fortunatus" (Fig. 116). In contrast to the other six, all of which have subjects from Ovid, this is most abstruse, since it does not present with certainty any known theme, ancient or modern. By far the most probable hypothesis hitherto adduced has been Professor Faldi's, who has proposed a variation on the theme of Fortune. One might suppose that the subject could refer allegorically to one of the Orsinis, but the absence of any of their emblems makes this hypothesis rather conjectural, though worth exploring. Or it might be supposed that some theme running through the other compositions might find its culminating expression in this allegory; but no such underlying concept has been detected so far.

The suggestion that the picture represents Fortune is definitely supported only by a single attribute, consisting of the locks of the flying female streaming out in the wind. But other attributes point to a variant of the theme, the explanation for which can be found in Ripa's *Iconologia* under *Sorte* rather than under *Fortuna* itself.¹⁵ Such attributes are the golden crown she carries and the chain held by a cupid, which in juxtaposition symbolize contrasting fates. The crown needs no elucidation, while the chain can mean suicide by hanging, or less literally, a violent end. Ripa derives these emblems, especially the chain, from an epigram of Ausonius which tells of a man in despair about to commit suicide, who suddenly finds a great treasure.¹⁶ Ripa converts the treasure into a crown, an emblem peculiarly apposite for one member of the Orsini family, as we shall see. But Brandi gives other attributes to the divinity and her train, like a cornucopia and a laurel, which are perhaps indicative of Good Fortune rather than Fortune in general.¹⁷ The pearl held up by one of the

nymphs of the sea could be a further offering of Good Fortune, though not one of her standard emblems.

But though the figure of Fortune, or Good Fortune, may present some ambiguities, it is really the figure of the sleeping youth which presents the most intractable problem of interpretation. Reclining almost nude on a rock along the shore, he slumbers oblivious to the crown Fortune is holding out to him, at the same time clasping in one hand flowers of indeterminate species. Since his situation suggests no ancient myth I have been able to trace, it is possible that Brandi may have intended an allegory of the *Homo fortunatus*, with further particular reference to the patron, or to one of his ancestors. This hypothesis is based on a rather recondite theory formulated in the Renaissance, knowledge of which by Brandi can hardly be taken for granted though it may possibly have been suggested to him by an erudite associate. Panofsky used the theory to explain a facet of the iconography in Correggio's decoration of the Camera di San Paolo.¹⁸ The great scholar pointed out that on certain Roman coins Fortune is sometimes accompanied by Virtue in the form of a nude young man. This observation can be supported by another which Panofsky made in a different connection—that a rock or a solid seat was sometimes signified the enduring stability of Virtue,¹⁹ and in addition could provide a striking contrast to the wings or the moving sphere of ever-flying Fortune. Although only an hypothesis, it is at least possible to interpret Brandi's contrast between the figure flying over the waters and the youth resting on a rock as this sort of juxtaposition between Fortune and Virtue, between variability and stability.

To account specifically for the sleeping condition of the youth, we may again borrow from Panofsky a variant of his theory derived from Gioviano Pontano's *De Fortuna*, first published in 1512 at Naples. This Renaissance scholar writes of the *homines fortunati*, whom the goddess Fortuna watches over at all times, whether they are awake or asleep.²⁰ Her favorites receive the richest gifts, such as crowns, pearls, palms or golden chains, all of which are being offered to the slumbering youth in Brandi's composition. On this interpretation the chain would be a golden gift that could also become a golden shackle which Fortune might impose upon him though a king. But whether or not the young man's fortune might eventually have an evil aspect, Ausonius' thought would not have been lost in the image of Fortune approaching her favorite without his seeking her and without his foreknowledge—"fuor d'intentione dell'agente."²¹

Although this modified interpretation seems a little more plausible, it does not account for the marine setting, which is important enough to be repeated in another version of the composition that comes from the Villa Taverna, but now decorates a ceiling in the American Embassy.²² Although essentially similar in composition, the iconography of this version is significantly different. The formidable figure of Saturn is added on the right, thereby widening the composition and counterbalancing the figure of Fortune on the other side. The crown is, moreover, transferred from Fortune to Saturn, who also holds attributes of Time, while the cornucopia and palm formerly accompanying Fortune are replaced by baskets of flowers. The sleeping youth is no longer nude, but wears a corselet of armor. The introduction of Saturn increases the probability that in the first version Fortune signifies Good Fortune, so that the second version forms a kind of variant signifying the Evil Fortune that must be guarded against, but which menacing Time will inevitably bring to bear. Yet it would not be accurate to designate the Embassy version as a veritable pendant since they are not of the same size, and Brandi would hardly be likely to paint two such similar compositions for the same series in the same gallery. But the differences between the two versions nevertheless complicate the interpretation of either. The basket of flowers substituted for the palm and cornucopia contrasts with the armor now worn by the sleeping youth and, even more so, with the brooding figure of Saturn or Time. The flowers may symbolize the frailty of Youth before the menace of Time, and the armor the need for protection against all the perils prepared by remorseless Saturn. Perhaps a patron with a temperament not sanguine enough to believe in *homines fortunati* wanted an altered iconography.

Without attempting further to unravel the complexities of the two versions, we should consider the possibility that the allegory of a *homo fortunatus* might refer to some incident in the career of one of the Orsinis. According to a family tradition, the well-known patron of the arts, minor poet and musician, Paolo Giordano II, Duca di Bracciano (1591-1656), and head of the senior branch of the family, visited, when still heir to the dukedom, the kingdom of Norway. There he made so great an impression on the sea-faring inhabitants that they offered him the crown of that coastal realm. That the Norwegians were serious, or even entertained such a fantasy, is unlikely, considering that at the time of the visit, around 1611, they were firmly under the control of Christian IV of Denmark. But perhaps they made a grandiloquent, though empty gesture to that effect at some festival which Orsini pride then dilated

into a splendid gift of Fortune to the youthful *homo fortunatus* while reposing on that northern shore. The crown proffered by Fortune in the picture could have an obvious reference to the age-old marine kingdom which drew its riches from the sea. The golden chain could in turn refer to the duties, or bondage to Fortune which acceptance would have entailed had the young prince not been advised by his father not to be tempted by the glittering prize. This interpretation could, then, explain the cornucopia, the pearls, and the palm of preference, while the slumber of the youth could be construed to suggest the unsolicited advent of Fortune's extraordinary offering.

Despite the improbability of a real offer of a crown by the Norwegians, as Ignazio Ciampi and Brigante Colonna have long since pointed out,²³ there can be no question that the story, whether true or false, was already current in late seventeenth century Rome, as attested by its appearance in Prosper Mandosio's *Biblioteca Romana*, published in 1692, when Don Flavio, the last Duke of Bracciano, was still living. The royal offer is mentioned in the *Biblioteca* as a notable event in a succinct biography of Paolo Giordano, along with a list of his literary works.²⁴ Even a shadow of verisimilitude for the offer might have sufficed for some descendant of the brilliant duke to have thought it worthy of commemoration in an allegorical painting.

That Brandi's allegory refers specifically to Paolo Giordano might be thought a dubious hypothesis, however, on the grounds that the Duke and his successors seem to have lived not at Monte Giordano, but at their palace on the Piazza Navona, which later became the Palazzo Braschi.²⁵ But it could have been ordered by another member of the family who, partly because of his quarrels with his brother, Don Flavio, the spendthrift Duke, might well have lived at Monte Giordano. This was Don Lelio, a literary ecclesiastic, who was second signatory of the deed of sale of Monte Giordano in 1688.²⁶ If he added the allegory to the series commenced much earlier, its different kind of subject would be accounted for; while its variation in style from some of the other paintings might be explained by the protracted execution of the series over a number of years caused by the declining fortunes of the Orsinis. Delayed or irregular payments might have deterred a wary Brandi from carrying out the original commission with his usual celerity. In the meantime his own style might have evolved to a new phase. Since the income of the bankrupt duke was totally impounded in 1675,²⁷ that year might mark a *terminus ante quem* for the completion of the series, except that Don Lelio might have had other resources.

Whatever the ultimate explanation may be, this splendid series of paintings in the Gallarati-Scotti Collection constitutes a major addition to the corpus of Giacinto Brandi's works and reveals a range of versatility hitherto unsuspected from his published *oeuvre*.

Notes

1. Vincenzo Ruffo, "La Galleria Ruffo nel secolo XVII in Messina," *Bollettino d'Arte*, X, 1916, 256.

2. Ruffo, 185.

3. Lione Pascoli, *Vite de' pittori, scultori, ed architetti moderni*, Rome, 1730, I, 200.

4. Luigi Salerno and Gaetano Drago, *SS. Ambrogio e Carlo al Corso, e l'Arciconfraternita dei Lombardi in Roma, Chiese illustrate*, No. 96 (1967), Rome, 63.

5. Andreina Griseri, "Precisazioni per il Palazzo reale di Torino. G. Brandi, Seyter, Bigari," *Bollettino della società piemontese di archeologia e di belle arti*, XII-XIII, 1958-1959, 140. See letters written from the resident of Savoy at Rome to Duke Carlo Emanuele II, here quoted.

6. Francesco Scannelli, *Il Microcosmo della Pittura*, Cesena, 1657, 208.

7. Professor Italo Faldi was the first to identify these paintings. I am very much indebted to him for pointing them out to me and for making various arrangements concerning them in my behalf.

8. I am very much obliged to the Marchese Gallarati-Scotti and to the Marchesa Donna Lavinia Gallarati-Scotti for gracious permission to publish these paintings by Brandi, and for so kindly permitting me to study them *in situ*. The Marchesa inherited the pictures, and the Palazzo Taverna at Monte Giordano, from her grandmother, the Contessa Lavinia Taverna Boncompagni, who had acquired them from the Princes Gabrielli in 1888.

9. Approximately 185 x 263 cm., oil on canvas.

10. See Furio Fasolo, *L'Opera di Hieronimo e Carlo Rainaldi*, Rome, 1961, 286-287; and *Ragguaglio Borrominiano, Mostra Documentaria*, ed. by Marcello del Piazzo, Rome, 1968, 99.

11. Both Anne Sutherland Harris and G. di Domenico Cortese attribute to Brandi the frieze illustrating the *Metamorphoses* cycle, but not the Bacchus and Ariadne frieze in an adjoining room, formerly attributed to him. The Bacchus frieze she attributes to Camassei. See A. Harris, "A Contribution to Andrea Camassei Studies," *Art Bulletin*, LII, 1970, especially 49 and 63. This attribution I have followed, though definite proof is still wanting. Giacinto Gimignani may have a claim.

12. I am very grateful to Dr. Carlo Bertelli, Director of the Gabinetto Fotografico

Nazionale, for kind permission to publish the photographs of both the paintings in the Palazzo Taverna, and in the Palazzo Doria Pamfili al Piazza Navona.

13. Lanfranco's composition in the Galleria Doria.

14. If we are to believe Bernardo De Dominici in his life of Brandi, in *Vite de' pittori, scultori ed architetti napoletani*, Naples, 1742-1743, III, 270. Brandi's high opinion of Reni is expressed in two letters published by De Dominici, one dated 1679, the other 1683.

15. Ripa, *Iconologia*, Padua, 1611, 493.

16. This epigram quoted by Ripa does not appear in all later editions of Ausonius. It is omitted in the Loeb Classical Library Edition of 1919 (trans. by H. G. E. White); but it may be found in the Panckoucke ed., Paris 1842, I, 41, Epigram XXII. But Epigram XXIII of the same edition, which is very similar in meaning though differently expressed, does appear in the Loeb edition, II, 163, as Epigram XIV.

17. The cornucopia can be interchangeable between *Fortuna* and *Fortuna Buona*, as in Ripa.

18. Erwin Panofsky, *The Iconography of Correggio's Camera di San Paolo*, London, 1961, 66.

19. Panofsky, "Good Government or Fortune," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, XVIII, 1966, esp. 310-315.

20. Panofsky, *The Iconography of Correggio*, 65.

21. Ripa, 493.

22. I have not been able to photograph this version. Dr. Luigi Salerno most kindly informed me of its existence.

23. Brigante Colonna, *Gli Orsini*, Milan, 1955, Chap. XXII, esp. 252ff. Also, Ignazio Ciampi, *Innocenzo X Pamfili e la sua Corte*, Rome, 1878.

24. Prosper Mandosio, *Biblioteca Romana seu Romanorum Scriptorum Centuria*, Rome, 1692, "centuria sexta," No. 37. A 1713 inventory of the pictures of the widow of Don Flavio (the Princess des Ursins) lists no pictures by Brandi. See Fernand Boyer, "Les tableaux de la princesse des Ursins à Rome," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art français*, 1931, 29-37.

25. Brigante Colonna, 255.

26. Pio Pecchiai, *Palazzo Taverna a Monte Giordano*, Rome, 1963, 27. For the relations between the two brothers, see letter by Don Flavio's wife, the princess quoted in Maud Cruttwell, *The Princess des Ursins*, New York and London, 1927, 35. They were Paolo Giordano II's nephews.

27. Brigante Colonna, 24. Paradoxically enough, 1675 was also the year Don Flavio married the Princesse des Ursins, but a pension promised by Louis XIV was never paid.

Viscardi's Mariahilfkirche at Freystadt and the Development of the Central Plan Church in Eighteenth Century Germany

By BEVERLY F. HEISNER
University of South Carolina

The pilgrimage church of Mariahilf at Freystadt in the Oberpfalz not far from Nürnberg was built by the Italo-Swiss architect Giovanni Antonio Viscardi in 1700-1710.¹ It has a central plan with an octagonal core, the sides of which are unequal (Fig. 117). Arms extend outward on the cross axes to create a sanctuary (east), narthex (west), and chapels (north and south). The narrower sides of the interior octagon, on the diagonal axes, are hollowed out to form lower register niche chapels with galleries above (Fig. 118). An arcade of equal height is created around the perimeter of the room by the stiling of the diagonal arches so that they reach the level of the cross arm arches. The arcade sustains a low bell-shaped dome which has only a residual drum. The effect of the perforated piers and the arcade is to minimize the importance of the wall and maximize the importance of the skeletal structure of the building. A wall-pier type of construction has been adapted to a central church plan. The light-filled interior is enhanced by white and pastel colored stucco decoration which follows and accentuates the structural members.

The Mariahilfkirche represents a merging of architectural forms from Italian and transalpine sources. The Italian central plan church, with special reference to Borromini's Sant' Agnese in Piazza Navona and Bernini's Santa Maria dell'Assunzione in Ariccia, must be seen as inspiration within the Roman baroque milieu for the Freystadt plan and elevation. A precedent for central plans, especially for Marian pilgrimage churches, also existed in Bavaria prior to the Mariahilfkirche in such buildings as the Mariabirnbaumkirche and the influential but unrealized project for the shrine at Altötting by Enrico Zuccalli. For Viscardi, the Altötting plans, with their references to the architecture of Bernini, may have served as an intermediary for the vocabulary of the Italian Baroque since there is no record of a trip by the architect to Italy.²

The completion of the Mariahilfkirche coincided with the beginning of a period of peace for Bavaria. In the next years ecclesiastical and secular building flourished there and the control of architectural projects passed from for-

eigners like Zuccalli and Viscardi to native builders. These builders looked, quite naturally, to the Freystadt church as a point of reference not only because it incorporated what were for Bavaria "modern" ideas, those of the Italian Baroque, but at the same time it evidenced respect for such northern preferences as the desire for well-lighted interiors and for reserved exterior articulation (Fig. 119).

Churches were constructed on every scale, but small and medium sized structures predominated. The Freystadt plan was flexible enough to provide a firm basis for the development of centralizing ideas for these churches, but it was not so complex or exotic as the work of Guarini or the mature Borromini, which was for the most part unacceptable to Bavarian taste.

The classic Italian dome, which was much altered by Viscardi at Freystadt, undergoes even more radical changes at the hands of later German architects. The conical shape of the Freystadt cupola is abandoned for a lowered profile and the drum and lantern are completely deleted. In this way the domical covering becomes a less commanding and isolated element of the church articulation.

The introduction of the vocabulary of French Rococo decoration into Bavarian churches in the decade after the construction of Freystadt corresponds to the further development of the idea of wall-pier construction utilizing an equalized arcade on the interior of central churches. The diagonal chapel-gallery motif is elaborated so that the pier is reduced to slender supports which hold the low vault. Windows are employed on all sides and at all levels around the central room to back-light the thin pier supports, projecting them into the central space and creating what appears to be an almost weightless shell within the heavier outer wall system, for example, in Balthasar Neumann's *Vierzehnheiligenkirche* and J. M. Fischer's *Rott-am-Inn*. The light and delicate rococo decoration of the interior is thus matched in the architectural forms of the church.

Michael Wenig's engravings of the *Mariahilfkirche* exterior (1709 and c. 1710) helped to make the church immediately available to other architects who also had easy access to the site (Fig. 120).³ Johann Michael Fischer, the architect most affected by the *Mariahilfkirche*, was born in nearby *Burglenzenfeld* in the *Oberpfalz* and must have known the church from first hand experience. His great churches of the 1730's through the 1750's, and even beginning with his rather insignificant early parish churches of *Unering* and *Bergkirchen* (1731-1732), utilized motifs found at Freystadt, and these are

carried into the important larger churches of Aufhausen, Ingolstadt, Berg-am-Laim and Rott-am-Inn.⁴

In the even earlier St. Anna-am-Lehel of 1727 traces of Viscardi's influence may be seen.⁵ In St. Anna, which has a longitudinal oval plan with six subsidiary chapels, a continuous wall-pier arcade encircles the room and has arches which rise to the same height reaching just below the undulating moulding of the low cupola. Although Fischer includes no gallery level at St. Anna, the depth of the chapels along with the arcade creates an interior with a rhythm very similar to that found at Freystadt. This type of longitudinal oval plan had already been used in southern Germany by Kosmas Damian Asam in his church at Weltenburg (1716), but there the side chapels are conceived on an a-b-a scheme and no equalization of the arches occurs beneath the cove of the central vault.

An octagon having unequal sides becomes the core of Johann Michael Fischer's central-plan churches. The reference to Freystadt both in adoption and utilization of this form is clear. It is the most basic and dominant element in Fischer's plans, the largest in size; and it always serves as the congregational room. All eight sides open into chapels, and those in the diagonals contain galleries on their second register.

For his interiors Fischer borrows motifs from the interior elevation of Freystadt; most notably he maintains the equalization of the height of the arches in the octagon arcade, cf. Aufhausen or Altomünster. He amplifies this motif to arrive at a variety of solutions for his centralized interiors. Thus at Ingolstadt, although the arcade is equalized in height, the undulating outline of the cupola is stressed through the transverse arches, which appear taller than those on the diagonal because of the chamfering of the arch frame.⁶

Viscardi had taken a first step in modifying the Italian type of tall dome with drum at Freystadt; Fischer takes a further step. He prefers a low drumless cupola, which will not strengthen the verticality of the interior, to carry a single illusionistically painted fresco.

Beginning with Aufhausen in the mid-thirties (1736-1751), J. M. Fischer's indebtedness to Freystadt is emphatic in both his plans and elevations. At Aufhausen, the octagonal core is inscribed within a square, the depth of the diagonal chapels which are hexagonal and have galleries is increased, and the choir is balanced on the west with a narthex of the same approximate size. One striking dissimilarity between Viscardi's and Fischer's plan lies in the latter's widening of the narthex through the addition of one bay rooms on

north and south. The choir and flanking sacristies together with this enlarged narthex create on the Aufhausen exterior an almost perfectly rectangular building quite contrary to the bold and irregular exterior outline at Freystadt.

Despite Fischer's use of pilasters in the Aufhausen interior, the wall-pier skeleton of the building emerges in much the same way that it does at Freystadt. The pilasters sustain a heavy entablature which begins at the gallery level and is frequently interrupted as it encircles the room. The convexity of the gallery fronts, noticeable at Freystadt, is further exaggerated at Aufhausen. These and other similarities between Aufhausen and Freystadt indicate that by the thirties Fischer had completely assimilated and was inventively utilizing Viscardi's ideas.

In his later churches, Fischer moves toward solutions in which light plays an even greater part in the interior than it did at Freystadt. The diagonal chapels at Aufhausen contain windows and effect a more consistent illumination in the eight segments of the octagon than occurs at Freystadt. Fischer expands upon this theme in his next central church at Ingolstadt (1737-1739), where he adds windows to the diagonal galleries. In this way the octagon is ringed with light on both levels, and the wall-piers project in very much the same manner as they do in a Vorarlberg church.

Johann Michael Fischer rejects in his churches the Italian conception of a pure central plan which he had approached in a rather pedantic manner at the early Bergkirchen. The solution which he came to prefer consists of a series of separate spatial units interconnected through their careful placement with regard to one another on the longitudinal axis and through their interior elevations and decorative articulation. In his mature plans a tension between longitudinal and central elements is always evident.

Fischer's ideas in this direction culminate in the Benedictine monastic church of St. Marinus and St. Anianus in Rott-am-Inn. The management of individual spatial units through the church on the longitudinal axis focuses attention upon the high altar, thus eliminating one of the traditional problems of central churches.

At Rott-am-Inn the octagon of uneven sides projects slightly on the exterior from the rectangles of choir and narthex between which it rests. The diagonal chapels have galleries, as does the choir, but the central arcade arches are no longer equal in height as they were at Aufhausen. The low illusionistically frescoed cupola rests only upon the arches of the cross axes. The diagonal arches, although springing from the same level of the podium above

the entablature as the transverse arches, only reach half-way to the cupola. At that point an intervening stucco cartouche is inserted as a connective between the two regions. The more syncopated rhythm of Rococo architecture has replaced the steadier rhythm of the Baroque found at Freystadt. J. M. Fischer's many churches scattered throughout Bavaria constitute the most important successors to the Freystadt Mariahilfkirche.

* * * * *

Another important forerunner to the many centralized south German churches appearing later in the eighteenth century is the Murnau parish church of St. Nikolaus. It resembles the earlier Freystadt Mariahilfkirche in both plan and elevation. Built in the years 1725-1727 to replace an older structure destroyed in the War of the Spanish Succession, its authorship is still contested.⁷

From a rectangular narthex entered through a door on either the north or south, the centralized interior space consists of a rectangle with eight projecting wall pier segments bent to create an internal octagon. The octagon of the plan is not as strong in actuality, however, as it is on paper. The principal experience of centrality within the room occurs on the upper register due to the great low cupola rising from a circular moulding running uninterrupted around the perimeter of the room. The other important factor contributing to the impression of centrality is the encircling arcade whose arches are approximately the same in height. Since this motif occurs nowhere else in Germany except at Freystadt prior to the twenties, Viscardi's church would again seem to have provided a point of departure.

The wall-pier segments at Murnau are not as assertive as they are at Freystadt. They create shallow triangular chapel alcoves at the corners of the rectangle of the plan. Their interiors are articulated by arch responds meeting at right angles. The altars of the east chapels are placed flat against the wall which faces directly into the room. This heightens the box-like character of the lower register which a preoccupation with the wall plane intensifies. On the west, the wall plane is emphasized by the inclusion of a choir-organ gallery having a flat front above the narthex bays.

The Murnau architect, in accentuating the walls, has created a longitudinal pull along them into the trefoil choir. He has vacillated before the idea of a concentrated central plan and has created a church interior lacking in vitality.

* * * * *

There is, in George Bähr's Frauenkirche in Dresden (1725-1743), a confluence of ideas from the north and the south. Hans Georg Roth's Carlsfeldkirche of 1684-1688 and Martin Frantz's Gnadenkirche at Jelenia Góra of 1709-1718,⁸ provided exemplars from the north German Protestant milieu in which central plans with low domes were utilized, but more direct and specific influence on the Dresden Frauenkirche was provided by the plans and elevations of both Viscardi's Mariahilfkirche and Baldassare Longhena's Santa Maria della Salute in Venice, begun in 1631.

Bähr had direct contact with the Freystadt church when he was called to give an opinion of the plans and execution of the church.⁹ A master carpenter before he turned to architecture, Bähr may have been especially aware of the technical refinements of the church. The use of stone for the exterior was taken over into his Dresden church, and there Bähr, despite great opposition, clung to his desire for the extension of stone to the dome, an aspect of the construction of Freystadt which Viscardi had envisioned and then was unable to execute.

Bähr's first plan for the Frauenkirche bears greater resemblance to Freystadt than does the final version, which is a compromise of his original idea.¹⁰ In the first plan, a Greek cross has box shaped entry projections on three arms while a large apsidal choir extends from the east. In the interior, eight free-standing piers, which were to have supported congregational galleries, do not destroy the clarity of the cross but do suggest an octagon within it. Instead of the diagonal and transverse chapels of Freystadt, an ambulatory was formed in the area behind the piers. It was designed to hold pews and did not provide free-passage around the room. This aspect of the plan illustrates Bähr's cognizance of that basic aim of Protestant church architecture, to provide maximum seating space with good visibility to the pulpit.

This type of internal ambulatory is basic to Longhena's Santa Maria della Salute, where it is functional in the traditional sense, and in the final plan Bähr further modifies his ideas in the direction of the Venetian church.¹¹ The Greek cross is abandoned in favor of a centralized space which places emphasis upon a circle within a square. In the lower registers progressive tiers of galleries curve around the interior supported on the eight free-standing piers which are now placed in a circle. The dome, resting upon eight arches which reach equal heights despite the unevenness of their intervals, rises from a broader more open base and assumes a greater importance than it had in the first plan.

Perhaps the most striking element in Bähr's final plan is the addition of projecting entry bays on the four corners of the square with the retention of the side entries from the first plan. The church has become accessible from practically any point in the surrounding streets. A clarification of the Protestant ideal of congregational participation has thus been advanced in ecclesiastical architecture. The Church of Santa Maria della Salute, which retained the more authoritarian axial entrance, has been democratized in Bähr's Frauenkirche.

The Frauenkirche's highly original interior elevation retains a lightness and dynamic verticality despite the multiplication of congregational galleries around seven sides of the internal octagon. A motif found earlier at Freystadt, the interconnection of the piers with arches reaching to approximately the same height, plays an essential part in creating this spatial impression. The unorthodox dome rises through several levels: first, a drumless lower cupola is articulated by four round-headed windows, alternating with doors which lead to stair towers on the corners of the square. This cupola conceals most of the upper dome from the viewer, but an oculus opens to reveal a portion of another cupola having two tiers of windows between ribs and rising to a lantern.

Although steeper than the one at Freystadt, the Frauenkirche dome is also bell-shaped. The impression of verticality which Viscardi achieves in the interior of his dome and then abandons in its exterior articulation is reversed in the Frauenkirche. There the height of the dome is negated internally yet soars lyrically above the exterior. A sloping roof with dormer windows, which is the external equivalent of the lower cupola on the interior, connects the walls of the church with the bell of the dome. The Frauenkirche's large open lantern commands and extends attention upward.

* * * * *

Balthasar Neumann, in both his early Benedictine church at Holzkirchen (1726-1730) and the later Werneck palace chapel (1741-1745),¹² selects an architectural vocabulary which refers to Viscardi. Holzkirchen is a central church of great purity with the octagon of the plan clearly expressed on interior and exterior. The single additional form employed is the circle of the dome on a low drum which is carried on a continuous entablature.

The octagon has uneven sides like the one found at Freystadt. Entry to the church is on a long side; the corresponding cross axis holds altars while the diagonals are composed on the lower chapel-upper gallery scheme. A round-headed window fills the back wall of the gallery and corresponds to

windows found on the transverse axis. Through the use of light, harmony is thus established in the eight sections beneath the dome.

Corinthian half-columns on high bases rising directly to the entablature articulate each of the wall-pier segments of the internal arcade. These elements are reminiscent of the Freystadt solution. However, at Holzkirchen, the arcade of the octagon is autonomous with regard to the columns. The arches at Holzkirchen all reach to the same height just beneath the entablature, but, instead of stiling those on the shorter sides, Balthasar Neumann is able to employ a more orthodox combination with round arches on the diagonals and three-centered (basket) arches on the cross axes. This is due to the lack of direct correspondence between columns and arch.

In the palace chapel at Werneck Neumann again creates an arcade of uniform height but here with wall-pier segments which project into the room from the rectangle of the floor plan.¹³ These appear to derive from the Mariahilfkirche via Johann Michael Fischer's St. Anna-am-Lehel. The form created by the arcade is an oval, as it is at St. Anna, rather than an octagon.

Viscardi's arcade in a centralized space underwent a remarkable transformation in the hands of German architects.¹⁴ Its evolution was to a simpler statement of the structural members sustaining the central vault. The culmination of this tendency occurred in the architecture of Dominikus Zimmermann at Steinhausen and Die Wieskirche. There Zimmermann completely emancipated the pier arcade from the wall, thus forming an inner shell within the framework of the central room. The Baroque conception at Freystadt, with its compartmentalized spaces dynamically interacting, had gradually given way to a more homogeneous interior in which the transition from bay to bay, space to space, and lower to upper register, was less distinguishable.

Notes

1. This study excerpts material from a dissertation presented to the University of Michigan, 1970, entitled, *Giovanni Antonio Viscardi's Mariahilfkirche at Freystadt: An Analysis of Its Forms, Sources, and Significance*.

2. North Italian architecture, especially Milanese, may also have affected Viscardi's conceptions of a central plan church.

3. Both engravings are of the exterior. Cf. Heisner, Figs. 14 and 15.

4. Felicitas Hagen-Dempf, *Der Zentralbaugedanke bei Johann Michael Fischer*, Munich, 1954, 61, 62, 13, 21, 30 and 44 for the respective plans of these churches by Fischer.

5. Hagen-Dempf, Pls. opposite 17 and 33, and Plan 7. Günther Neumann, "Die Gestaltung der Zentralbauten Joh. Michael Fischers und deren Verhältnis zu Italien," *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, II, 1951, 238-244, recognizes in St. Anna-am-Lehel traces of Viscardi's influence.

6. Hagen-Dempf, Pl. opposite 49.

7. A fire in 1774 destroyed the church records. Cf. Norbert Lieb, *Münchener Barockbaumeister*, Munich, 1941, 83 ff., Pls. 62 and 45.

8. Eberhard Hempel, *Baroque Art and Architecture in Central Europe*, Baltimore, 1965, Pls. 120b and 87.

9. Hempel, 329, n. 8; and Otto Höver, *Vergleichende Architekturgeschichte*, Munich, 1923, 159: "Bähr konnte bei seinem Aufenthalt in Freystadt, wohin er als Sachverständiger gereist war, eingehende Studien machen und verwertete die empfangenen Anregungen an der Dresdener Frauenkirche." No date is given for the visit.

10. For details of the building history of the church: Werner Lange, *Die Frauenkirche zu Dresden*, Berlin, 1959. Also, Eberhard Hempel, *Geschichte der deutschen Baukunst*, Munich, 1949, 422, Pls. 374, 375, 377.

11. Henry A. Millon, editor, *Key Monuments of the History of Architecture*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1964, 377, for plan and exterior view of the Salute.

12. Hans Reuther, *Die Kirchenbauten Balthasar Neumanns*, Berlin, 1960, 64-65, Pls. 21 and 22; and 97-98, Pl. 4.

13. Carmen Hertz, "Balthasar Neumanns Schlossanlage zu Werneck," *Beiträge zur Bauwissenschaft*, XXIV, 1918, plan, Figs. 11 and 12; and a section, Fig. 13.

14. The plan and interior articulation of the Mariahilfkirche also affected several minor architects of the later eighteenth century in Bavaria. Cf. Heisner, 103ff.

In Bohemia and Moravia, where the ecclesiastical architecture of Guarini and Borromini was so influential, especially upon the Dientzenhofers and on Hildebrandt in his Gabel church, the longitudinal oval with adjacent chapels and also the Greek cross plan were preferred for central churches in the Baroque period. Viscardi's Freystadt plan with its central octagon was, in comparison, relatively unstimulating to the architects of this region. For further exploration of this theme, see Heisner, 106-108.

Paolo Campi: An Introduction

By ROBERT ENGGASS

University of Kansas

Campi has dropped out of sight as completely as it is possible for any artist active in 18th-century Rome to do.¹ Apart from the small entry in Campori² in 1873, the minimum—perhaps a dozen lines—in Thieme-Becker³ in 1911, and a page in Riccoboni⁴ in 1942, no article, however brief, has been devoted to him or his work. Though most of his surviving sculpture is in Rome not a single one of these Roman pieces, apart from the St. Sebastian in Sant’Agnese, has ever before been illustrated—this despite the fact that there are two marble statues by him (both over life size) now in St. Peter’s. This brief article focuses on Campi’s work in Rome, for which I have provided illustrations, some new source material, one or two rediscovered works, and a few words on style.

“Paolo Campi filgio del quondam Domenico de Carrara Scultore in Roma” reads a document dated 1712 from the archives of Montecassino.⁵ The earliest notice we have of him is in 1702 when he won a prize in the Concorso Clementino held by the Academy of St. Luke in Rome.⁶ Probably at about this date Campi joined the workshop of Pierre Le Gros II. There he remained until that distinguished member of the French colony in Rome died in 1719. “Il Signor Paolo Campi Giovane del mio studio ritornato ultimamente da Monte Casino mi ha presentato per parte di V.A. Ill.ma un cortese regalo. . .” Le Gros wrote in a letter of 9 January 1712 to the Abbot of Montecassino for whom he was then working.⁷ If we assume that Campi, whom Le Gros called a young man in 1712, was in his late teens when he won the prize at the Academy of St. Luke, then we can guess that he was born about 1680. The date can serve, in any case, until more facts are known. One further strand may be added to those few from which we weave his biography: his marriage to Rosalba Maria Salvioni, the daughter of a painter in the Vatican and herself a painter in her own right, at least until after she was married.⁸

The earliest indication that we have of Campi doing independent work outside of Le Gros’ studio is in 1703. It refers to his part in the sculptural program for St. Peter’s Square. In the 1721 edition of Titi’s guide of Rome Campi’s name appears in the midst of a very long list of sculptors responsible for “*statue*”—not otherwise identified—for this project.⁹ Titi’s citation is noted in Thieme-Becker and also by Riccoboni, who refers to Campi’s work for St.

Peter's as "non precisabili, 1700-1721."¹⁰ However, an entry not previously noted in the Archives of St. Peter's appearing under the heading of 21 April 1703, allows us to identify both the subject and the date. It reads:

"A Paolo Campi altro scultore p. resto di scudi
60 p. la Statua di S. Bonaventura Scudi 60"¹¹

The entry belongs to one of a series of lists, almost all identical in format, all containing identical payments to different sculptors, each of whom was responsible for a statue of a saint on the balustrade. From time to time these lists bear the heading: "Spese delle Statue collocate nelli due Bracci diritti delli Portici Vaticani."¹² Unfortunately the *St. Bonaventura* is not included among the ninety engravings that Pietro Bombelli made in the 1780's of the one hundred forty statues that line the colonnades and galleries of the Square. It will require an iconographic study of the whole program if the remaining figures, or even a substantial portion of them, are to be identified.

The early guidebooks tell us that Campi is responsible for two stucco angels in the church of S. Salvatore in Lauro in Rome.¹³ The figures are still in place, holding a crown of thorns and floating on individual stucco cloud-banks that rest firmly on the sloping sides of the pediment above the high altar (Fig. 121). We have no documentary evidence for the date of these works but I suspect they were done in the first decade of the eighteenth century, not in 1731 as Riccoboni tentatively suggests.¹⁴ The garment rhythms are still filled with the echoes of Bernini's High Baroque, not the gentler rhythms that expressed artistic preferences in Rome in the second decade of the Settecento. Campi's inspiration comes from similar large scale angels, likewise placed above pediments, in the Chapel of St. Ignatius in the Gesù di Roma. He would have known these works well. They form part of the largest sculptural program carried out at the end of the Seicento in Rome. More specifically, Campi derived the left figure of his pair in San Salvatore in Lauro from Ottoni's splendid marble angel on the pediment on the left wall of the chapel in the Gesù, and his right figure from Camillo Rusconi's right-hand figure on the pediment on the right wall of the same chapel.

The St. Sebastian that Campi did for the church of Sant' Agnese in Piazza Navona is still something of a puzzle. "Del s. Sebastiano, che è sull'altare della crociata sinistra," Titi wrote, "vi è chi dice essere una statua antica, ridotta da Paolo Campi a rappresentare questo santo."¹⁵ The figure is marble but the tree trunk behind the figure and the various pieces of armour beside it are

stucco (Fig. 122). On the seminude torso the lines of demarcation that separate the components of the muscle structure are shown with exaggerated sharpness and precision, exactly as they are likely to appear in the endless perfunctory Roman copies of Hellenistic originals. The statue has fooled more people than just Titi, but in point of fact no part of it is antique. Instead it copies the mock-antique style to be found in the statue of St. Sebastian that Domenico Guidi made, probably about 1665, for the facade of Sant'Andrea della Valle. The St. Sebastian in Sant'Agnese is entirely by Campi and, like all the decorations of the church, was commissioned for it by the Pamphili. In his forthcoming book on the sculptural program of Sant'Agnese, Rudolf Preimisberger will publish documents of payment from the Pamphili archives that will permit the work to be precisely dated, and an iconographic analysis of the statue that will explain its meaning within the context of the decorative system as a whole.

During the years between 1712 and 1735 Campi was busy most of the time working on one or another of the statues that he did for the cloister of the monastery at Montecassino. A good many sculptors took part in the program, but of the eighteen marble statues involved Campi received commissions for eight—far more than anyone else. Only two of these, a Charlemagne (Fig. 123) and a St. Benedict (Figs. 124, 125), survived the Allied bombardment of 1943 that reduced the monastery to rubble. The original commission for the Charlemagne had been given to Le Gros in 1714, but when the French sculptor died the statue had barely been roughed out.¹⁶ Campi took over the work in 1719 and probably finished it by 1721. Apart from a few abrasions the statue is intact (Fig. 123). The dynamic pose of the figure, the vigorous rhythms of the garment folds, the mass of details in the ornament, are all quite unlike anything else Campi ever did. The whiplash effect of the corner of the cape as it bunches up in a fan-shaped cluster of radial ridges—this alone would be enough to make us doubt the attribution were it not a documented work. Though the execution is entirely by Campi (unhampered by a concern for the grace of line and the refinement of detail that make Le Gros' work such a delight) he must have inherited Le Gros' *maquette* (or perhaps even the *modello*) and apparently he tried to follow it as closely as he could.

There can be no doubt that the Benedictines at Montecassino were satisfied with Campi's work. After he had made eight statues for the cloister they asked him to execute two enormous figures—both about nine feet high—to flank the grand stairway. They represent St. Benedict, the founder of the

order, and his sister, St. Scholastica. He made both statues in his studio in Rome, then shipped them by sea to Gaeta, from whence they proceeded overland to their final destination on the mountain top. In a document dated 14 December 1735 the sculptor acknowledged receipt of final payment for both works and tells us they took him two years to complete.¹⁷ Among all the 18th-century statues that once stood in Montecassino these are the only two for which we have good photographs taken before the bombardment of 1943. From these photos we can determine that the St. Benedict has survived almost in its entirety, subject only to an overall pitting of the surface. There are some minor restorations: most notably in the area of the garment surface that covers the weight-bearing leg (cf. Figs. 124 and 125). Of the Scholastica nothing whatsoever remains. The lifeless modern statue that serves as a replacement takes something of its shape from Campi's original but nothing of its spirit.

The statue of St. Benedict is at once both monumental and graceful, swathed in ponderous robes yet swaying softly. As the body bends in the suggestion of an arc two sets of folds swing out across the torso, curving slightly. The basic prototype that Campi drew on had already been established early in the second decade of the century by the sculptors who provided the colossal marble apostle statues that line the nave of St. John Lateran. What comes to mind is not so much Le Gros' contribution as the quieter work of Pierre Etienne Monnot: the St. Paul (finished in 1706) and the St. Peter (begun two years later). But since Campi's commission called on him to commemorate the founder of a religious order, he could not have failed to study carefully the over-life-size statue of St. Dominic that his master, Le Gros, had made for the Dominicans and had placed in St. Peter's in 1706. Given the same problem, we are struck by the differences in the solution. The pose of Le Gros' statue suggests a sense of springiness, an impression intensified by the lively small-scale rhythms that well up everywhere in the areas between the major lines of motion. Instead the pose of Campi's statue conveys lassitude, re-enforced by eliminating the secondary rhythms altogether. This is the final phase of late Baroque *détente*, a style that was enjoying marked success in Rome at this moment: witness for example the strikingly similar statue of St. Benedict that Carlo Monaldi was making at exactly this time (1735) to place in St. Peter's. This was by no means the only option however. The marble statues of St. Cajetan of Thiene and St. Francis of Paola, on which Bernardino Ludovisi was working in his studio in Rome in this same period, are decisively Barocchetto.¹⁸

When Campi turned to the St. Scholastica (Fig. 126) his style changed still further. Strongly stabilizing verticals bisect the center of the figure. Equally strong horizontals lie across the upper part of the chest. The tectonic theme is dominant. Against it all curvilinear counter-currents are secondary, of small effect. What we see here is neither Late Baroque nor Barocchetto but one of the relatively rare examples of early 18th-century classicism, a style that flourished quite consistently in the first half of the century (well before Neoclassicism came into being) in the work of such artists as Pompeo Battoni and Marco Benefial.

Toward the end of his career Campi received commissions for two statues in the series of the founders of religious orders that line the nave and crossing of St. Peter's. The first of these is of St. Juliana Falconieri (Fig. 127). An engraving by Pietro Bombelli tells us Campi made the statue in 1732.¹⁹ It was to be his masterpiece. Nothing in his previous work prepares us for this deeply moving figure of the saint bending forward with arms outstretched and mouth open in an expression that blends grief with compassion. Here in St. Peter's, Campi turns back to the vigorous movement, the momentary gestures, the deeply coloristic garment folds that Le Gros had used for his statue of St. Dominic so many years earlier. Now in Campi's statue the forms take on a new complexity, an unexpected enrichment. In contrast, for example, to the broader rhythms that flow across the figure's head and shoulders, the wimple beneath the cowl bunches softly in a series of small-scale eddies that continually change direction, slowing us down in preparation for the climactic point of focus: the intensely expressive face (Fig. 128).

One important sculptural commission that was carried out by Campi, but which has not been associated with his name for two centuries, can now be restored to the corpus of his certain work. As part of the detailed description of the newly erected façade of St. John Lateran we read, in the 1750 edition of *Roma antica e moderna* (Rome, II, 448) that "Vedonsi nel Frontespizio due Angeli parimente di marmo, scolpiti da Paolo Campi, li quale sostengono dentro di una Corona di Lauro l'Immagine del Santissimo Salvatore di Mosaiico, ch'era situata verso il Tetto dell'antica Facciata. . ." In a gatefold engraving of the façade, opposite page 427 in the same volume, Campi's angels are clearly visible. The façade, which was begun in 1732, on the designs of Alessandro Galileo for Pope Clement XII, was substantially complete by 1735, the date of the inscription on the great frieze. The sculpture in the pediment must have been completed by 1736, at which time it was described, though without

the name of the artist, by G. B. Gaddi.²⁰ Subsequently the knowledge that this sculpture was by Campi was lost sight of altogether. The angels are not included in any list of Campi's works nor have they been given to him elsewhere, in this or the previous century, anywhere in the literature of art. But the over-life-size marble figures are still in their original place in the pediment at the top of the great façade. There they "float," perhaps a hundred feet over our heads, imperfectly perceived through the atmospheric envelope even by the camera's telescopic eye (Fig. 129). But in the bright Roman sun that sparkles on the projecting marble ridges of the garment folds and sets up so strong a contrast to the pools of deep shadow formed by the billowing draperies, the stocky "statues" (they are almost free standing) come alive with movement. In place of lassitude we have vigor.

The final statement of this new use of an old style is Campi's over-life-size statue of St. Peter Nolasco (founder of the Mercedarian Order) in St. Peter's (Fig. 130). The attribution to Campi is sustained consistently in the early literature.²¹ The date comes from a large engraving of the statue which carries this inscription:

"Paulus Campi Sculp. in Basilc.[sic] Vatic. a. 1742
Pet. Bombelli Incid. Rom. Sup Lic. a. 1785."²²

On the face of the stone plinth on which the statue rests is inscribed the following lines:

S. PETRVS NOLASCO
ORDINIS BEATAE MARIAE VIRGINIS DE MERCEDE
REDEMPTIONIS CAPTORVM FVNDATOR

which tells us that Peter Nolasco founded the Order of Our Lady of Ransom for the rescue of captives (from the Moors).

In this work the strong rhythms of Campi's late style not only continue but augment. Emphatic clusters of lines cross the body on a bias, meeting and intersecting with one another. Nonetheless it all seems rather forced: too many straight lines, not enough curves; too many parallel folds, not enough pattern; too much noise and confusion to be absorbed by the stocky figure who stands almost motionless, gazing up to heaven. His impressive bulk makes the tiny midget he has just freed look all the more out of place.

Whether Campi's contemporaries applauded the work, derided it, or received it with indifference, we have no way of knowing. What work he did

after this, where he lived, when he died—all of these things remain a mystery. In 1742 the thread runs out.

Notes

1. Apart from the photograph of the St. Sebastian in Rome and the pre-war photos of the St. Scholastica and the St. Benedict in Montecassino, which were made for the Gabinetto fotografico nazionale, all the photographs used in this article were taken at my request. They represent a very small part of a full scale photographic campaign carried out over a three year period with the aim of providing a visual record of virtually all early Settecento sculpture in Rome. For grants to carry out this campaign and for support and encouragement of the larger project of which it forms a part, I am deeply grateful to the Trustees and Officers of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation and above all to its able executive Vice-President Mary M. Davis.

2. Giuseppe Campori, *Memorie biografiche degli scultori, architetti, pittori ec. nativi di Carrara . . .*, Modena, 1873, 53-55.

3. Friedrich Noack, "Pietro Paolo Campi," in Thieme-Becker, *Allgemeines Lexikon . . .*, Leipzig, V, 1911, 472.

4. Alberto Riccoboni, *Roma nell'arte: la scultura nell'evo moderno dal Quattrocento al oggi*, Rome, 1942, 275-276.

5. Andrea Caravita, *I Codici e le arti a Monte Cassino*, Montecassino, III, 1870, 510.

6. Campori, 53.

7. Caravita, III, 502.

8. Girolamo Tiraboschi, *Notizie de' pittori, scultori, incisori, e architetti nati degli Stati . . . di Modena*, Modena, 1786, 135.

9. Filippo Titi, *Nuovo studio di pittura, scultura ed architettura nelle chiese di Roma . . .*, Rome, 1721, 27.

10. Riccoboni, 276.

11. Archivio della Reverenda Fabbrica di S. Pietro in Vaticano, Ser. Arm., Vol. 397 (*Giornale, 1697 . . . 1707*), 227.

12. E.g., Archivio . . . S. Pietro, Ser. Arm., Vol. 397, p. 254, 31 December 1703. Here as elsewhere I express my grateful thanks to Don Cipriano Cipriani for the endless things he has done to facilitate work not only for me but for a whole generation of scholars in the Archives of the Fabbrica.

13. Filippo Titi, *Descrizione delle pitture, sculture e architetture . . . in Roma*, Rome, 1763, 408, in the section dealing with San Salvatore in Lauro, writes: "Nell'altar maggiore . . . gli Angioli di stucco son di Paolo Campi."

14. Riccoboni, 276.

15. F. Titi, *Descrizione*, 131.

16. "Quella poi che rapresent il Carlo Magnio resta solo spociato il Marmo . . .," Campi wrote in a deposition of 30 July 1719 (Caravita, 516). On December 12th of the following year Campi acknowledged receipt of "li detti scudi dui cento a conto della statua che io lavoro di marmo che rapresenta il Carlo Magnio da collocarsi in una delle nicie del Claustro del Venerabile Monastero di Monte Casino. . ." (Caravita, 515).

17. Caravita, 518-521.

18. R. Enggass, "Bernardino Ludovisi—III: his work in Portugal," *Burlington Magazine*, CX, 1968, 614-617 and Figs. 26, 27, 29. The St. Cajetan is inscribed "1733" and St. Francis of Paola, likewise for the Basilica at Mafra, must have been done about this same date.

19. The engraving on an unnumbered plate in P. Bombelli, *Le statue de' dodici Apostoli esistenti nella Basilica Lateranense scolpite da celebri autori*, Rome, 1786, is inscribed as follows:

"Paulus Campi Sculp. in Basil. Vatic. a. 1732
Petrus Bombelli Incidit Romae anno 1785"

The attribution is confirmed by various eighteenth century sources, including G. P. Chattard, *Nuova descrizione del Vaticano o sia della sacrosanta Basilica di S. Pietro*, Rome, I, 1762, 146; Titi, *Descrizione*, 1763, 21; G. Tiraboschi, 135.

20. G. B. Gaddi, *Roma nobilitata nelle sue fabbriche dalla Santità di Nostro Signore Clemente XII*, Rome, 1736, 13: "Nel Tympano del Frontespizio vedonsi due grandi Angioli di marmo bianco, li quali reggono una Corona di Lauro, dentro di cui è rimessa l'Antica Immagine del Santissimo Salvatore lavorata a Mosaico. . ."

21. Chattard, I, 146; F. Titi, *Descrizione*, 21; Tiraboschi, 135.

22. Bombelli, 1786. The plate is unnumbered. As is the case with Campi's statute of St. Juliana, the date provided by the engraving seems to have been overlooked in all the subsequent literature.

Tiepolo's Zenobia Cycle

By FERN RUSK SHAPLEY

National Gallery of Art, Washington

At the beginning of this century Molmenti, in his monumental book on Tiepolo, lamented the dispersal of the great artist's paintings which had begun soon after his death. "Taken from the walls of palaces and churches for which they were painted, some were lost or destroyed, others scattered here and there, and only later searched out and cared for."¹

Small wonder, then, that paintings by Tiepolo which have first come to notice in the course of the present century sometimes offer baffling problems of provenance and even of subject. In the case of his large canvas reproduced in Fig. 131, identifying its subject may well help identify its original location also. As for the subject, evidence is now at hand to verify its interpretation as *Queen Zenobia Addressing Her Soldiers*. This subject was proposed in 1965 by Panofsky,² only to be discredited in favor of one or another of several subjects proposed earlier, most of them involving some episode in Roman history. Reflecting the uncertainty as to the particular episode represented, the label over which the picture has been exhibited since its acquisition in 1961 by the National Gallery of Art, reads *A Scene from Roman History*.

As evidence for his interpretation of the subject, Panofsky cites the story of Zenobia told in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (popularly paraphrased by Gibbon).³ Here Zenobia, ruler of Palmyra from 267 to 272, one of the most famous women of all times, is described as no less hardy and courageous than beautiful and chaste; she not only directed military campaigns, she shared the life of her soldiers, accompanied them in battle, and went to their gatherings "after the fashion of Roman emperors, a helmet on her head, her arms often bare." It is thus that she is shown in Tiepolo's painting, addressing her troops (Fig. 131). Under her brocaded mantle, armor covers her breast, and on her head is a plumed helmet; but that her queenly state may not be forgotten, a diadem encircles her helmet and she carries a scepter in her right hand.⁴

The reasonableness of this interpretation of the subject becomes certainty through the discovery that the Washington picture has a pendant in the painting of a later episode from the life of Zenobia. That pendant is the well-known *Triumph of Aurelian* in the Galleria Sabauda, Turin (Fig. 132).⁵ There our heroine is again the center of attention: almost sinking under the

weight of jewels and rich, trailing robes, Zenobia is led in chains at the head of the emperor's elaborate procession; for Palmyra has fallen (272) and Zenobia has been captured and brought by Aurelian to Rome, with her fabulous hoard of treasure.

That the two paintings were designed in a single decorative scheme is obvious. There can be no doubt of their stylistic compatibility and, while never associating the one with the other, critics have assigned each to Tiepolo's early period, from the late 1720's to the early 1730's.⁶ The Turin picture is somewhat wider than the one in Washington; but the two are equal in height,⁷ as would be expected in sections of wall decorations designed for a single room.

At least two other known paintings belonged to this decorative scheme, the *Hunter on Horseback* and the *Hunter with a Stag* in the Crespi Collection, Milan (Figs. 133 and 134). They are much narrower than the Turin and Washington pictures, but they are the same height,⁸ and they are painted in the same style. Their subjects, too, although at first sight they may not seem so, are appropriate to the Zenobia cycle. Zenobia's husband, Odenaethus, ruler of the East and ally of Rome until his death, in 267, was passionately fond of hunting, and Zenobia is said to have shared his devotion to this sport. Intervals between wars were spent in hunting; and it was the hunt, at last, that cost Odenaethus his life: he was assassinated by his nephew out of resentment at being reprimanded for unseemly conduct in a hunting expedition.

The earliest known records specifically referring to the four canvases from the Zenobia cycle give no indication of its original location. The first date that we find connected with the Washington and Crespi pictures is 1905: a note in the Kress Foundation archives (without citation of source) states that these three paintings were "described by Barozzi as in the Valmarana Villa in 1905." Now this Barozzi is presumably the Conte Dino Barozzi, of Venice, who sold the three paintings in 1909 to C. Ledyard Blair, of Peapack-Gladstone, New Jersey. Barozzi's report of their provenance is so vague that in 1949 Lionello Venturi could write that the Washington picture "comes from the Villa Valmarana near Vicenza and shows the same style as the frescoes Tiepolo painted there in and around 1737."⁹ Venturi's suggestion of stylistic affinity with the Vicenza frescoes was obviously ill-considered: that these are in a much later style is confirmed by the rereading of the inscribed date as 1757. Suida has cited Venturi's statement as incorrect,¹⁰ saying that the picture now in Washington is painted in the style of the early 1730's, and that it comes from the

Villa Valmarana in Noventa Padovana, in the province of Padua, a provenance which Suida could have taken over from Lorenzetti's book of 1942.¹¹

The general confusion about Barozzi's acquisition of the Washington and Crespi paintings leaves one skeptical about their connection with the Villa Valmarana in Noventa Padovana, a villa which was left at the death, in 1894, of Elena Valmarana (born Elena Vendramin Calergi) to an institution for deaf-mutes. Even if it be concluded that the paintings were once there we have no evidence of how long they had been there and certainly no document or legend to indicate whether they had been painted for that villa. The building may even have served as no more than a way-station in passing the paintings from one owner to another. A guidebook of 1931¹² describes the 18th-century decorations of the walls in the main-floor rooms of the villa as if none of the decorations were missing, and no mention is made of Tiepolo's paintings ever having been there.

The *Triumph of Aurelian*, now in Turin, is first definitely recorded in the 1841 catalogue (no. 1390) of the splendid collection of Cardinal Fesch, the uncle of Napoleon. When and from whom the Cardinal obtained the painting we do not know. There is abundant evidence that from the first years of the nineteenth century he used his access to fabulous wealth and his almost unlimited clerical and political influence to acquire the best works of art that became available in those unsettled times.

It is the subject matter of the four paintings that has provided the most promising clue to their origin. Sack, who catalogued the Turin picture in 1910,¹³ noted that the Zenobio family of Venice might reasonably have commissioned decorations from the story of Zenobia because of the similarity of the name to their own. Morassi, in 1962, followed up this suggestion with the statement of da Canal (1732), in reference to the Venetian Ca' Zenobio, that Tiepolo had painted various stories in a room there "in his very early period."¹⁴ This should indicate a date for the decorations before 1732. Pride of lineage is too prevalent at all times to call for emphasis here upon its fashion in 18th-century Italy. What could be more glamorous than to claim descent from the brilliant, heroic Queen Zenobia! To be sure, according to the favored version of her story, Zenobia had been brought to Italy in chains, but the chains were of gold; further, Aurelian forgave her for having defied his army, and he provided her with an elegant villa at Tivoli, where she lived as a respected Roman matron, her son a trusted friend of the Emperor and her daughters married to Roman nobles.

The dating established by da Canal for the Ca' Zenobio decorations, i.e., before 1732, accords well with the style of Tiepolo's Zenobia cycle of decorations.¹⁵ Clearly, all four of the paintings belong to one period. Parallels between them are striking. The soldiers in the Turin and Washington paintings are remarkably similar; the scenes shown in the hazy distance of both pictures are alike in effect; and the hunter on the horse in one of the Crespi paintings might easily be exchanged for the Emperor in his chariot in the Turin picture. In corroboration of the early date, the four paintings may be compared with Tiepolo's decorations, now scattered, from the Ca' Dolfin, Venice, with their suggested dating of 1725-30.¹⁶ Compare, for example, the Crespi hunter's horse (Fig. 133) with one in the Ca' Dolfin *Capture of Carthage*, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (Fig. 135). The Crespi horse has been paralleled also with the horse in one of Tiepolo's rare *capricci* etchings (Fig. 136): Rizzi cites this similarity of type, and especially of pose, as evidence of contemporaneity of painting and etching.¹⁷ A definite dating of the Zenobia cycle before 1732 might help solve the disputed dating of the series of *capricci*, which Rizzi tends to place about 1740, but which could be a decade earlier.

It is not unreasonable to hope that the happy discovery of some document may confirm the identification of Tiepolo's Zenobia cycle as decoration for the Ca' Zenobio. The Ca' Zenobio still stands in Venice, on the Rio dei Carmini, near the Scuola Grande dei Carmini. It was built by Antonio Gaspari about 1700 and has been used as a school since 1850 by the Armenian Order of Mekhitarists. The only Tiepolo now belonging to the Order is an oval ceiling painting, *Justice and Peace*, which has been installed in San Lazzaro degli Armeni, on the Island of San Lazzaro, Venice, headquarters of the Mekhitarists since 1717. Morassi says that this ceiling painting, which is in the same early style as Tiepolo's Zenobia cycle, was brought by the Mekhitarists from Ca' Zenobio, where it was probably part of the original decorations.¹⁸

Notes

1. Pompeo Molmenti, *G. B. Tiepolo*, Milan, 1909, 245.

2. Erwin Panofsky, "Classical Reminiscences in Titian's Portraits," *Festschrift für Herbert von Einem*, Berlin, 1965, 198, n. 26); E. Panofsky, *Problems in Titian*, New York, 1969, 77.

3. The version of the story of Zenobia which I have followed is that given by Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, J. B. Bury ed., London, II, 1906, 83ff., 354f. His source, chiefly the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (semi-historical accounts, possibly dating from the fourth century), was certainly well known in 18th-century Venice. Cf. also Alfred von Sallet (*Die Fürsten von Palmyra unter Gallienus, Claudius und Aurelianus*, 1866), who reconstructs the same version of the story of Zenobia partly from inscriptions found on coins.

4. W. E. Suida, *Philadelphia Museum Bulletin*, XLVI, Autumn 1950, 22, suggests that the gesture of Zenobia's left hand—thumb and index finger forming a circle—may signify an exhortation to unity. It may be noted that Donato Creti shows Christ making the same gesture while addressing Mary and Martha, an occasion clearly in need of an exhortation to unity. Creti's painting, of about 1710, in the Ospizio, San Giovanni in Persiceto (Bologna), is reproduced by Renato Roli, *Arte Antica e Moderna*, No. 7, 1959, Fig. 148 b.

5. See Noemi Gabrielli, *Galleria Sabauda, maestri italiani*, Turin, 1971, 245, No. 594 (catalogued as by Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, 1728-32). The author parallels the Turin painting stylistically with Tiepolo's decorations from the Ca' Dolfin, Venice (some now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), which have been, in turn, convincingly dated between 1725 and 1730 (Antonio Morassi, *G. B. Tiepolo*, London, 1962, 34, Figs. 294 and 306).

6. See note 5 above. Edward Sack, *Giambattista und Domenico Tiepolo*, Hamburg, 1910, 178, No. 224, calls the Turin painting a youthful work. Morassi, 1962, 51, dates it c. 1728-32, while (on p. 67), although not noticing the association of the Turin painting with the one in Washington, he dates the latter c. 1730-35. Aldo Rizzi in his catalogue of paintings, *Mostra del Tiepolo*, Udine, June 27-October 31, 1971, 58, discussing the Crespi companion paintings (see below and my Figs. 133 and 134) is alone in suggesting a date as late as 1740 for the Washington and Crespi paintings. In the same exhibition catalogue (33), however, Rizzi accepts a dating before 1732 for the Turin painting, and stresses its stylistic relationship to the Castelgomberto painting, of c. 1725.

7. The Turin picture measures 260 x 402 cm.; the one in Washington, 261.4 x 365.8 cm. The former measurements are taken from Gabrielli's Turin catalogue, note 5, above.

8. The *Hunter on Horseback* measures 262 x 148 cm.; the *Hunter with a Stag*, 262 x 110 cm.

9. Venturi's unpublished expertise is in the archives of the Kress Foundation.

10. Suida's unpublished note is in the archives of the Kress Foundation.

11. Giulio Lorenzetti, *Das Jahrhundert Tiepolos*, 1942, caption for Pl. 38 (the painting is not mentioned in the text). Lorenzetti's caption gives the location of the Washington picture as the Blair Collection. Whether it left the Blair Collection only in 1949, when it was acquired, through French & Company, for the Kress Collection, we do not know. It may be noted that the dossier, dated January 10, 1950, submitted by French & Company, quoting partly from Venturi, introduces a further misunderstanding into the provenance data: "This painting comes from the Villa Valmarana, Noventa, near Vicenza[!] and shows the same style as the frescoes Tiepolo painted there in and around 1737." The Washington picture is not mentioned in the catalogue of the Blair sale at

Parke-Bernet's, New York, June 10, 1950, when the two Crespi pictures were sold, as lots 226A and 226B, with no pre-Blair provenance data.

12. Bruno Brunelli and Adolfo Callegari, *Ville del Brenta e degli Euganei*, 1931; see under the heading *Villa Grimani* (an earlier designation of the Villa Valmarana).

13. Sack, 178.

14. Morassi, 1962, 51, citing both Vincenzo da Canal, *Vita di Gregorio Lazzarini*, p. xxxiii of ms. copy, and G. A. Moschini, *Guida per la città di Venezia*, Venice, II, 1815, 280. The treatise by da Canal is apparently important as the earliest critical appreciation of Tiepolo (see Nicola Ivanoff, in *Arte Veneta*, VII, 1953, 117f.). Unfortunately, I have not yet been able to consult either the original manuscript or Moschini's 1809 publication of it. However, p. xxxiii of the manuscript is presumably quoted in Morassi's second citation, Moschini, 280, where we read: "Per questo palazzo [Ca' Zenobio] Gregorio Lazzarini fece un soffitto con Cerere e Bacco l'anno 1700: Giambattista Tiepolo vi compartì nella sua prima età una sala con varie storie; e Luca Carlevaris, soprannominato di cà Zenobio, vi dipinse opere molte di finitezza e gusto."

15. See notes 5 and 6 above.

16. Morassi, 34.

17. Rizzi, 58.

18. See Morassi, 56 and Fig. 215.

A Note on the Career of Harold E. Wethey, with a List of his Publications

By ADELAIDE A. ADAMS

Assembled here for the first time is a complete list of publications—books, articles, and reviews—together with a list of doctoral dissertations directed by Harold Edwin Wethey, the scholar to whom this collection of essays in Western European art is dedicated.

Harold Wethey was born in 1902 in Port Byron, New York. Following undergraduate work in Romance Languages at Cornell (B.A., 1923) and a brief business experience in New York, he began graduate study in the History of Art at Harvard, where he received the Master of Arts degree in 1931 and the Doctor of Philosophy degree in 1934. His first book, based on his doctoral dissertation, *Gil de Siloe and His School*, appeared in 1936.

Wethey taught at Bryn Mawr College and at Washington University in St. Louis before he joined the faculty of the University of Michigan in 1940. In 1964-65 Wethey was Henry Russel Lecturer; in 1968 he received the Distinguished Faculty Achievement Award of the University of Michigan. His contribution to scholarship has also been recognized by learned societies around the world. The Hispanic Society of New York awarded him its Medal in 1952 for distinguished research and publication on Spanish sculpture. The Royal Academy of Fine Arts of St. Ferdinand in Madrid, the Sociedad Peruana de Historia, and the Academia Nacional de Ciencias de Bolivia all elected him to membership. He has held two Guggenheim Fellowships, two American Council of Learned Societies Fellowships, a Fulbright Research grant, a Rockefeller Fellowship, and nine Rackham Research grants.

Since Dr. Wethey's retirement from teaching in 1972, he has continued to be a very productive scholar. The third and last volume of his definitive study of Titian is scheduled to appear for publication in 1975. This monumental monograph and catalogue raisonné, the only complete work on the painting of Titian to be attempted since the 1870's, marks the culmination of Professor Wethey's career as an art historian.

A true heir and worthy transmitter of the Renaissance tradition, Dr. Wethey has made his own life one of ever widening intellectual horizons. With equal interest and authority, he has dealt with problems in architecture, sculpture, and painting and has done extensive research on artists who were

masters of all three arts—Alonso Cano, El Greco, and to a lesser degree Sebastián de Herrera Barnuevo.

HAROLD E. WETHEY — BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS:

1936

1. *Gil de Siloe and His School. A Study of Late Gothic Sculpture in Burgos.* Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1936. Pp. 140 + 146 illus. on 83 plates.

1949

2. *Colonial Architecture and Sculpture in Peru.* Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1949. Pp. xvii + 330 + 367 illus. on 216 plates.

Book award of Society of Architectural Historians, 1950.

Photographic reprint, Westport, Greenwood Press, 1971.

1955

3. *Alonso Cano. Painter, Sculptor and Architect.* Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1955. Pp. xiii + 227 + 176 illus. on 112 plates.

1958

4. *Alonso Cano Pintor.* Madrid, Instituto Diego Velázquez, 1958. Pp. 35 + 49 illus. on 48 plates.

1961

5. *Arquitectura virreinal en Bolivia.* La Paz, Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, 1961. Pp. 199, 10 architectural drawings in the text, 84 illus.

(A translation of articles originally published 1947-1952.)

1962

6. *El Greco and His School.* Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1962.

Vol. I, Text, pp. xiv + 125 + 405 illus. on 216 plates.

Vol. II, Catalogue Raisonné, pp. x + 276.

1966

7. *Editor: Chandler R. Post, History of Spanish Painting.* Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1966.

Vol. XIII, The Schools of Aragon and Navarre in the Early Renaissance. Pp. xv + 451, 188 illus.

Vol. XIV, The School of Castile in the Later Renaissance. Pp. xxviii + 294, 106 illus.

1968

8. *El Greco y su escuela*. Madrid, Ediciones Guadarrama, 1967, revised edition in Spanish of the work of 1962.
Vol. I, Text, pp. 123 + 382 illus. on 334 plates.
Vol. II, Catalogue Raisonné, pp. 287 + 16 plates in color.

1969

9. *Titian*, Volume I, *The Religious Paintings*. London, Phaidon Press, 1969. Pp. 390, including 242 black-and-white illus., frontispiece in color.

1971

Titian, Volume II, *The Portraits*. London, Phaidon Press, 1971. Pp. 426, including 275 black-and-white illus., 4 color plates.

In Press

Titian, Volume III, *The Mythological and Historical Paintings*. London, Phaidon Press, 1975, including about 320 black-and-white illus. and 8 color plates.

ARTICLES:

1935

1. "Gil de Siloe and Sculpture in Burgos under the Catholic Kings," *Summary of Theses*. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1935, 129-132.

1937

2. "Gil de Siloe," Thieme-Becker's *Künstler-Lexikon*, XXXI, 1937, 27-28.
3. "Diego de Siloe," Thieme-Becker's *Künstler-Lexikon*, XXXI, 1937, 26-27.
4. "Anequín de Egas Cueman, A Fleming in Spain," *Art Bulletin*, XIX, 1937, 381-400.

1939

5. "Guillermo Sagrera," *Art Bulletin*, XXI, 1939, 44-60.
6. "Narciso Tomé," Thieme-Becker's *Künstler-Lexikon*, XXXIII, 1939, 265-266.
7. "Tomé y Gavilán," Thieme-Becker's *Künstler-Lexikon*, XXXIII, 1939, 266.
8. "Tordesillas," Thieme-Becker's *Künstler-Lexikon*, XXXIII, 1939, 285-286.
9. "Tudelilla," Thieme-Becker's *Künstler-Lexikon*, XXXIII, 1939, 471.
10. "An American Pioneer in Hispanic Studies: Georgiana Goddard King," *Parnassus*, XI, 1939, 33-35.

1940

11. "A Madonna and Child by Diego de Siloe," *Art Bulletin*, XXII, 1940, 190-196.

12. "Juan de Valmaseda," Thieme-Becker's *Künstler-Lexikon*, XXXIV, 1940, 86-87.
13. "Juan Vascardo," Thieme-Becker's *Künstler-Lexikon*, XXXIV, 1940, 129.
14. "Felipe Vigarni," Thieme-Becker's *Künstler-Lexikon*, XXXIV, 1940, 344-345.
15. "Gregorio Vigarni," Thieme-Becker's *Künstler-Lexikon*, XXXIV, 1940, 345-346.
16. "Villabrille," Thieme-Becker's *Künstler-Lexikon*, XXXIV, 1940, 363.

1941

17. "Goya Exhibition," *Art in America*, XXIX, 1941, 98-99.
18. "Exhibition of Spanish Painting at Toledo," *Art in America*, XXIX, 1941, 168-170.
19. "Report of College Art Association," *Parnassus*, XIII, 1941, 115.

1942

20. "Division of Fine Arts and Fogg Museum of Art, Harvard University," *Hispanic Source Materials in the United States*, ed. R. S. Hilton. Toronto, 1942, 203-207.
21. "Mexican Fortress Churches of the Sixteenth Century" (letter to the editor), *Art Bulletin*, XXIV, 1942, 384-386.

1943

22. "A Spanish Relief of the Epiphany," *Art Quarterly*, VI, 1943, 13-16.
23. "The Early Works of Bartolomé Ordóñez and Diego de Siloe," *Art Bulletin*, XXV, 1943, 226-238, 325-345.

1944

24. "La pintura contemporánea en los Estados Unidos," *La Razón*, Bogotá, February 1944.

1945

25. "La pintura en los Estados Unidos," *Cursos y Conferencias*, Buenos Aires, Colegio Libre, XXVI, 1945, 385-409.
26. "Iglesias de Cajamarca," *Cultura Peruana* (Lima, V, 22), 1945, 13.

1946

27. "Saña, A Dead City of Peru," *Michigan Alumnus Quarterly Review*, LIII, 10, 1946, 9-14.
28. "Recent Studies of the Architectural History of Peru and Bolivia," *Journal of Society of Architectural Historians*, V, 1945-1946, 39-41.
29. "La Merced in Cuzco, Peru," *Journal of Society of Architectural Historians*, V, 1945-1946, 35-38.

30. "Saña, la ciudad muerta del Perú," *Cultura Peruana* (Lima, VIII, 28), 1947, unpagued, 4 pp.
31. "The Problem of Toribio de Alcaraz," *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, XXXI, 1947, 165-174.
32. "Two Spanish Prophets of the Renaissance," *Art Quarterly*, X, 1947, 133-138.
- 1948
33. "La Merced del Cuzco," *Revista Universitaria*, Cuzco, XXXVII, 1948, 151-160.
- 1949
34. "Spanish-American Art, Bibliography for 1946," *Handbook of Latin-American Studies*, XII, 1949, 54-63.
- 1950
35. "Retablos coloniales en Bolivia," *Anales del Instituto de Arte Americano*, Buenos Aires, III, 1950, 7-14.
36. "La arquitectura colonial de Arequipa," *El Deber* (Arequipa, Peru, July 27, 1950), 9-12.
- 1951
37. "Spanish-American Art, Bibliography for 1947-1948," *Handbook of Latin-American Studies*, XIV, 1951, 50-67.
38. "Mestizo Architecture in Bolivia," *Art Quarterly*, XIV, 1951, 283-306.
- 1952
39. "Hispanic Colonial Architecture in Bolivia," *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, XXXIX, 1952, 47-60; also, XL, 1952, 193-208.
40. "La última fase de la arquitectura colonial en Cochabamba, Sucre y Potosí," *Arte en América y Filipinas*, III, 1952, 121-136.
41. "Spanish-American Art, Bibliography for 1949," *Handbook of Latin-American Studies*, XV, 1952, 50-60.
42. "A Drawing by Alonso Cano," *Bulletin, University of Michigan, Museum of Art*, I, 3, 1952, 2-4.
43. "Alonso Cano's Drawings," *Art Bulletin*, XXXIV, 1952, 217-234.
- 1953
44. "Franciscan Art in Peru," *The Americas*, IX, 1953, 399-411.
45. "El testamento de Alonso Cano," *Boletín de la Sociedad Española de Excursiones*, LVII, 1953, 1-11.
46. "Spanish-American Art, Bibliography for 1950," *Handbook of Latin-American Studies*, XVI, 1953, 47-53.

47. "Juan Niño de Guevara," *Academia. Anales y boletín de la Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando*, II, 1953, 137-142.

1954

48. "Discípulos granadinos de Alonso Cano," *Archivo español de arte*, XXVII, 1954, 25-34.
54. "Spanish-American Art, Bibliography for 1951," *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, XVII, 1954, 34-50.
50. "Spanish-American Architecture," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th edition, printing of 1954, XXI, 148-149.
51. "Herrera Barnuevo's Work for the Jesuits of Madrid," *Art Quarterly*, XVII, 1954, 335-344.
52. "Arte franciscano en el Perú," *Revista del Instituto Americano de Arte*, Cuzco, VII, 1954, 91-102.

1955

53. "Colonial Art and Architecture in Latin America," *Encyclopedia Americana*, printing of 1955, VII, 43-45.
54. "Spanish-American Art, Bibliography for 1952," *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, XVIII, 1955, 34-42.

1956

55. "Decorative Projects by Sebastián de Herrera Barnuevo," *Burlington Magazine*, XCVIII, 1956, 40-46.

1958

56. "Spanish-American Art, Bibliography for 1953-1956," *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, XX, 1958, 58-72.
57. "Colonial Art," *Mexican Art Pre-Columbian to Modern Times* [Catalogue], Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, etc., 1958, 25-33.
58. "Sebastián de Herrera Barnuevo," *Anales del Instituto de Arte Americano*, Buenos Aires, XI, 1958, 13-41.

1959

59. "Escorial," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th edition, printing of 1959, VIII, 705-706.
60. "Pietro Torrigiano," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th edition, printing of 1959, XXII, 310.
61. "Spanish-American Art, Bibliography for 1956-1957," *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, XXI, 1959, 43-49.

1960

62. "Bolivia. Epoca coloniale e moderna," *Enciclopedia Universale dell'Arte*, Rome, II, 1960, 716-717.
63. "Bolivia. Colonial and Modern Period," *Encyclopedia of World Art*, New York, McGraw-Hill, II, 1960, 544-545.
64. "Velázquez and Alonso Cano," *Varia Velazqueña*, Madrid, 1960, I, 452-455.
65. "Alonso Cano," *Encyclopedia of World Art*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960, III, 56-57.

1961

66. "Ibero-American Architecture," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th edition, printing of 1961, XII, 31A-31B.
67. "El Greco y Velázquez en el manierismo y el barroco," *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos*, Nos. 140-141, 1961, 255-260.

1962

68. "Portraits du Greco en France," *Revue du Louvre*, XIIe année, 6, 1962, 273-280.

1963

69. "Spanish Painting at Indianapolis and Providence," *Burlington Magazine*, CV, 1963, 207-208.

1964

70. "Orazio Borgianni in Italy and in Spain," *Burlington Magazine*, CVI, 1964, 147-159.
71. "Orazio Borgianni, Addenda," *Burlington Magazine*, CVI, 1964, 378-380.
72. "Escaleras del primer renacimiento español," *Archivo español de arte*, XXXVII, 1964, 295-305.
73. "Michelangelo e El Greco," *Palatino*, Anno VIII, Ser. 3, 1964, 144-148.

1966

74. "Herrera Barnuevo and his Chapel in the Descalzas Reales," (with A. S. Wethey), *Art Bulletin*, XLVIII, 1966, 15-34.
75. Letter to the Editor (on the Roman Catholicism of El Greco), *Art Bulletin*, XLVIII, 1966, 126-127.

1967

76. "Alonso Cano," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, New York, McGraw-Hill, III, 1967, 28.
77. "El Greco," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, New York, McGraw-Hill, VI, 1967, 717-720.

78. *The Italian Heritage*, An Exhibition . . . for . . . the Committee to Rescue Italian Art, Wildenstein Gallery, 1967, unpagged [viii + 94 pp., 74 illus.], biographies and entries on Hans Holbein the Younger, El Greco, Velázquez, Zurbarán, and Alonso Cano [pp. 45, 52-54, 74-79].

79. "Herrera Barnuevo y su capilla de las Descalzas Reales," (with A. S. Wethey), *Reales Sitios*, Revista del Patrimonio Nacional, Madrid, Año IV, Núm. 13, 1967, 12-21.

80. "The Spanish Viceroy, Luca Giordano, and Andrea Vaccaro," *Burlington Magazine*, CIX, 1967, 678-686.

1968

81. "Alonso Cano," *Gran Enciclopedia Larousse*, II, Barcelona, 1968, 618.

1969

82. "Los retratos de Felipe II por Tiziano," *Archivo español de arte*, [homenaje a D. Manuel Gómez Moreno], XLII, 1969, 129-138.

1970

83. "Orazio Borgianni," *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Rome, XII, 1970, 744-747.

1972

84. "Titian's 'Ecce Homo' and 'Mater Dolorosa' for Charles V and Philip II," *Actes du XXIIe Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art*, 1969, Budapest, 1972, II, 753-757.

1973

85. "Giorgione," *Encyclopedia of World Biography*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1973, IV, 404-406.

86. "Titian," *Encyclopedia of World Biography*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1973, X, 459-462.

87. "El Greco," *Encyclopedia of World Biography*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1973, IV, 520-524.

88. "Luis de Morales," *Encyclopedia of World Biography*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1973, VII, 504-505.

1974

89. "Giorgione," *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Macropaedia*, 1974, VIII, 160-161.

90. "Titian," *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Macropaedia*, 1974, XVIII, 457-461.

91. "El Greco," *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Macropaedia*, 1974, VIII, 306-309.

92. "The Spanish School, Paintings," Catalogue, Worcester Art Museum, Worcester, 1974, I, 512.

In Press

93. "Sebastián de Terrera Barnuevo," *Gran Enciclopedia Larousse*, Barcelona.
 94. "Titian's 'Adam and Eve' and Philip II," *Acts, Twenty-third International Congress of the History of Art, Granada, 1973*.

REVIEWS:

1940

1. Bernard Bevan, *History of Spanish Architecture*. *Art Bulletin*, XXII, 1940, 178-181.
 2. Harriet D. Adams, *Selective Bibliography of Hispano-Islamic Art*. *Ars Islamica*, VII, 1940, 171.

1941

3. Arthur Gardner, *Alabaster Effigies*. *Parnassus*, XIII, 1941, 146.

1942

4. Georgiana Goddard King, *Heart of Spain*. *Art in America*, XXX, 1942, 135-136.
 5. José Gudiol y Ricart, *Goya*. *College Art Journal*, I, 1942, 79.
 6. W. E. Suida, *Raphael*. *College Art Journal*, II, 1942, 29-30.

1946

7. Manuel Gómez-Moreno, *Las águilas del renacimiento español*, *Art Bulletin*. XXVIII, 1946, 58-60.
 8. Victor Barriga, *El templo de la Merced de Lima*. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXVI, 1946, 581-582.

1947

9. Benjamín Gento Sanz, *San Francisco de Lima*. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXVII, 1947, 109-110.
 10. Diego Angulo and Enrique Marco Dorta, *Historia del arte hispanoamericano*. I, *Art in America*, XXXV, 1947, 239-242.
 11. Emilio Harth-terré, *Artífices de virreinato del Perú*. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXVII, 1947, 684-686.
 12. Alberto Tauro, *Biobibliografía de Emilio Harth-terré, arquitecto*. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXVII, 1947, 684-686.

1948

13. Padre Rubén Vargas Ugarte, *Ensayo de un diccionario de artífices en la América meridional*. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXVIII, 1948, 428-429.

14. Padre Guillermo Furlong, *Arquitectos argentinos. Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXVIII, 1948, 428-429.

1949

15. Robert C. Smith and Elizabeth Wilder, *A Guide to the Art of Latin America. Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXIX, 1949, 280.

1950

16. Elizabeth du Gué Trapier, *Velázquez. College Art Journal*, IX, 2, 1949-1950, 235-236.

1951

17. Elizabeth Wilder Weismann, *Mexico in Sculpture: 1521-1821. Saturday Review of Literature*, March 3, 1951, 44.

18. Mario Buschiazzo, *El templo de San Francisco de la Paz. Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXI, 1951, 109-110.

19. Martín S. Noel, *El santuario de Copacabana; de la Paz a Tiahuanaco. Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXI, 1951, 485-486.

20. Walter W. S. Cook and José Gudíol Ricart, *Pintura y imaginaria románica. Art Quarterly*, XIV, 1951, 175.

21. Pál Kelemen, *Baroque and Rococo in Latin America. Saturday Review of Literature*, July 7, 1951, 38.

1952

22. Enrique Marco Dorta, *Fuentes para la historia de arte hispanoamericano. Art Bulletin*, XXXIV, 1952, 323-324.

23. Enrique Marco Dorta, *Cartagena de Indias. Art Bulletin*, XXXIV, 1952, 323-324.

24. José Guerrero Lovillo. *Las cántigas. College Art Journal*, XI, 1951-1952, 147-148.

25. Beatrice Gilman Proske, *Castilian Sculpture, Gothic to Renaissance. Saturday Review of Literature*, April 4, 1952, 45-46.

26. Juan Giuria, *La arquitectura en el Paraguay. Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXII, 1952, 575-577.

27. Martín S. Noel, *La arquitectura mestiza en las riberas del Titicaca. Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXII, 1952, 575-577.

28. Diego Angulo, Enrique Marco Dorta and Mario Buschiazzo. *Historia del arte hispanoamericano*, II, *Magazine of Art*, XLIII, 1952, 191-192.

29. Chandler Rathfon Post, *A History of Spanish Painting*. Vol. X, *Magazine of Art*, XLIII, 1952, 137-138.

1953

30. José Hernández Díaz, Antonio Sancho Corbacho and Francisco Collantes de Terán, *Catálogo arqueológico y artístico de la provincia de Sevilla*. *College Art Journal*, XII, 1953, 190-191.
31. José Hernández Díaz, *Imaginería hispalense del bajo renacimiento*. *College Art Journal*, XII, 1953, 190-191.
32. Elizabeth du Gué Trapier, *Ribera*. *College Art Journal*, XII, 1953, 295-296.
33. Heinrich Berlin, *Historia de la imaginería colonial en Guatemala*. *College Art Journal*, XIII, 1953, 58-59.
34. Antonio Sancho Corbacho, *Arquitectura barroca sevillana del siglo XVIII*. *Journal of Society of Architectural Historians*, XII, 1953, 31.
35. Beatrice Gilman Proske, *Castilian Sculpture, Gothic to Renaissance*. *Art Bulletin*, XXXV, 1953, 251-254.

1954

36. *Cuzco. Reconstruction of the Town and Restoration of its Monuments*. Edited by George Kubler. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXIV, 1954, 581.
37. Irving B. Myers, *Mexico's Modern Architecture*. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXIV, 1954, 582.
38. Justino Fernández, *Arte moderno y contemporáneo de México*. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXIV, 1954, 542.
39. Luis Cardoza y Aragón, *Pintura mexicana contemporánea*. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXIV, 1954, 582.

1955

40. Manuel Toussaint, *La catedral y las iglesias de Puebla*. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXV, 1955, 515.

1957

41. Diego Angulo Iñiguez, Enrique Marco Dorta, and Mario J. Buschiazzo. *Historia del arte hispanoamericano*, III, *Art Bulletin*, XXXIX, 1957, 155-159.
42. Martin S. Soria, *La pintura del siglo XVI en Sudamérica*. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXVII, 1957, 508-509.
43. José de Mesa y Teresa Gisbert, *Holguín y la pintura alto peruana del virreinato*. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXVII, 1957, 506-507.

1958

44. Erwin Walter Palm, *Los monumentos arquitectónicos de la Española*, I, II. *Art Bulletin*, XL, 1958, 79-81.

45. Enrique Marco Dorta, *La arquitectura barroca en el Perú*. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXVIII, 1958, 406-407.

1960

46. George Kubler and Martin Soria, *Art and Architecture in Spain and Portugal and their American Dominions, 1500-1800*. *The Americas*, XVI, 1960, 425-427.
47. A different review of the same. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XL, 1960, 439-440.

1962

48. Juan Antonio Gaya Nuño, *Luis de Morales*. *Art Bulletin*, XLIV, 1962, 248-250.

1964

49. Halldor Soehner, *Spanische Meister*. *Art Journal*, XXIII, 1964, 328 and 332.

1969

50. Beatrice Gilman Proske, *Juan Martínez Montañés*. *Art Bulletin*, LI, 1969, 399-400.

DIRECTION OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS:

Completed

1. 1953: Robert Enggass: *The Religious Paintings of Giovanni Battista Gaulli*.
2. 1956: Emma H. Mellencamp: *Renaissance Costume in Italian Painting, 1450-1500*.
3. 1957: Marilyn Stokstad: *The Romanesque Sculpture of the Pórtico de la Gloria at Santiago de Compostela*.
4. 1957: Sister Mary Angelina Filipiak: *The Plans of the Convents of the Poor Clares in Central Italy in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*.
5. 1958: Glenn N. Patton: *Antonio Guerrero y Torres and Mexican Architecture of the Eighteenth Century*.
6. 1959: Victor H. Miesel: *The Classical Elements in the Paintings of Peter Paul Rubens*.
7. 1961: Rosemary A. Marzolf: *The Life and Works of Juan Carreño de Miranda (1614-1685)*.
8. 1966: Margaret M. Damm: *Van Dyck's Mythological Paintings*.
9. 1966: R. Ward Bissell: *Orazio Gentileschi, The Italian Period*.
10. 1970: Janet Anderson: *The Sculpture of Pedro de Mena (1628-1688)*.

11. 1971: Mary Taylor: *The Drawings and Paintings of Ubaldo Gandolfi (1728-1781)*.
12. 1973: Stephen Janke, *Jehan Lomme and Late Gothic Sculpture in Navarre*.
13. 1973: Michael Stoughton, *The Paintings of Giovanni Battista Caracciolo (c. 1570-1637)*.
14. 1974: Bernard Bonario, *Marco Basaiti (c. 1470—after 1530)*.
In process
15. Curtis Coley, *The Paintings of Bernardo Cavallino (1616-1654)* (Begun 1957).
16. Jan Swenson, *The Paintings of Marco Ricci (1676-1729)* (Begun 1959).
17. Robert Loescher, *The Altarpieces of José Churriguera (1650-1723)*. (Begun 1962).
18. William M. Kloss, *The Paintings of Guglielmo Cortese (1628-1679)*. (Begun 1967).
19. Duncan Kinkead, *Valdés Leal (1622-1690), Spanish Baroque Painter*. (Begun 1970).
20. Ryan Howard, *Pedro Duque Cornejo (1677-1734), Andalusian Sculptor*. (Begun 1970).
21. Penelope Benson, *The Veronese Painter, Francesco Maffei (1620-1660)*. (Begun 1970).
22. Harry Murutes, *The Altarpieces of Lorenzo Lotto (c. 1480-c. 1556)*. (Begun 1973).