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Abstract

On 13 October 1967 Virginia P. and Robert C. Greenlease donated a walnut crucifix by French sculptor César Bagard to Rockhurst University’s Jesuit community in Kansas City, Missouri. This gift initiated a collaboration of thirty years between Mrs. Greenlease and Rockhurst’s president, Father Maurice E. Van Ackeren, S.J. Together they sought to enhance the university and its students’ spiritual and educational experience by making fine religious works of art accessible for viewing on campus. Virginia financed the purchases that Father Van Ackeren made, the sum of which came to be known as the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art. Throughout their endeavor, the two took advantage of the expertise of the curators of the William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art in Kansas City, Missouri (now known as The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art) and employed that institution as an intermediary station for evaluating works before they were purchased. The majority of objects were acquired during the 1970s. This timing proved fortuitous for the assembly of the university’s collection, as museum-quality sacred works were available at fairly reasonable prices. The result for Rockhurst was a diverse collection of exemplary objects depicting religious subjects and/or with liturgical functions that date from the late medieval through the rococo periods. The works that comprise the collection are of Italian, German, Austrian, French, and Spanish provenance and their mediums range from lindenwood, polychromed wood, alabaster, and marble statues, to paintings rendered in tempera on wood panel and in oil on canvas and copper, as well as to works on paper, furniture, textiles, and silver.

Many of the collection’s works are associated with known artists, but most have scarcely been considered with regard to those artists’ respective oeuvres. Painters and sculptors of Italian and non-Italian origins whose works are represented in the collection include Andrea di Bartolo
(1360-1428), Gil de Siloé (c. 1450-1501), Francesco d’Ubertino Verdi, also called Il Bachiacca (1494-1557), Antiveduto Grammatica (1571-1626), Peter Strudel (1660-1714), Pietro da Cortona (1596-1669), Bartolomé Esteban Murillo (1617-1682), Francesco Trevisani (1656-1746), Ehrgott Bernhard Bendl (1660-1738), Felix Planner (active 1690-1710), Giuseppe Maria Crespi (1665-1747), and Giambattista Tiepolo (1696-1770).

The dissertation is divided into three sections. Part one chronicles the collection’s history and discusses the acquisition process, how choices were made in the selection of objects, which works were chosen, and what those decisions might indicate about personal taste, contemporary art market trends, and addressing the rationale for assembling a collection for educational purposes. Following the introduction is a catalog of the collection’s objects. The entries are divided into two categories: “Paintings and Works on Paper” and “Sculptures and Metalwork,” and each is arranged in chronological order. The contextual and iconographic assessment of these objects comprises the core of this study.
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Introduction

This dissertation analyzes for the first time the history of the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art and paintings, sculptures, and works of sacred and/or liturgical function it contains. The origins of this collection, which is housed in the Greenlease Gallery at Rockhurst University in Kansas City, Missouri, date from 13 October 1967, when Virginia P. and Robert C. Greenlease donated to the Jesuit community at Rockhurst a walnut crucifix by the French sculptor César Bagard (1620-1707).¹ This gift to Rockhurst initiated a partnership between Mrs. Greenlease and the university’s president, Father Maurice Van Ackeren S.J., who, over the course of thirty years, sought to enhance the university and its students’ spiritual and educational experience by making fine European works of religious art accessible for viewing on campus.² Virginia financed the purchases that she and Father Van Ackeren selected, and they relied upon the expertise of Ralph T. Coe, Curator of Renaissance and Baroque Art at the William Rockhill Nelson Gallery of Art in Kansas City, Missouri (since 1982 known as The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art) and employed that institution as an intermediary station for evaluating works they considered for purchase. The result of this collaborative relationship was a diverse collection of museum-quality objects depicting religious subjects and/or with liturgical functions that date from the early fifteenth to the mid-eighteenth centuries, the sum of which came to be known as the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art. The objects in question include lindenwood, polychromed wood, alabaster, and marble statues; paintings rendered in tempera on wood panel and in oil on canvas and copper; as well as works on paper, furniture, textiles, and

¹ “Treasury Collection: Thomas More Centre and Rockhurst College,” box 209, GLA.
² In 2006, the college became known officially as Rockhurst University, although the school charter had designated Rockhurst as a university already in 1951. See Shirl Kasper, Rockhurst University: The First 100 Years (Kansas City, MO: Rockhurst University Press, 2010), 334.
silver, and are of Austrian, English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish provenance. The paintings are all of Italian origin and represent the Sienese, Florentine, Venetian, Roman, and Bolognese schools.

Many of the collection’s works are associated with known artists, but most have scarcely been considered with regard to those artists’ respective oeuvres. Painters and sculptors of Italian and non-Italian origins whose works are represented in the collection include Andrea di Bartolo (1360-1428), Gil de Siloé (c. 1450-1501), Francesco d’Ubertino Verdi, also called Il Bachiacca (1494-1557), Antiveduto Grammatica (1571-1626), Peter Strudel (1660-1714), Pietro da Cortona (1596-1669), Bartolomé Esteban Murillo (1617-1682), Francesco Trevisani (1656-1746), Ehrgott Bernhard Bendl (1660-1738), Felix Planner (active 1690-1710), Giuseppe Maria Crespi (1665-1747), and Giambattista Tiepolo (1696-1770). As far as the aforementioned sculptors Bagard (Nancy, France), Bendl (Augsburg, Germany), and Strudel (Vienna, Austria), and the silversmith Planner (Munich, Germany) are concerned, the present study constitutes the first scholarly consideration of their works in English, since literature on these artists is found primarily in the language of their respective places of origin.

The Van Ackeren Collection is comprised of twenty-seven objects, twenty of which Virginia Greenlease bequeathed to Rockhurst on behalf of the Robert C. Greenlease family. The Rockhurst-affiliated Saint Thomas More Library Club and some of its individual members donated the remainder of the works. Considering the variety of media and breadth of temporal

---

3 Deed of Trust, Van Ackeren Collection Trust file, GGA. The Greenlease Gallery’s holdings are divided into two categories. The group of twenty works that Virginia Greenlease donated to Rockhurst are identified as “Special Collections.” In her deed of trust Mrs. Greenlease stipulated that Rockhurst was never to sell these works, unless it was no longer affiliated with the Jesuit Order, in which case they were to be donated to the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art. The remainder of objects are designated as “General Collections” and can be de-accessioned at the discretion of Rockhurst’s Board of Trustees.
and geographical regions represented in this collection and the time that it would require to delve into each of these distinct areas of scholarship, it was necessary to limit the number of objects discussed in the present study. This was done with the intent of leaving the remaining works for future examination. As such, this dissertation will focus exclusively on the works the collection’s founding donor, Virginia Greenlease, bequeathed to Rockhurst. However, due to their fragile state, two of her acquisitions, a mid-fifteenth-century Spanish altar cloth depicting the Coronation of the Virgin and a large tapestry of c. 1544-67 that depicts an Old Testament scene of Joseph and his brothers attributed to the workshop of the Flemish weaver Michel Coxcie (1499-1592), were inaccessible and therefore have not been evaluated. After those textiles have undergone restoration and their condition has been stabilized, they deserve study, as they are exemplary works. These two works, along with the other textile that Mrs Greenlease donated, a mid-fifteenth-century German half-chasuble, ie. a single panel of the outermost liturgical vestment that a priest wore while celebrating Mass, will be addressed briefly in part one. A wooden prie-dieu, or kneeling bench, of Spanish origin and a Portuguese altarpiece of carved wood, both dating from c. 1700, and a crystal pendant once thought to be of Byzantine provenance but that scholar Genevra Kornbluth determined was a counterfeit, have not been considered. Instead, for the sake of economy and temporal and material cohesiveness, the objects cataloged in this dissertation consist of a baroque chalice, a Spanish drawing, five sculptures, and seven paintings that Mrs. Greenlease donated to Rockhurst University.

---

On 15 September 1914 Rockhurst opened its doors as a high school on its present campus at 52nd Street and Troost Avenue in Kansas City, Missouri. As the first freshman class approached graduation three years later, the institution was expanded to include a college. Rockhurst is affiliated with the Jesuit Order and the development of its art collection is in keeping with the Jesuit’s educational mission. Also known as the Society of Jesus, the Order was founded on 27 September 1540, when Pope Paul III issued a papal bull, the *Regimini militantis ecclesiae*, allowing the Spaniard Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556) and his followers to establish a religious order. From the time of its foundation, the Order has stressed the importance of education. Beginning in 1548, the Jesuits codified their educational philosophy, which they then published in a handbook known as the *Ratio studiorum*. This text stipulates the Order’s guidelines for instruction in the humanistic disciplines and emphasizes, among other things, the study of the fine arts. The educational tradition that the Society of Jesus established in the sixteenth century eventually made its way to the United States, where it continues to thrive. To be specific, between 1798 and 1952, the Jesuits founded twenty-eight colleges and

---


universities in the United States, whose liberal arts curriculum is based upon the *Ratio studiorum*. Like most schools of higher learning, Jesuit and otherwise, these institutions display works of art on their campuses, including rotating exhibitions, outdoor sculptures, and paintings hung in libraries, common areas, and administrative buildings.  

Of the twenty-eight American Jesuit colleges and universities, Rockhurst is one of ten that has a permanent art collection on campus. However, the collection in Kansas City has a low scholarly profile and is the only American Jesuit university collection not mentioned in either the College Art Association’s [CAA] official guide to American college and university art museums and exhibition galleries (2000), or in Victor Danilov’s compendia of university and college museums, galleries, and related facilities (1996, 2011). The present study seeks to remedy this state of neglect.

There are few connections between the Greenlease and other Jesuit collections, as each has a unique history that is the result of differing circumstances of origin, reflects individual patrons’ interests, and varies in terms of its respective level of institutional support. Two Jesuit art collections that are, in some respects, comparable to the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious

---

8 For example, Xavier University displays works of art throughout the campus, including in the library, common areas, and administrative offices. Likewise, Boston College and Fairfield University do the same, with the addition of featuring outdoor sculptures on the campus grounds. I thank Jill Deupi, then Director of the Bellarmine Museum at Fairfield University, and Kitty Uetz, Director for the Xavier University Art Gallery, for generously sharing their time and knowledge during on-site visits to their respective campuses, and to McMullen Director and Boston College Art History professor Nancy Netzer, whose correspondence regarding her institution’s art collection proved helpful.

Art are the Rotjman collection at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin and the Martin D’Arcy collection at Loyola University in Chicago. Like the Van Ackeren Collection, the Marquette and Loyola collections were established during the 1960s and it is perhaps significant that their foundation dates coincide roughly with the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965), which was held to reassess the relationship between the Roman Catholic Church and the modern world. An outcome of the council was that priests were directed to encourage the laity to become more involved in the Church. This consideration may explain why patrons at these three institutions were inspired to found and/or contribute objects to what would become permanent art collections. Another similarity between these collections is that all three were initially installed in campus libraries. Perhaps the library, as a secure and monitored space and place of learning and study, seemed an appropriate location for their display. Indeed, independently of each other, the Kansas City, Chicago, and Milwaukee collections were founded with the specific mandate that they serve as educational resources by making fine art easily accessible to students on campus.

The patrons of Marquette’s collection were Marc and Lillian Rojtman, a Jewish couple from New York who had transferred to Milwaukee for business purposes. Upon their arrival in

---

Wisconsin, they experienced a sense of alienation within the largely Christian community, except among the Jesuits at Marquette, who warmly welcomed the couple. The Jesuits’ treatment of the Rojtmans demonstrates the longstanding tradition within the Society of Jesus to show tolerance for other cultures, which in large part accounted for their success as missionaries in foreign lands. As we shall see in the next section, the stories of the Rojtmans and the Greenleases are similar in that each felt a deep sense of gratitude toward the Jesuits, who showed them a profound level of compassion. As an expression of gratitude for that kindness, each couple donated European works of religious art dating from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries that served as the foundation of permanent art collections that were intended for educational purposes on a Jesuit university campus. Lillian Rojtman outlived her husband and continued to bequeath works of art to Marquette until her death on 1 May 2001. Virginia Greenlease similarly began donating works to the Jesuit institution of her choice with her husband, but continued her benefactory efforts on behalf of that university long after his death and until her own death on 23 September 2001, the same year that Lillian passed.

The Van Ackeren collection is also similar to the Martin D’Arcy collection at Loyola University in Chicago, because each consists of European religious works of sacred and/or liturgical function that range in date from the medieval to the baroque periods. The two

13 I express my gratitude to Haggerty Museum curator Lee Coppernoll, who related this story to me 12 June 2014 during a meeting at Marquette University. I also thank her gracious assistant Emilia Layden.
14 “List of Paintings: Gifts of Mr. and Mrs. Marc Rojtman / Mrs. Lillian Berkman,” HMAA. The Rojtmans donated eighteen paintings, including three with Old Testament themes, compared to the Greenleases who gave twenty works, including one that depicts an Old Testament scene. Lillian remarried, so that her last name was later Berkman.
17 I express my gratitude to LUMA curator Jonathan Canning for his gracious tour of the collection (October 2014), explanation of its history, and for his helpful assistance during the course of my research.
collections are alike in that determined Jesuit priests were deeply involved in their establishment. Additionally, art historians aided the process of their expansion, which resulted in cohesive assemblages of works that are related in terms of theme, in contrast to the majority of collections at other U.S. Jesuit universities, which seem to have served as repositories for random works that reflect the various tastes of the donors who bequeathed them. Whereas at Rockhurst, Father Van Ackeren was the energetic priest and driving force behind garnering the funds from Mrs. Greenlease to acquire works, and the curator Ted Coe advised them, at Loyola University, faculty member and art historian Father Donald Rowe, S. J. served both roles. Rowe received encouragement for his endeavor from Father Martin Cyril D’Arcy, S. J. (1888-1976), a renowned British humanist, who often visited the university as a guest lecturer, and after whom the Chicago collection was named. Prominent British art historian, John Pope-Hennessy (1913-1994), who was an undergraduate student at Oxford when D’Arcy was the Master of Campion Hall, wrote in the introduction to a catalog of the Loyola collection published in 1979:

(Of all of the contributions made in the museum field in the United States, perhaps the most important is the concept of the university museum as a place where students of every kind, at a period when their minds are malleable, can get on terms with works of art.)

Indeed, this was a goal shared by those who established the Van Ackeren, Martin D’Arcy, and Rojtman collections.

In 1975 Ted Coe, who recognized the educational value of the Van Ackeren collection, promoted its study, and expressed an intention to lead University of Kansas graduate students in

---

18 Canning, *Gilded Glory*, 3.
19 See “Foreword” in Rowe, *The First Ten Years.*
cataloging it.\textsuperscript{20} Although the following year Coe did teach at the Kress Foundation Department of Art History at the University of Kansas, his students did not study the Rockhurst objects and a catalog for the collection was never written.\textsuperscript{21} While many of the other Jesuit collections have published related catalogs, Rockhurst is one of the few that has not researched its collection. The scant attention paid to this repository of religious objects and images consists of a smattering of local newspaper articles and a small gallery pamphlet, published in 1986, that provides short descriptions for selected works. While a few of the works have been mentioned in art historical literature, discussion of these objects has been limited primarily to issues of style and attribution, leaving much room for further exploration. The present study will thus redress the state of scholarly neglect via a critical history of the collection as a whole, as well as a careful, contextual analysis of the paintings, sculptures, works on paper, and metalwork that Virginia Greenlease bequeathed to Rockhurst University.

\textit{Format}

Because of its object-based nature, this study adopts the format of a museum catalog such as the catalogs produced for the fifteenth-century Italian paintings at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, DC (2003) by Miklós Boskovits and David Alan Brown, the John G. Johnson Italian Painting Collection at the Philadelphia Museum of Art (2004) by Carl Strehlke, and The

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{21} University of Kansas, Kress Foundation Department of Art History Academic Files, 1976; e-mail correspondence, Jane C. Weaver to Loren Whittaker, 8 May 2011. Weaver was a student enrolled in Coe’s class.
Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art’s collection of Italian paintings (1996) by Eliot W. Rowlands.\textsuperscript{22} All three serve as apt prototypes, because each concentrates on paintings of Italian provenance that, for the most part, date from the same periods as those that constitute the Van Ackeren collection. Each of the aforementioned publications begins with a history of the relevant collection’s formation, followed by individual entries for each object that include an artist biography, description of the work, condition assessment, list of provenance, and general commentary.\textsuperscript{23}

In keeping with the catalog format mentioned above, part one chronicles the collection’s history, tracing for the first time its beginning as a single gift in 1967 and through its expansion over the following years and subsequent transformation in 2000 into a permanent art installation. Additionally, this chapter introduces the individuals who assembled the collection, from the patron and university president to the curator and art dealers, discussing the role that each played in the acquisition process, how choices were made in the selection of objects, which works were chosen, and what those decisions might indicate about personal taste, contemporary art market trends, and addressing the rationale for assembling a collection for educational purposes. Following a description of the collection’s history is a catalog of the fourteen objects that Virginia Greenlease bequeathed to Rockhurst on behalf of the Robert C. Greenlease family. The close, contextual assessment of these objects comprises the core of this study. Each entry includes a short biography of the artist; a description of the object’s appearance, including its


\textsuperscript{23} For introductory chapters, see Rowlands, \textit{The Collections of the Nelson-Atkins}, 15-23; Strehlke, \textit{Italian Paintings 1250-1450}, 1-19.
size, medium, format, palette, composition, and subject matter; a condition report that identifies any known conservation assessments and treatment undertaken on the work; a discussion of attribution; and a list of known provenance. The general commentary that follows includes an interpretation of iconography and an assessment of form and materiality as it concerns the original function for which the object was intended. This section also considers issues pertaining to the work’s original setting and intended audience. The entries are divided into two categories: “Paintings and Works on Paper” and “Sculptures and Metalwork,” and each is arranged in chronological order.

Methodology

A major challenge in assessing the Van Ackeren collection is the lack of original documentation for most of the objects it houses. Therefore, each object served as as primary source material. Due to the variety of works considered and their diverse places and periods of origin, it was necessary to delve into local artistic traditions in Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Austria, and the Netherlands. In each case I engaged in a close examination of the object, which included contextualizing its iconography, probable function, viewership, and authorship. With regard to the latter, I engaged extensively in connoisseurship, confirming some attributions and refuting others. During the course of my work, Rockhurst University offered unlimited access to the collection, which afforded the opportunity to scrutinize each work closely. Depending upon the medium, works were viewed with the aid of magnification and/or raking light, which

---

25 I express my gratitude to Anne Pearce, who was instrumental in facilitating my access to the collection.
revealed surface imperfections. For paintings, ultraviolet light was employed to expose areas of in-painting that were invisible to the naked eye. It was not possible to study these works under more sophisticated means, such as infrared reflectography (IRR) and/or dendrochronology.\(^{26}\) However, for several of the objects there were related conservation reports from the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art and/or from conservators in private practice that provided valuable, supplementary information regarding that object’s condition.

Although at various times each of the Van Ackeren objects has been attributed to a particular artist, there are no documented commissions related to any of these works and only one, the baroque chalice of 1707 by Munich-based goldsmith, Felix Planner, bears a secure date and the monogram of its maker.\(^{27}\) Therefore, it was necessary to verify the attribution of each work. To do so, the Morellian approach to connoisseurship was employed. Italian art historian Giovanni Morelli developed this method, which examines the work being studied and compares elements, such as the articulation of ears, hands, and eyes, with works securely attributed to an artist, as a means to determine or refute authorship.\(^{28}\) German art historian Max Friedländer likened this approach to that of a graphologist, who compares loops in a handwriting samples, except that the art historian examines “folds and fluttering sashes” in drapery, for instance.\(^{29}\) Although subjective in approach and not without its shortcomings, this method proved

\(^{26}\) IRR is used to peer through paint layers to reveal underdrawings that reflect an artist’s original composition. Dendochronology can be employed to determine the geographic origin and age of the wood used in sculptures and also as a support for painting. Both methods can help confirm whether or not a work is original.

\(^{27}\) See cat. no. 14.


particularly useful in the case of the undocumented works in the Van Ackeren collection.30

To implement this method, it was necessary to compare the Van Ackeren’s paintings, sculptures, and work on paper with works by the artists to whom they have been attributed.31 If discrepancies arose, which in some cases they did, other comparative examples and/or possible attributions were sought. An effort was made to view comparable works in person and to rely as little as possible on photographs and online resources, although the latter did provide excellent images. For this dissertation, visual research was conducted in Italy at the Gallerie degli Uffizi and Palatine Gallery of the Palazzo Pitti in Florence; the church of S. Lorenzo in Borgo S. Lorenzo; the Accademia di S. Luca, and the churches of S. Carlo ai Catinari, S. Prassede, S. Maria en via Lata, and S. Sebastiano in via Appia in Rome; the Scuola Grande di S. Rocco and the church of SS. Giovanni e Paolo in Venice; and the Museo dell’Opera del Duomo in Siena.

In Germany, visual research was conducted at the Benedictine abbey of Saints Ulrich and Afra in Augsburg; the Wallraf-Richartz and Schnütigen Museums in Cologne; the Museum Kunstpalast, Maxkirche, and Theresienhospital in Düsseldorf; and the Bayerischen Nationalmuseum in Munich. Primary visual research was also conducted in Vienna, Austria at the Kunsthistorisches Museum, the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, the Hofburg Palace, the Pestsäule, and the church of Saint Roch.

Other sites in Europe where I conducted visual research include the Musée Historique au

30 Historically, the motives of connoisseurs have been put to question, as in the instance of Bernard Berenson, who, as an art dealer, benefitted financially from attributions that he made, which were favorable to attracting higher prices on the art market. For a discussion of the benefits and perceived shortcomings of this approach see Hatt and Klonk, Methods, 40-63; Jordanova, The Look of the Past, 21, 104, 211-12.

31 For a use of connoisseurship as a method of determining attribution that is analogous to the one used in this dissertation, see Julien Chapuis, Tilman Riemenschneider: Master Sculptor of the Late Middle Ages (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), 30-40.
Palais Ducal and the church of S. Sebastian in Nancy, France; the Louvre in Paris; and the Bonnefantenmuseum in Maastricht, the Netherlands. In the United States, I studied works related to those at Rockhurst University at the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum and the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, the Cleveland Museum of Art, The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, and the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Cloisters Museum in New York.

Assessing works related to those in the Van Ackeren Collection of religious art in the museums and churches mentioned above first hand enabled me to either confirm or change attributions related to particular works. Once a probable author was established for a particular work, then stylistic considerations were used to determine the place a work occupied within the context of a particular artist’s oeuvre, thereby determining its likely date.

The objects in the Van Ackeren collection were intentionally chosen for their devotional and/or liturgical function. Therefore, it was necessary to study the iconography of those objects in order to understand better their intended meanings. In some cases, this iconographical analysis led to new identifications of depicted saints, provided evidence that linked an object to a particular geographic location, or revealed an object’s specific function. For example, I have been able to demonstrate that the previously unknown bishop saint in a painting by Francesco Trevisani is Saint Liborius, a fourth-century bishop from Le Mans, France, and a Netherlandish sculpture that was thought to portray the Virgin Mary more likely represents either Saint Catherine or Saint Barbara.32

---

32 See cat. nos. 6, 10.
Additionally, each work was considered in terms of its socio-historical context. Each discrete object demanded a different contextual approach, depending upon its size, medium, provenance, and type. Of particular relevance to this study was Michael Baxandall’s notion of the “period eye,” which recognizes that “rational human actions” created the work at hand and imbued it with qualities that not only related the object to the setting for which it was meant, but also drew on cultural references that were understood by its intended audience. As Baxandall conceded, even when dealt with cautiously, this approach remains subjective, and, although we can never hope to understand fully the experience of an audience from a culture several centuries removed from our own, we can nevertheless operate warily on a plane of empathetic understanding with viewers from the past that could provide at least some insight into the initial experience.

Since the Van Ackeren collection’s inception, there has been no official system in place for the archiving of documents related to the objects that comprise it, much less the acquisition of works for the collection. By sorting through bills of sales, receipts, and letters between the art dealers and Ted Coe and/or Father Van Ackeren that were archived at the Greenlease Library and Greenlease Gallery and in curatorial files at the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, this study establishes for the first time a chronology for the collection’s formation. Perhaps sometime in the near future accession numbers will be assigned to each of the collection’s objects and the gallery labels, which currently contain incorrect information pertaining to the works they

---


34 Baxandall, “Patterns of Intention,” 41-43.

35 Baxandall, Patterns of Intention, 105-15.
An important aspect of the present study is that it has added works to the canon of particular artists’ oeuvres and taken others away. Additionally, it has focused upon otherwise little-studied works such as late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century wooden statues from Spain, Germany, and France, and Austrian Baroque marble sculpture. In its assessment of such works by lesser-known artists, this dissertation helps to address the need to broaden the art historical canon. For, despite the success and high esteem that these artists experienced during their respective lifetimes, the oeuvres of many have been the victims of scholarly neglect. This occurred primarily because later scholars and art critics disparaged them for lacking innovation. However, those critics overlooked the fact that the success of these artists was related to their ability to cultivate a broad base of wealthy and important clients, which they attracted because they painted and sculpted in a manner that appealed to their patrons. Often, to please a patron, this required conformity to contemporary styles, which sometimes precluded artistic innovation.

As art historian Paul Williamson noted in his 2002 catalog of the Victoria and Albert Museum’s collection of Netherlandish sculpture, we have approached a point in art historical scholarship that necessitates publishing less well-known works in order to expand the corpus of works studied, both “qualitatively and quantitatively,” which will allow for a more comprehensive understanding of late medieval and early modern art.\(^\text{36}\) Thus, the evaluation of each object in the Van Ackeren collection contributes to a broader, more balanced comprehension of the period, as works that have, thus far escaped scholarly notice gain the

attention that they deserve.
Part 1: The History of the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art

From Tragedy Arises Beneficence

The Robert C. Greenlease Family donated the majority of works that belong to the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art. Considered by most to be an honest, forthright, and generous man, Robert (1882-1969) was raised on a farm in central Missouri and earned his fortune as a successful owner of Cadillac car dealerships in the Midwest. Politically conservative, Robert counted Dwight D. Eisenhower among his close friends. He was a dapper man, who often dressed in a finely tailored suit with a fedora. Although a Christian, Mr. Greenlease was not a Catholic, unlike his wife, Virginia (1909-2001), who was extremely devout in her faith. Virginia, who worked as a registered nurse before she married Robert in 1939, has been described as a benevolent and genteel woman. The couple had two children, Virginia Sue (1941-1984) and Robert Cosgrove Jr. (1947-1953).

The Greenleases shared a long and close affiliation with the Rockhurst Jesuits. However, their deep sense of personal commitment to that religious community arose from tragedy. On 28 September 1953, the couple’s son, nicknamed Bobby, was abducted from his Kansas City, Missouri grade school, Notre Dame de Sion. Before the Greenleases had collected the $600,000 in ransom the kidnappers had demanded, the six-year-old boy had already been

37 Shirl Kasper, Rockhurst University: The First 100 Years (Kansas City, MO: Rockhurst University Press, 2010), 281.
38 Robert Greenlease belonged to the Country Club Christian Church in Kansas City, Missouri, which is affiliated with the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) denomination.
murdered. The case, which garnered local, national, and international attention, was compared to the 1932 kidnapping of aviator Charles Lindbergh’s infant son from his crib at night, and whose body was found two months after the ransom was paid. Just as the Lindbergh kidnapping led to Congress passing the Federal Kidnapping Act, making it a federal offense to take a child across a state line, the Greenlease tragedy also set into motion national regulations to control school dismissal to prevent similar situations from occurring. As the Kansas City family’s heartbreak unfolded, members of the news media, such as NBC-TV’s New York reporter John Cameron Swayze (1906-1995), flocked to the Greenlease residence. Father Joseph Freeman (1911-2002), a Rockhurst Jesuit, acted as the family’s spokesman, safeguarding them from the press, as he provided the family “around-the-clock” support and spiritual solace. Kansas City newspapers, published twice daily at the time, reported the Catholic clergy’s notable presence in the Greenlease household during this difficult period. The family never forgot this steadfast act of kindness. To show their gratitude, they donated generously to Rockhurst and created a legacy there in honor of their son. After her husband’s death in 1969, Mrs. Greenlease continued her philanthropic role at the university. In 1972, she was one of two women selected to serve on its

41 The Greenlease ransom of $600,000 is equivalent to $3-4 million today. For further details on the crime, see the FBI’s website, http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/history/famous-cases/greenlease-kidnapping; Mike Lear, “Author Recalls Greenlease Kidnapping, 60 Years Ago This Week,” MissouriNet, 27 September 2013, at http://www.missourinet.com/2013/09/27/author-recalls-greenlease-kidnapping-60-years-ago-this-week/ (accessed online 12 July 2014).
43 See n. 3.
45 Brian Burnes, “Abduction Happened in Different Time, Place: Greenlease Case Left Legacy in KC,” Kansas City Star, 28 September 2003. The Greenlease family also bequeathed land to the Jesuits for a separate high school campus, sponsored countless scholarships for the high school students, and endowed the university’s philosophy chair in honor of Father Freeman, the Jesuit who helped them most through their grief.
Board of Regents, and, five years later, she became the first woman to become a Board Trustee.46

Rockhurst’s president at the time of the kidnapping in 1953 was Father Maurice E. Van Ackeren, S.J. (1911-1997). Father Van Ackeren joined the Society of Jesus at the Jesuit monastery in Florissant, Missouri on 1 September 1932 and was ordained into the priesthood on 22 June 1943. He was not only a talented educator who garnered the esteem of students and faculty alike, but also an apt administrator.47 Serving as Rockhurst’s ninth president from 1951 to 1978, Father Van Ackeren was the university’s longest-tenured head of the school, overseeing the largest stage of building growth in Rockhurst’s history.48 Early in his presidency, Maurice Van Ackeren recognized, in his own words, a “need for more emphasis on the fine arts at Rockhurst.”49 In line with the tenets of Jesuit educational philosophy, Father Van Ackeren dedicated himself to cultivating the arts on campus, firmly believing that their study would benefit Rockhurst’s students.50 A major step that Father Van Ackeren took to implement his plan to emphasize the arts on Rockhurst’s campus occurred in 1965, when he founded the Thomas More Center, an institution that was meant to strengthen cultural ties between Rockhurst and the community.51 This move fomented an environment at Rockhurst that was receptive to

46 “Two Women, Three Men to Rockhurst Board,” Kansas City Star, 29 September 1972. Robert had also previously served on the Board of Regents as longtime Honorary Director and charter member.
47 Interview, Friederich O. Gastreich, 11 June 2014. Gastreich was a student at Rockhurst when Van Ackeren first became the school’s president. Also see n. 3.
48 During Van Ackeren’s presidency, eight new buildings were constructed on campus, including the library, which the Greenleases financed, residence halls, and an athletic field. See “Expanding Campus for Rockhurst College as It Will Appear in 1970,” Kansas City Star, 7 December 1958, 1G; “Rockhurst Phase Two Speeds Ahead,” ibid., 1 May 1966, 1G; “Hearnes to a College Fete: Missouri Governor Will be Speaker at Rockhurst Celebration,” ibid., 27 September 1967; Kasper, Rockhurst, 219, 313.
49 Rockhurst University publicity pamphlet, “A New Look to the Treasury Room,” 1, box 209, GLA.
the establishment of a permanent art collection.

Father Van Ackeren was known as an astute fundraiser who had the ability to attract patrons. Indeed, thanks to those patrons’ support, during his tenure, the university’s massive campus improvements were completed on a balanced budget. Van Ackeren’s contemporaries described his demeanor as gracious and unpretentious and complimented his ability to communicate in a distinctive way that appealed to benefactors. Typically, his approach was to draw someone’s interest into his projects and then befriend them afterwards. This seems to have been the case with the Greenleases, who met Father Van Ackeren through Father Freeman, the Jesuit priest who consoled the family after the terrible loss of their son. Precisely how the idea emerged to acquire works of art for Rockhurst is not known, because the Greenleases themselves do not seem to have been art collectors. Nevertheless, the university’s president and Mrs. Greenlease soon became united in the effort. For Father Van Ackeren, establishing a permanent art collection on campus furthered his objective to make art more accessible to Rockhurst’s students and the surrounding community. For Virginia, building the collection offered her a way to heal by creating a meaningful legacy dedicated to the memory of the son she lost. In the process, Virginia Greenlease and Father Van Ackeren formed a profound bond of friendship that lasted three decades, until Father Maurice Van Ackeren died in 1997.

The Patron, the Priest, and the Curator

To help them in their pursuit of fine works of art to purchase, the university president and

52 See n. 3.
53 Ibid.
54 Ibid.
his patron logically sought out one of the closest available experts of European art, Ralph T. Coe (1929-2010), who was the curator of Renaissance and Baroque European Art at the nearby William Rockhill Nelson Gallery.\textsuperscript{55} “Ted,” as Coe was known to his friends and colleagues, earned degrees in art history at Oberlin College and Yale University, before studying Italian Renaissance bronze sculptures as an intern for Italian sculpture expert John Pope-Hennessy at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London.\textsuperscript{56} Prior to his arrival in Kansas City in 1959, Coe also served as a curator at the National Gallery in Washington, D.C. However, Coe’s true preparation for the museum field actually began much earlier in his life at his family’s stately residence in the affluent suburbs of Cleveland, Ohio, where Ted had access to his father’s extensive art library and important collection of impressionist and early twentieth-century paintings.\textsuperscript{57} Coe’s wealthy industrialist father, Ralph M. Coe, was also a member of the Cleveland Museum of Art’s accessions committee.\textsuperscript{58} As a teenager, Ted worked as his father’s “de facto art secretary,” as he later described himself. At the time he gained practical experience in the field, by both arranging loans of works from his father’s collection to museums as well as negotiating with art dealers.\textsuperscript{59} Because of his own interest in the handling of precious objects, Coe decided to pursue a career as a museum curator rather than as an academician.\textsuperscript{60} These early

\textsuperscript{55} It is likely that Virginia met Coe through the Nelson Gallery, which, during the 1950s and 1960s, catered primarily to the city’s wealthy benefactors. I extend my gratitude to Holly Wright, archivist at The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, who assisted me in the retrieval of pertinent records from the museum’s archives for this study and to Gaylord Torrence, Fred and Virginia Merrill Senior Curator of American Indian Art, also at the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, who shared with me much of the information included in this section regarding his good friend and colleague, Ted Coe, whom he met in 1982. Interview, Gaylord Torrence, 28 October 2014.


\textsuperscript{57} For Ted Coe’s description of his childhood interest in the art world, see “The Re-Education of an Art Collector: From Aesthetics to Culture” in \textit{The Responsive Eye}, 7-26.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 11-13.

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., 1, 4.
experiences served Coe well in his chosen profession, and, by extension, benefited Mrs. Greenlease and Father Van Ackeren, who relied upon his expertise in negotiating with the dealers from whom they obtained the objects that comprise the Van Ackeren collection.

**Acquiring Objects: The Selection Process**

By the late 1960s, Ted Coe had formed a mutually beneficial relationship with a select group of dealers to whom he remained loyal.\(^{61}\) Three of his preferred contacts were Edward R. Lubin, Inc., Frederick Mont, Inc., and French and Company. It is likely that Coe introduced Father Van Ackeren and his patron as new clients to these New York-based firms, which probably explains why Virginia Greenlease made the majority of art purchases for Rockhurst at these institutions. During negotiations with these dealers, Father Van Ackeren apparently acted as Mrs. Greenlease’s primary liaison by virtue of the fact that letters relating to any business seem only to have been addressed to either Ted Coe and/or Father Van Ackeren, and never to Virginia.\(^{62}\) Therefore, regarding the matter of any purchases, she probably expressed her wishes orally to Father Van Ackeren, since, according to those who knew her, Virginia was not comfortable with putting pen to paper and preferred instead to communicate in person.\(^{63}\) Though Virginia evidently left many of the business details to Father Van Ackeren, she was not merely a passive observer in the acquisition of objects for Rockhurst. Extant letters show that the art

\(^{61}\) See n. 19.

\(^{62}\) Betty Mont to Ted Coe, 18 May 1974, Ralph T. Coe Personal Correspondence file, RG99 3.7, NAMAA.

\(^{63}\) See n. 3.
ven
dors were acutely aware of her important role as patron.⁶⁴

Judging from the objects that were offered for sale to Virginia, the art dealers with whom she and her collaborators dealt were clearly aware that their new client sought high-quality works of religious art. In a letter that he wrote in 1971 to the Los Angeles-based dealer, Gerald G. Stiebel, regarding Virginia’s recent purchase of an altar cloth, Father Van Ackeren’s assistant, Father Robert Lakas, S. J. (1917-1974), noted that Mrs. Greenlease was “…very happy with the selection…and feels that it will increase the quality of our growing collection.”⁶⁵ Lakas added further, “We hope as the years go on to add to this collection and that you will be uncovering other fine pieces down through the years.”⁶⁶ In light of the fact that Virginia herself left no written record of her involvement in the purchasing process, this excerpt is important, because it documents her intention to acquire museum-quality objects for the expanding collection. That Lakas was the one to deliver this message shows that Rockhurst was equally committed to this endeavor.

A potential acquisition was deemed suitable for consideration, either from a dealer’s recommendation or by Father Van Ackeren, who chose the work himself during trips to New York. Once a work was selected, the dealer sent a transparency image of that object, as well as pertinent information relating to its condition, provenance, place of origin, and the artist’s biography to both Coe and Van Ackeren, who subsequently conveyed this information to Mrs.

---

⁶⁴ Edward Lubin to Ted Coe, 2 June 1975, Ralph T. Coe: Personal Correspondence, file RG99 3.4, NAMAA: Mont to Coe, 28 December 1979, file, RG99, 3.7, NAMAA. For instance, in his letter to Coe, Edward Lubin assured that, because of her past generosity, “Mrs. G.” would have the “inside track” to purchase a “deliberately, low-priced…sculpture.” Like Lubin, Betty Mont assured Coe that her company had offered Virginia the lowest price possible.

⁶⁵ Gerald G. Stiebel to Father Robert R. Lakas, 23 August 1971, Coronation of the Virgin: Acquisition file, GGA.

⁶⁶ Ibid.
Greenlease for her consideration. Often the accompanying essay cited the favorable opinion of a respected expert, such as Italian connoisseur Federico Zeri (1921-1988), who the dealer quoted as saying that a painting of the *Madonna of Humility* by Andrea di Bartolo was “one of the most beautiful examples of Sienese art from the end of the Trecento.” Indeed, this is one of the finest works in the Van Ackeren Collection. Certainly, such glowing reports were advantageous to the dealer, because they validated the firm’s asking price. However, such a positive “write-up” could also potentially prove problematic, for instance, if the dealer paid the expert, who then might be inclined to give a more favorable assessment that might induce a client to pay more and, thus, allow the dealer to benefit financially. At the time Coe was active as a curator, the use of outside experts might have been less rigorous in comparison to today’s standards. Despite the potential for unscrupulous behavior, it seems that the New York firms with which Coe interacted dealt equitably with Virginia Greenlease and Father Van Ackeren and provided them with the most accurate information that was available to them at the time. As in all professions, reputations take a long time to cultivate, but little time to undermine. So, it would have behooved all parties involved to act reputably in such transactions. The dealer would then sustain a reputation for fair business practices and for carrying good quality inventory, which would foster a client’s trust and encourage repeat business. Perhaps this is why Coe and his

---

67 Mont to Coe, 11 April 1978, Ralph T. Coe: Personal Correspondence, file, RG99 3.7, NAMAA.
68 Mont to Coe, 27 Feb. 1974, *Madonna of Humility*: Acquisition file, GGA. Contrary to Zeri’s opinion, the Andrea di Bartolo painting likely dates to the first decade of the Quattrocento, and not to the Trecento. See cat. no. 1. For more information on Zeri as a connoisseur, see Andrea Bacchi, *Il conoscitore d’arte: Sculture dal XV al XIX secolo della collezione di Federico Zeri* (Milan: Electa, 1989).
70 The College Art Association (CAA) first adopted a “Code of Ethics for Art Historians and Guidelines for the Professional Practice of Art History” in 1973, with revisions that followed in 1974, 1995, and 2014. See http://www.collegeart.org/guidelines/histethics. The American Alliance of Museums (AAM, formerly the American Association of Museums), the International Council of Museums (ICOM), and the Association of Art Museum Directors (AAMD) also have codified professional guidelines.
dealers remained faithful to one another, in a relationship of mutual benefit and satisfaction.

For the final consideration of a purchase, an object was shipped to the Nelson Gallery, which provided a secure environment in which Father Van Ackeren and Virginia Greenlease could view selected works and where Coe could inspect their condition. 71 If all three agreed that the work of art was suitable for purchase, then Van Ackeren outlined contractual terms such as the number of payments required and price, which, as he was a shrewd negotiator, was typically discounted. 72 While Father Van Ackeren always deferred to Virginia in finalizing purchases, there is no evidence to indicate that she ever disapproved of any of his choices. In fact, she seems to have gained great satisfaction in affording Father Van Ackeren the opportunity to purchase art, something he did eagerly, yet judiciously. 73 Once an agreement was reached between all parties and at least a partial payment was made, the Nelson released the work, which Virginia Greenlease then immediately donated to Rockhurst, where the object was put on display. 74

Through the course of working with Ted Coe in building this collection, Mrs. Greenlease developed a keen ability to recognize promising works of art. For example, in 1980, when she was considering a mid-eighteenth-century bozzetto that depicts Saint Mark the Evangelist and was attributed to the workshop of Giambattista Tiepolo (1696-1770) for purchase, she was so convinced that the Venetian master himself had painted it, that she insisted that the matter of

---

71 For correspondence that references shipments of potential acquisitions to the Nelson Gallery, Coe to Van Ackeren, 7 March 1977, Rockhurst file, NAMAA; Mont to Van Ackeren, 16 June 1978, Il Bachiacca: Acquisition file, GGA; Edward Lubin to Coe, 2 June 1975, Ralph T. Coe Personal Correspondence file, RG99 3.4, NAMAA.
72 Final Invoice Payment, December 1978, Il Bachiacca: Acquisition file, GGA.
73 Interview, Cynthia Cartwright, 3 July 2014. Cartwright is currently director of the Center for the Arts and Sciences at Rockhurst University.
74 Maurice E. Van Ackeren, S. J. to Mrs. William J. Robertson, Loewi-Robertson, Inc., 6 November 1972, Half-Chasuble: Acquisition file, GGA.
attribution be delved into further.75 Certainly this would have been good news to a dealer, who might have anticipated a higher asking price if the work did indeed belong to the master, but it also would have benefited Rockhurst to have an autograph work, albeit a preparatory study, by such a renowned artist. It is not clear who conducted this research, but at some point, Coe and the art dealer affirmed the painting’s authenticity and changed its attribution to Giambattista Tiepolo, an attribution that the present study supports.76 This incident involving what was evidently Virginia’s favorite painting demonstrates that Rockhurst benefited not only from Mrs. Greenlease’s financial largesse, but also from her good eye.

Just as Father Van Ackeren and Mrs. Greenlease relied upon Coe for his expertise, so, too, did the dealers depend upon his ability to expedite a sale. On more than one occasion Betty Mont pressed Coe to urge Father Van Ackeren to purchase a particular work of art. For instance, after not receiving word from Van Ackeren regarding the potential purchase of a painting of the Holy Family by Giuseppe Maria Crespi (1665-1747), Mont wrote a letter to Coe, imploring, “Ted, my dear, whatever happened to our Father Van Ackeren? ... I am certainly not the one to urge a client – but you know how rare such items are [and] with its deep feeling of worship, it would be fine for the museum.”77 By using Coe as her conduit to finalize a sale, Mrs. Mont lessened the appearance of being a high-pressure salesperson. Eventually Rockhurst acquired the work, but nearly two years passed between the time that Father Van Ackeren first encountered the Crespi painting at the Mont’s New York gallery and when it arrived in Kansas.

---

75 See n. 3.
76 See cat. no. 8.
77 Mont to Coe, 11 January 1975 and Mont to Coe, 3 Feb. 1975, Ralph T. Coe: Personal Correspondence file, RG99 3.7, NAMAA. See also cat. no. 7.
That Father Van Ackeren was not one to be rushed into a decision is demonstrated again in the 1978 acquisition of a painting of the *Madonna and Child with the Infant Saint John* of c. 1515-18 by Francesco d’Ubertino Verdi, better known as Il Bachiacca.\(^7^9\) Worried that the sale to Rockhurst might fall through, Betty beseeched Coe in a letter, “If you see [Father Van Ackeren], Ted, please **remind** him. The painting would be so wonderful for the Rockhurst College.”\(^8^0\) In response, the curator assured Mrs. Mont that he had already informed Father Van Ackeren that the painting was an “extraordinarily fine picture,” noting also that, “I don’t think they are quite yet ready to come to a decision, but I will do my best to ease it along.”\(^8^1\) Acting as the middleman, Coe advised the patron and priest from Rockhurst on their selections, while also generating more income for his New York associates. Ultimately, Mrs. Greenlease did acquire the painting by Il Bachiacca for Rockhurst, where it remains, justifiably, one of the collection’s most prized works.\(^8^2\) For the purchase of both the Crespi and Il Bachiacca paintings, Betty Mont showed a respectable amount of concern in finding a suitable buyer for each work. However, she was probably even more anxious to move her inventory, and if Rockhurst would not purchase the work, then she wanted notification to that effect, so that she could sell the work to someone else. Van Ackeren’s deliberate nature was a reflection of the cautious and methodical approach that made him such a good administrator. He was intently focused on the fiduciary responsibility that he had to the university and was careful with how he allocated funds. Since

---

\(^7^8\) Van Ackeren first saw the Crespi painting during a visit to New York in January of 1975. See Mont to Coe, 11 January 1975, ibid.  
\(^7^9\) See cat. no. 2.  
\(^8^0\) Mont to Coe, 11 April 1978, Ralph T. Coe: Personal Correspondence file, RG99 3.7, NAMAA.  
\(^8^1\) Coe to Mont, 14 April 1978, ibid.  
\(^8^2\) Mrs. Greenlease invested as much in the painting by Il Bachiacca as she had in the Andrea di Bartolo panel that she purchased three years prior.
he was also overseeing campus renovations at that time, his ability to solicit donors was limited.83

Ted Coe: Builder of Collections

While Father Van Ackeren and Mrs. Greenlease were motivated to make fine art accessible to Rockhurst students on campus and to benefit an institution to which she felt she owed a great deal, the reason why Ted Coe became involved in the project is less apparent. Today, the Code of Ethics outlined in the standards of best practices for both the American Alliance of Museums (hereafter AAM, formerly the American Association of Museums) and for the Association of Art Museum Directors (hereafter AAMD) expressly forbid a museum employee to use his or her position for financial gain, but in the 1970s those rules were relatively recently implemented.84 The AAMD’s guidelines, which were drawn up in June of 1966, allowed for a director to advise others, as long as s/he did not benefit monetarily from that transaction.85 Therefore, ethically, it would have been acceptable for Coe to facilitate these transactions, as long as he did not receive a fee for his services from either the art vendor, or from the patron. There are no records to document any payments to Coe, nor is there any indication in the written correspondence that either the dealer or the patron ever compensated the curator, although, in lieu of payment, Coe might have suggested that a donation be directed

83 Mont to Coe, 10 February 1975, Ralph T. Coe Personal Correspondence file, RG99 3.7, NAMAA.
84 A standard is defined as “a required or agreed level of quality and attainment,” and “best practices,” as “commendable,” but not necessary actions. See Elizabeth E. Merritt, National Standards and Best Practices for U. S. Museums (Washington, DC: The AAM Press, 2008), 1-3.
85 See Appendix A in “A Code of Ethics for Art Museum Directors,” in Professional Practices in Art Museums, 2011 available as a PDF on the AADM website, https://aamd.org/standards-and-practices. The related passage states, “The director must not function as a commercial dealer in works of art nor be party to the recommendation for purchase by museums or collectors of works of art in which the director has any undisclosed financial interest.”
toward his museum.\textsuperscript{86}

So, if not for personal financial gain, why would the curator of one museum agree to assist another institution in acquiring works of art? Would there not be an inherent conflict of interest? The AAM Code of Ethics, which addresses this topic, was first formulated in 1978, and most recently revised in 2000. It states, “Where conflicts of interest arise—actual, potential or perceived—the duty of loyalty must never be compromised.”\textsuperscript{87} This stipulation clearly indicates that a curator must always consider first what is in the best interest of his own organization, before acting on behalf of another. The fact that this specification is even included in the code shows that the problem probably existed in the profession at the time, and therefore, needed to be addressed.\textsuperscript{88} However, in this particular case, all indications suggest that the curator behaved appropriately. For example, extant records show that Coe did not act without the knowledge, and apparent blessing, of the Nelson’s director, Laurence Sickman (1907-1988).\textsuperscript{89} Indeed, after the Van Ackeren Gallery opened in 1975, Sickman himself was listed as a member of the collection’s advisory council.\textsuperscript{90}

Coe’s sharing of his expertise to aid the development of a small university’s fledgling collection probably also presented little ethical conflict because the type and quality of works that Father Van Ackeren and Mrs. Greenlease sought for Rockhurst belonged, in general, to a

\textsuperscript{86} There were some rather large monetary gifts at the time that anonymous donors had given to the Nelson Gallery. It is possible that one or more of these came from the Greenlease family as a gesture of appreciation for Coe’s assistance.

\textsuperscript{87} Merritt, \textit{National Standards}, 24-25.

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{89} Betty Mont to Van Ackeren, 3 September 1976, Crespi: Acquisition file, GGA. For example, Betty Mont wrote to Father Van Ackeren, “Mr. Coe and Mr. Sickman will greatly approve of your purchase, - they have always wanted the Crespi for the museum.” Although it is not entirely clear, Mont seems to intimate that Coe and Sickman, who was Nelson gallery director from 1953 to 1977, knew about the Crespi painting, but, because they were not acquiring it for their own museum, Mrs. Greenlease had the option to buy it for Rockhurst.

\textsuperscript{90} Invitation to Van Ackeren Gallery opening, List of advisory board members, box, 209, GLA.
different league altogether than what the considerably larger and more prestigious Nelson
Gallery might consider for its own collection. Ostensibly, Coe could have recommended works
for Virginia Greenlease to obtain for the Van Ackeren collection that he was not interested in
acquiring for his own institution. For instance, Coe may have passed on acquiring Andrea di
Bartolo’s *Madonna of Humility* and Il Bachiacca’s *Madonna and Child with Infant Saint John the Baptist* for his own museum, because the Nelson Gallery already had comparable works in its
collection. In the case of the Sienese Andrea di Bartolo’s panel, the Nelson had obtained a
painting of the same subject by Lorenzo Monaco (1370-1425) in 1940. Although the latter was
executed by a Florentine artist, the museum already had Sienese works in its collection,
including a painting of Saint Peter by Andrea’s father, Bartolo di Fredi Ceni (c. 1332-1403),
which the Nelson purchased in 1950, as well as a small panel depicting the *Madonna and Child*
by Lippo Memmi (active c. 1317-1350), and a *Madonna and Child Between Saints Jerome and Augustine* by Giovanni di Paolo (c. 1397-1482), which the Samuel H. Kress Foundation donated
in 1961 as part of the museum’s Kress Collection. Perhaps Coe deemed the *Madonna and Child with Infant Saint John* painting by Il Bachiacca unnecessary for the Nelson as the museum
already had two very fine analogous examples of the same subject and period by Florentine
artists Lorenzo di Credi (1458/9-1537) and Giuliano Bugiardini (1475-1554), that were acquired
in 1939 and 1968, respectively.91

Another reason that Coe might have recommended a work for Virginia to buy for the
Rockhurst collection would have been if his own museum board denied approval for a proposed
purchase, as happened on occasion. Through his father’s association with the Cleveland

Museum of Art, Coe learned early on about institutional politics. However, that did not lessen his sense of frustration in dealing with the board on such matters, as the following excerpt from his letter to Edward Lubin reveals:

“I have to report to you a tragedy. Neither Mr. Sickman nor I can get the Guggenbichler sculpture through the trustees. Our chief trustee is adamant – it’s just too “Catholic” for his concept of true sculpture. We have pushed him to the breaking point, but we have no alternative, but to send the sculpture back to you. I am certainly appreciative of your cooperation and the decent price you made us. This is the price that museum people pay for American democracy. This would never happen at the Victoria and Albert Museum, where I served my residency – and sometimes I wish I were back there!”

The work in question was a gilt and polychrome, life-size wood sculpture of c. 1680 by Austrian sculptor, Meinrad Guggenbichler (1649-1723). The statue depicted Saint John Gualbert (985-1073) wearing a thickly carved and gilded chain with a disproportionately large medallion showing a three-quarter profile of Jesus. The board members, who were Protestant, considered the display of iconography to be garish and not in line with their aesthetic sensibilities. For works that the board deemed unsuitable for the Nelson, Coe could, without conflict, recommend

---

94 Coe to Lubin, 15 October 1962, Ralph T. Coe: Personal Correspondence file, RG99 3.4, NAMAA. Of the fifty-six works that the Nelson Gallery acquired during the 1960s, three depicted scenes from the Old Testament, and seven from the New Testament. Board member Milton McGreevy (served 1949-1980) acquired the Saint John the Baptist by Caravaggio for the museum, which exemplifies the type of religious painting that the board did not feel was overtly Catholic. Other Nelson board members whom Coe references include David T. Beals, Jr. (1950-1963) and Menefee D. Blackwell (1957-1991), who were Unitarian and Episcopalian, respectively. For information on the Caravaggio painting, see Rowlands, The Collections of the Nelson-Atkins, 215-26, cat. no. 25.
their purchase to the Jesuit priest and his devout patron, for whom an “overtly Catholic” work of art would not have presented a problem.

Just get it to Kansas City!

While these considerations may explain how Coe was able to assist Rockhurst, they do not explain why he was motivated to do so. According to Gaylord Torrence, Fred and Virginia Merrill Senior Curator of American Indian Art at the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, it was completely in Ted Coe’s nature to help on this project because he possessed “an enormous belief in the arts and demonstrated a profound interest in furthering his field.”95 When Coe arrived in Kansas City, it was still a fairly provincial town and he was determined to improve the city’s cultural condition by expanding its resources, with the idea of informing the community’s consciousness of the fine arts. Torrence explains that Coe’s greatest legacy to Kansas City was that he was a “builder of collections.” For instance, Coe advised Henry W. Bloch, co-founder of the tax-preparation company H & R Block, and Henry’s wife Marion on their collection of Impressionist and Post-Impressionist Art, which the Blochs recently donated to the Nelson-Atkins. By helping to bring the Greenlease works to Kansas City, there was always the chance that in the future they would end up at the Nelson.96 That getting fine works of art to Kansas City was a priority for Coe is reflected in a letter that Betty Mont wrote to the Nelson’s director, Sickman, in reference to the Greenlease purchase of the Andrea di Bartolo painting mentioned above. Betty proclaimed, “[S]o, it [the Andrea di Bartolo painting] remains at least in Kansas

95 See n. 19.
96 Two paintings in the Van Ackeren collection have been featured at the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art. See cat. nos. 4, 13.
City! This note suggests that this fine example of early Quattrocento painting may have first been offered to the Nelson, but since the museum did not purchase it, this prized picture became a centerpiece of the Rockhurst Collection. When the Van Ackeren Gallery first opened in 1975, Coe pointed out the gallery’s “top museum quality,” objects to a newspaper reporter and reflected proudly, “I look upon [the Rockhurst collection] as a major addition to the cultural life of the city.”


On 13 October 1967, the day after the Greenlease Library at Rockhurst University was dedicated, Robert and Virginia Greenlease donated to the Jesuits at Rockhurst a wood carving of the Crucifixion with Mary Magdalene by César Bagard (1620-1707). The Bagard sculpture was placed in the new library’s Treasury Room, which served as an informal viewing area that was named after the space that traditionally stores a church’s precious liturgical implements. During the early 1970s, Virginia Greenlease began in earnest to acquire more sacred and liturgical objects that were suitable additions for the Rockhurst treasury. In the first two years of the decade, she purchased five objects, three of which were an embroidered Spanish altar frontal of c. 1400, a Flemish tapestry of 1548-44, and a mid-fifteenth-century German half-chasuble, which is a panel from the outermost liturgical vestment that a priest wore while celebrating

---

97 Betty Mont to Lawrence Sickman, 6 May 1974, Ralph T. Coe: Personal Correspondence file, RG99 3.7, NAMAA.
98 Donald Hoffman, “Art at Rockhurst,” Kansas City Star, 18 May 1975, 1F, 3F.
100 “Art at Rockhurst,” Kansas City Star, 18 May 1975, 1F.
Mass. Since the focus of the present study is paintings and sculptures, these three textiles have been excluded from the catalog that follows, but they will be discussed briefly below. The other two objects that Mrs. Greenlease purchased at the time for Rockhurst were a German Baroque chalice of 1707 by a Munich goldsmith, Felix Planner, and a polychrome wood statue depicting a *Saint Anne Trinity* of c. 1500 from the atelier of Burgos sculptor Gil de Siloé.

In September of 1971, the chalice, altar frontal and *Saint Anne Trinity* statue were presented to the public during a Mass at Saint Francis Xavier, a Jesuit-affiliated Catholic church that is located just west of the university’s campus. The aforementioned Father Lakas, who had become director of the Saint Thomas More Center, organized the event. During the service, Benedictine monks from Conception Abbey, which is located ninety miles northwest of Kansas City, sang Gregorian chants and processed the nearly three-foot tall *Saint Anne* statue through the church’s nave. The Baroque chalice was used during the celebration of the Eucharist at the high altar, which was decorated with the crimson, velvet Spanish altar cloth of c. 1400 that depicts Saints Francis of Assisi and Anthony of Padua flanking Christ and Mary, who sit upon a Gothic throne. These figures are embroidered in gem tones of red, green, and blue, with gold thread accents. Presenting these objects in a church allowed attendees to observe the chalice, altar cloth, and statue as objects functioning within a setting for which they were intended; it was

103 See cat. nos. 9, 14.
104 “Rockhurst College Mass on Man, Art, and Culture,” *Kansas City Times*, 16 September 1971.
the only time, however, that they were used in this manner, as they soon took their place with the Bagard Crucifix in the Greenlease Library’s Treasury Room.  

One week before she purchased the altar frontal, Virginia Greenlease bought the Flemish tapestry entitled *Joseph’s Brethren Selling him to the Ishmaelites* mentioned above. This work is part of a series showing scenes from the Old Testament figure, Joseph, that wool manufacturer and art connoisseur Mr. Charles Mather Ffoulke (1841-1909) acquired in 1904 from Prince Rospigliosi (d. 1913) of Rome. Although Father Van Ackeren was interested in acquiring one of the companion tapestries, his wish was never realized. The Van Ackeren tapestry’s border shows the stylistic influence of Raphael’s *Acts of Apostles* tapestries that Pope Leo X (r. 1513-1521) commissioned in 1515 to line the lower section of the Sistine Chapel’s walls. The Joseph tapestry, which measures 3.44 x 5.33 meters (11’4” x 17’ 6”), is the largest object in the collection. Due to its considerable dimensions, the textile did not fit on the walls of the Treasury Room. Instead, it was placed upstairs in the Greenlease Library’s main reading room, where it hung for several decades from the three-story high north wall. As a result, the tapestry’s fibers were stretched out of shape, and, because of their continuous exposure to sunlight, the tapestry’s

---


108 Ffoulke’s collection of tapestries was the earliest and largest of its kind in the United States. See William Caldwell, "Charles Mather Ffoulke: Educator, Author, Lecturer, Collector of Antique Tapestries, and Director of the Fletcher Manufacturing Co., Providence, R.I," *The Successful American* 7 (1903): 382-83. Ffoulke’s collection of tapestries was the earliest and largest of its kind in the United States.

109 Hoffman, IF.

110 For more on Raphael’s tapestries, see Mark Evans and Clare Brown, eds., *Raphael: Cartoons and Tapestries for the Sistine Chapel* (London: V & A Publishing, 2010).
colors have faded.\textsuperscript{111}

The half-chasuble Virginia donated to Rockhurst in 1972, which dates from the fifteenth century, likely came from the Rhine River valley in Germany. It consists of the dorsal, or posterior, panel of a type of garment that, as mentioned above, priests wore when celebrating Mass. The chasuble is made from red and green velvet decorated with a Venetian-inspired pomegranate design. The panel’s cross-shaped orphrey, or decorative border, depicts the Crucifixion. God the Father appears at the apex of the cross in this embroidered and appliqued scene, and Mary Magdalene kneels at the cross’ base. The Virgin Mary and John the Evangelist stand to the left and right of the cross, respectively, with Saints Peter and Paul flanking Christ at the level of the crossbar.\textsuperscript{112} Floating angels in flowing gowns bear gold chalices that collect Christ’s blood, which appears as red thread strands pouring from his wounds.\textsuperscript{113} The chasuble, which Virginia purchased from Loewi-Robertson, Inc. of Los Angeles, was the only object that came from a dealer whose business was located west of Kansas City, and it was the last textile purchased for the collection.

\textsuperscript{111} Having sustained substantial damage, the tapestry was vacuumed of dust and debris and placed in storage, where it awaits repair. For references to the Joseph tapestry, see Joseph Breck, "A Brussels Tapestry," \textit{Bulletin of the Minneapolis Institute of Arts} 5, no. 2 (1916): 11-12; George Leland Hunter, \textit{Decorative Textiles: An Illustrated Book on Coverings for Furniture Walls, and Floors, Including Damasks, Brocades and Velvets, Tapestries, Laces, Embroideries, Chintzes, Cretones, Drapery and Furniture Trimmings, Wall Papers, Carpets and Rugs, Tooled and Illuminated Leathers} (New York: J. B. Lipincott Company, 1918), 272, plate 4; Candace Adelson, \textit{European Tapestry in the Minneapolis Institute of Arts} (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1994), 122-30 n. 19, fig. 55. When Adelson published her work, she was apparently unaware that Rockhurst owned the tapestry, because she relied upon information that Jean-Paul Asselberghs had related to her 17 April 1970, that he had seen the tapestry at French and Company that year, which would have been before Rockhurst acquired it. For the illustration of the Greenlease tapestry in her book, Adelson used a black-and-white photograph of 1918.

\textsuperscript{112} The GGA file for this object mentions that the chasuble is published in \textit{Die Liturgischen Gewänder und Kirchlichen Stickereien des Schnütgen Museums Köln}, June 1926.

\textsuperscript{113} The chasuble was purchased 8 November 1972. For information regarding chasubles originating in the Rhineland, see Nancy Netzer and Virginia Reinburg, eds., \textit{Fragmented Devotion: Medieval Objects from the Schnütgen Museum Cologne} (Chicago: McMullen Museum of Art in association with the University of Chicago Press, 2000); Pauline Johnstone, \textit{High Fashion in the Church: The Place of Church Vestments in the History of Art from the Ninth to the Nineteenth Century} (Leeds, UK: W.S. Maney and Son Ltd., 2002), 70-78.
The greater number of important and precious works added to the collection warranted the construction of a proper and secure display space with climate control to ensure a stable environment in which to protect and preserve the objects. While Father Van Ackeren was concerned about caring properly for the collection, he also wanted to make the works easily accessible for students and visitors alike. He explained at the time, “The situation is simple...those pieces at present are neither displayed to their best advantage, nor are they easily reached and adequately lighted.”\(^{114}\) Thus, the idea emerged to reconfigure the Treasury Room into a versatile gallery that could also accommodate temporary exhibitions. In 1973 Mrs. Greenlease pledged to underwrite the cost of construction, which was completed within two years.

With the promise of a formal gallery imminent, a number of new objects were added to the collection. For the first time, some of those works came from donors other than Mrs. Greenlease. In February of 1973, an art dealer’s invoice shows that Rockhurst purchased a French Gothic alabaster altarpiece fragment that represents the *Education of Saint Anne* (c. 1400-1500) and a two-sided, mid-fifteenth-century, tempera-on-panel painting depicting Princess Cleolinde approaching a dragon on one side and Mary Magdalene on the reverse. Art historian Erwin Panofsky attributed the latter to the circle of The Master of the Saint George Legend.\(^ {115}\) These works were bought from the Kansas City-based Lawrence Gallery, which was the only

\(^{114}\) “A New Look to the Treasury Room,” Van Ackeren Gallery files, box 209, GLA.
\(^{115}\) Ibid., Lawrence Sickman to Rockhurst, 27 March, 1973, “Information on art works purchased from Lawrence Gallery by Rockhurst College...September 16, 1972.”
local dealer from which objects for the collection were obtained. The sales receipt indicates that, as a sign of reciprocity for the purchases, the gallery’s proprietors, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Lawrence, donated to Rockhurst a small, somewhat crudely carved, wood fifteenth-century Pietà, perhaps of Flemish or German origin that was probably once inserted in the central panel of a portable triptych. The Greenlease Archive records indicate that members of the Thomas More group donated at least two works to the gallery. One of these was a mid-seventeenth-century wood and polychrome statue of the Madonna and Child measuring 27.9 cm (11 in.) in height. The book club donated this Austrian sculpture in honor of one of its members, Mrs. Marie Pierson. The second work, a marble relief of the Head of the Virgin of c. 1700, which was attributed at the time to the Bolognese sculptor, Giuseppe Mazza (1653-1741), was donated in memory of Marie Pierson’s mother, Daisy C. Kahmann. Thus, Mrs. Greenlease was not the sole donor of works for the Van Ackeren collection. However, since the study focuses on the objects that she donated, those works that others bequeathed to Rockhurst await future study.

As the Jesuit university’s collection continued to grow, plans for a new gallery were underway. Working in conjunction with the local architectural firm McCoy, Hutchison, and Stone, designer John Lowrey of the Nelson Gallery planned to transform the Treasury Room on

\[116\] A similarly styled wooden sculpture of a Pietà belongs to the Victoria and Albert Museum. For a comparative image, see, Williamson, Netherlandish Sculpture, 110-11, fig. 30. Lawrence Gallery acquired the Princess Cleoline panel from Effie Siegrist, an advisor to local art collectors, who had obtained the work in Europe. See Sidney Lawrence of Lawrence Gallery to Rockhurst College, 27 March 1973, Education of Saint Ann: Acquisition file, GGA.

\[117\] Robin A. Branstator, "Giuseppe Mazza," in Dictionary of Art, ed. Jane Turner (London and New York: Macmillan Publishers Limited and Grove Dictionaries, Inc., 1996), 20: 902-03. The attribution of this small, round marble relief, which measures 31.5 x 27 cm (12 6/8 x 10 5/8 in.), has been in question since the object was added to the collection in 1973. The work came from Michael Hall Fine Arts of New York, who obtained it from a London dealer, who claimed to have purchased it in Venice, where Mazza worked on occasion. Letters dating from the end of September to the beginning of November 1975 from various experts who weighed in on the matter are found in Mazza: Acquisition file, GGA.
the library’s first floor into a proper gallery.\textsuperscript{118} Around the time that Virginia Greenlease agreed to finance the gallery’s construction, she also donated Andrea di Bartolo’s \textit{Madonna of Humility} of c. 1410.\textsuperscript{119} It is worth noting that Virginia paid more than twice as much for this single panel than she had for the entire sum of objects that she had thus far donated to the collection.\textsuperscript{120} However, the purchase was well timed, because it provided an exceptional work to serve as the new gallery’s centerpiece.

A short time before the gallery opened, Virginia also donated an Italian prie-dieu, or kneeling bench, and a Portuguese altarpiece. Both are of carved wood and date from c. 1700.\textsuperscript{121} The prayer bench, which is typically used either in a domestic setting or a side chapel in a church, has a walnut-colored patina.\textsuperscript{122} The kneeler, which is decorated with carved faces, a heraldic device and vegetal motifs, is hinged and the lid lifts up to reveal a rectangular storage space underneath. There is also a drawer near the top and a cupboard door at the center, where personal prayer items, such as a bible or rosary, may have been placed. Four square-shaped relief sculptures of grotesque faces are carved into the front side. The sculpted altarpiece, on the other hand, is made of ebony.\textsuperscript{123} The Virgin of the Immaculate Conception stands in a niche at the center of that work, where she is flanked by two Corinthian columns and two saints. God the Father appears at the altarpiece’s apex and five busts of angels, in relief, complete its embellishment.\textsuperscript{124} Mrs. Greenlease’s purchase of these objects aligned with the theme of the

\textsuperscript{118} Hoffman, 1F.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid. See also cat. no. 1.
\textsuperscript{120} Calculations were made from a tally of inventory purchase prices obtained from GGA acquisition files.
\textsuperscript{121} There are no known records for the purchase of these objects. However, the Greenlease Gallery labels state that the Robert C. Greenlease Family donated these works.
\textsuperscript{122} The prie-dieu measures 96.52 x 69.85 x 48.9 cm (38 x 27 ½ x 19 ¼ in.).
\textsuperscript{123} The altarpiece measures 92.075 x 60.325 x 16.51 cm (36 ¼ x 23 ¾ x 6 ½ in.).
\textsuperscript{124} For more on the iconography for the Immaculate Conception, see cat. nos. 5, 13.
collection’s holdings as a treasury of religious art dating from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{125}

Two additional works that Mrs. Greenlease purchased before the gallery’s premiere were an unpainted, sculpted Netherlandish Madonna of c. 1490-1500, attributed at the time to the Master of Elsloo, and a polychrome and gilt wood statue of \textit{Saint Cecilia Playing the Organ} of c. 1700 by Erhgot Bernhard Bendl (c. 1660-1738) of southern Germany.\textsuperscript{126} The simultaneous purchase of Gothic and Baroque statues demonstrated an interest on the part of Mrs. Greenlease, Father Van Ackeren, and Ted Coe to diversify the collection in terms of its representation of medium, chronology, and geography. Additionally, the two statues added visual variety to the collection’s display, for the unpainted Gothic statue’s static, columnar stance and thickly carved, angular fabric folds, provide a marked stylistic contrast to the twisting pose and fluttering garment of the Baroque figure.

On 1 June 1975, in commemoration of Father Van Ackeren’s twenty-fifth year as Rockhurst’s president, the newly renovated Treasury Room was rededicated as the Van Ackeren Gallery.\textsuperscript{127} Displayed within it were fourteen works that Virginia Greenlease bequeathed, along with a few objects that the Saint Thomas More Club and some of its members had donated, the sum of which was known as the Treasury Collection.\textsuperscript{128} To provide easy access to the general public, the gallery had its own exterior entrance on the library’s south side, which was

\begin{enumerate}
\item[\textsuperscript{125}] Hoffman, 1F, 3F.
\item[\textsuperscript{126}] See cat. nos. 10, 12.
\item[\textsuperscript{127}] Kasper, \textit{Rockhurst}, 282.
\item[\textsuperscript{128}] Ibid., 19-21. See also Allie S. Patrick, “Van Ackeren Gallery at Rockhurst College Formally Opened to the Public on June 1, 1975 Features Religious Art from 15\textsuperscript{th}-18\textsuperscript{th} Centuries,” \textit{News from Rockhurst College}, 9, box 209, Van Ackeren Gallery files, GLA. During an interview that she gave to a reporter at the gallery’s inauguration on 23 May 1975, Virginia Greenlease expressed the belief that her late husband, Robert, would have approved of naming the space after Father Van Ackeren.
\end{enumerate}
independent of the library’s main entrance on the east facade. Visitors entered by descending two short staircases into a sunken outdoor courtyard tiled in gray slate, where a set of glass doors opened into a foyer, where there was another dividing wall of glass that served as the gallery’s entry. The generous installation of glass created no visual barriers and encouraged visitors to explore what lay beyond the partition. A second ingress on the inner west wall near the library’s central staircase offered a convenient route to the gallery from the library proper for students and faculty. The two entrances, one for the Rockhurst student body, and the other for the public, created pathways to the gallery’s space, where the visitors converged. As such, the gallery and its collection were able to fulfill the mission that Father Van Ackeren had advocated early in his presidency, which was, as mentioned above, to establish cultural ties between the campus and community and to emphasize the fine arts at Rockhurst.

During ceremonies held on the inauguration of the Van Ackren Gallery, Virginia reiterated her late husband’s interest in education and related how they both had wished that the collection’s objects would be used to instruct the university’s students. Moreover, she promised to purchase more works of art for the collection, and expressed the hope that the gallery’s opening would encourage others to do the same. Using the Old Testament Joseph tapestry as an example, Virginia specified that the collection would not necessarily be limited in the future to solely Christian art. While a few other individuals and groups donated works to the Van Ackeren collection, Virginia Greenlease remained the gallery’s primary benefactor.

---

129 Hoffman, 1F, 3F.
130 An exception is a mid- to late-nineteenth-century, silver-on-copper electroplate reproduction by Elkington of a Portuguese pax of circa 1520-30 that Rockhurst patron Mrs. John R. Cunningham, Sr. donated to the collection. The work represents a copy of the Esphinheiro Pax (Museu Nacional de Portugal, Lisbon) which Portugal designated as a national treasure. There is an electroplate copy, like the one that belongs to the Van Ackeren collection, at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.
Augmenting the Collection

One month after the gallery opened to the public, Virginia Greenlease declined the opportunity to purchase a statue of the Virgin of the Immaculate Conception by the Burgundian artist Felipe Vigarny (1475-1542) from Edward Lubin, perhaps because the sculpture from the workshop of Gil de Siloé was of the same medium and from the same geographic region and time period as the Vigarny example. Instead, Virginia and Father Van Ackeren waited two years before they purchased the next work to be added to the collection, a sculpture that also depicted the Immaculate Conception, but whose marble medium and Austrian provenance were not yet represented in the collection. The statue in question dates from c. 1700 and was attributed to Gabriel Grupello (1644-1730), an Antwerp-trained sculptor, who worked as a court artist for John William, Elector Palatine (1658-1716) in Düsseldorf, Germany. However, as the present study will show, the work should instead be attributed to Peter Strudel, who was an imperial court artist in Vienna for the Holy Roman Emperor, Leopold I (1640-1705). The sculpture measures 170.18 cm (67 in.) in height and is Rockhurst’s only life-size, marble statue. The new acquisition was placed, to dramatic effect, in the foyer of the Van Ackeren Gallery. In tandem with this purchase, Virginia acquired a pen and sepia drawing of the Virgin of the Immaculate Conception of c. 1664 by noted Seville artist Bartolomé Esteban Murillo (1617-1682). Why Father Van Ackeren and Virginia Greenlease sought out works of this specific subject at this

133 See cat. no. 5.
particular time is unclear. However, the theme of the Virgin Mary’s conception without sin was one that, since early in its history, the Society of Jesus had actively promoted. The concurrent acquisition of two objects that represent the same subject worked well thematically, and, since the works originated from two different regions in Europe and were executed in different media, their purchase also demonstrated a sustained and concerted effort to diversify the collection’s holdings of sacred art.

In 1978, Virginia purchased what was thought to be a Byzantine crystal medallion of c. 500-600 that depicts the Resurrection and Ascension. This object would have further expanded the collection’s breadth, but in 1995 American art historian Genevra Kornbluth identified the medallion as a likely forgery that was probably made in Beirut during the 1960s. Apparently fraudulent objects of this type were produced in response to a surging interest in collecting Byzantine works at the time and appeared in clusters on the art market from 1961-1964, 1970-1972, and 1975-1982. The date of its purchase coincided with the last period of their production and its acquisition demonstrates the perennial challenges of navigating the art market, even with the guidance of reputable professionals.

136 Kornbluth, "Early Byzantine Crystals: An Assessment," 23, 30. The British Museum’s 1971 purchase also coincided with one of these periods.
During roughly their first decade of collecting works for Rockhurst, Mrs. Greenlease and Father Van Ackeren acquired only one painting, the *Madonna of Humility* by Andrea di Bartolo. Aside from the liturgical objects it contained, the remainder of the early collection was comprised primarily of religious sculptures. Beginning in 1976, however, Mrs. Greenlease and Father Van Ackeren shifted their attention to the acquisition of paintings, focusing particularly on works that originated from the Italian peninsula. Over the course of the next decade they compiled a small, but varied, collection of paintings executed in various media, including oil on canvas and oil on copper, which complemented the gold-and-tempera panel by Andrea di Bartolo. The paintings that were acquired date from the early fifteenth to the mid-eighteenth centuries and represent the diverse styles associated with the schools of Siena, Florence, Venice, Bologna, and Rome. Of the final six paintings that Virginia donated to the collection, three present scenes of a single, male saint receiving heavenly inspiration, and the other three depict scenes from the life of the Holy Family, including two that take place in domestic interiors and one that is set in a landscape.

The first paintings were purchased in 1976, when Virginia acquired from Frederick Mont, Inc. two oil-on-canvas works entitled *The Holy Family* of c. 1700 by Giuseppe Maria Crespi (1665-1747) of Bologna and *Saint Mark the Evangelist* of c. 1730-35 by the celebrated Venetian painter Giambattista Tiepolo (1696-1770).尽管这些作品可能巧合而并非购买时的考虑因素，但它们却分享了艺术传统的联系，因为 Tiepolo

---

137 See cat. nos 7, 8.
adopted the brisk brushstroke technique of his teacher, Giovanni Battista Piazzetta (1682-1754), who himself had learned the technique in Bologna from Crespi. This painterly style is evident in both Greenlease works. Virginia and Father Van Ackeren selected the Crespi painting over another similarly sized painting that was offered for sale at the same time, an *Adoration of the Magi* by the French Baroque painter, Claude Vignon (1593-1670). Vignon’s opulent scene, which showed an exotic setting with a splendid retinue of servants accompanying the sumptuously clad Magi, presented a stylistic antithesis to the modest scene depicted in Crespi’s painting. Perhaps the priest and his patron selected the Bolognese work because they intended to purchase only Italian paintings, or perhaps because, due to its less extraneous detail, the scene was more legible. Evidently, price was not necessarily a deciding factor in the selection process, because Virginia paid twice as much for the Crespi painting as she would have for the one by Vignon. This choice infers that the priest and his patron sought out works of the highest quality available, but within the limits of Mrs. Greenlease’s pocketbook.

In 1978 Virginia purchased a *Madonna and Child with the Infant Saint John in a Landscape* of 1515-18 by Il Bachiacca, which added a Florentine Renaissance component to the collection, further broadening its representation of Italian schools and periods. The dimensions of this oil-on-canvas painting, which was likely transferred from panel, are double those of the other paintings that Virginia had acquired thus far, which were small-scale devotional works. This important painting added another prominent work to the collection. While her financial expenditure for this picture was commensurate with its art historical

---

138 See cat. no. 11.
139 Betty Mont to Ted Coe, 11 January 1975, Ralph T. Coe: Personal Correspondence file, RG99 3.7, NAMAA.
significance, Virginia’s commitment to investing in the collection also suggests her sustained confidence in the endeavor. The next acquisition was much smaller in size and of a medium and stylistic period not yet represented in the collection. The oil-on-copper work of c. 1725 is by Francesco Trevisani (1656-1746), a Venetian artist who was active in Rome. The image shows the Madonna and Child with a bishop saint who here is identified for the first time as Saint Liborius, a fourth-century bishop from Le Mans, France. The painting was acquired with the help of Edgar Peters Bowron, who replaced Ted Coe as Curator of European Art for the Nelson, when Coe became the museum’s director in 1978. A letter of the following year that Bowron wrote to Martin Zimet of the New York firm, French and Company gives tangible evidence that the acquisition of each work was carefully considered in terms of the entire collection. Bowron’s communication reads as follows:

“...I hope that you will strongly urge Mrs. Greenlease to consider the Trevisani for the Van Ackeren Gallery. Its subject, scale, and exquisite quality would harmonize particularly well with the pictures by Tiepolo, Crespi, etc.”

This was the only instance in which Peters Bowron advised on a purchase for Rockhurst’s collection. His statement to Zimet nevertheless indicates that his advice echoed that of his predecessor, in his consideration of how the painting complemented the collection as a whole in terms of its religious subject, pristine condition, and size. While the painting’s dimensions
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141 There were two payments made for the Il Bachiaccia painting, on 13 September 1978 and 14 February 1979, the sum total of which equaled Mrs. Greenlease’s investment in the Andrea di Bartolo painting three years prior.
142 See cat. no. 6.
143 Edgar Peters-Bowron to Martin J. Zimet of French and Company, 1 October 1979, Trevisani: Acquisition file, GGA.
144 Edgar Peters Bowron, who now is Curator of European Art at the Museum of Fine Arts in Houston, worked at the Nelson-Atkins from 1978 to 1981. In an e-mail dated 3 December 2014, Peters Bowron communicated that he remembered advising on the purchase of the Trevisani painting, but that had been the extent of his involvement with the Van Ackeren collection. I thank him for sharing this information.
complemented the smaller Tiepolo and Crespi works, Trevisani’s minute, detailed brushwork offered a fine contrast in technique, while the addition of a Roman Rococo work to the collection also expanded its representation of artistic styles. At the time that it was purchased, the Trevisani painting was the only work on copper belonging to a Kansas City public collection, which added special significance to its acquisition. That fact later came into play, when, in 1998, Peters Bowron requested the loan of this painting from Rockhurst for the exhibition “Copper as Canvas: Two Centuries of Masterpiece Paintings on Copper, 1575-1775,” since the Nelson-Atkins still had no oil-on-copper painting of its own to display. In any case, the order of acquisitions for the collection show a well-orchestrated approach to bringing works that represented the material and stylistic diversity of European medieval and early modern Christian art to the Rockhurst collection.

Although Virginia Greenlease first considered her two final purchases for the collection in 1985, she did not acquire them until three years later. Like the Il Bacchiacca painting, these works are larger in scale than the majority of the mostly diminutive objects in the collection. One of those acquisitions, a Birth of the Virgin of 1620-24 by Pietro da Cortona (1596-1669) shows attendants in contemporary dress in a well-appointed chamber, complete with a poster bed covered with a crimson coverlet and drapes. In contrast, a fine painting of Saint Charles Borromeo of 1612 by Antiveduto Grammatica (1570/71-1626) portrays the Counter-Reformation saint flanked by two angels as he gazes upon a cross. Perhaps Mrs. Greenlease and Father Van Ackeren were aware that a Jesuit cleric encouraged Charles Borromeo (1538-1584) to enter

146 See cat. no. 4.
147 See cat. no. 3.
the priesthood. Additionally, Cortona found inspiration in Jesuit spirituality and Grammatica painted an image for the tomb of the Order’s founder, Saint Ignatius of Loyola, in the church of the Gesù in Rome. Although it is not certain if these earlier connections to the Society of Jesus informed the decision to purchase either of these paintings, nevertheless these points add significance to works in a Jesuit art collection.

If the gallery space was ever photographed, those images have since been lost. All that remains in the Greenlease Library’s archives are pictures of social functions and art lectures in which the camera lens was clearly focused upon the visitors rather than the works of art and the space that accommodated them. Each of these images shows only a small section of the Van Ackeren Gallery, but they do give a sense of how the collection was displayed. During the renovation, the Treasury Room’s north wall, which had previously opened to the library book stacks, was closed to provide more wall space. The room was configured into a slender, octagonal shape, with narrow walls angled at forty-five degrees in place of each of the rectangular room’s four corners. This configuration provided more space to hang pictures. Three lighted glass cases with pale, sage-colored interiors were recessed into the walls along the room’s perimeter. The longer of these cases was situated on the east wall and the two smaller ones flanked the library entrance on the opposite side. Floating walls painted a light ochre hue were stationed at the room’s center to provide more hanging space. Upon entering the gallery, visitors encountered Peter Strudel’s marble, life-size statue of the Virgin of the Immaculate

148 Borromeo’s confessor, Giovanni Battista Ribera, S.J., (1525-94) inspired him to become a priest. Charles was ordained on 17 July 1563. See cat. no. 3 and John Alexander, From Renaissance to Counter-Reformation: The Architectural Patronage of Carlo Borromeo during the Reign of Pius IV (Milan: Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 2007), 41.
Conception.\textsuperscript{150} The sculpture was placed low to the ground and positioned in front of a six-foot-wide floating wall that was set back, perhaps by eight feet, and parallel to the entrance. On the other side of that floating wall was the prized Madonna of Humility by Andrea di Bartolo. Likely, the painting was installed there to protect it from the sunlight that streamed through the entrance’s glass partition.

Upon entering the gallery, if one turned immediately to the right one would have encountered César Bagard’s wood Crucifix, which hung on the angled wall just to the right of the entryway.\textsuperscript{151} Installed in the long glass case that was recessed next to it in the east wall was a variety of objects, including, on the far right, the Portuguese altarpiece and, on the far left, the wood-and-polychrome Saint Anne Trinity sculpture associated with the Spanish workshop of Gil di Siloé. The placement of the preparatory sketch of the Virgin of the Immaculate Conception of by Murillo at the center of the case highlighted that work’s importance.\textsuperscript{152} While it was grouped with other works that likewise came from the Iberian Peninsula, the drawing occupied a position that did not allow for a comparison with the sculpture of the same subject in the entryway. Underneath the drawing, and just to the right, there was a cube-shaped pedestal upon which the German Baroque chalice by Felix Planner stood. To the left of the chalice there was a small sculpture, the identity of which is indecipherable in the photographs. It may have been the aforementioned fourteenth- to fifteenth-century [?] alabaster Education of the Virgin or a wood and polychrome Madonna and Child of c. 1650 that were donated by benefactors other than Mrs. Greenlease. Near the north end of the east wall hung the German half-chasuble, which was

\textsuperscript{150} See cat. no. 13.
\textsuperscript{151} See cat. no. 11.
\textsuperscript{152} See cat. no. 5.
displayed in its own glass case.

The focal point of the north wall was the *Saint Mark the Evangelist* by Giambattista Tiepolo, which, by all accounts, was Mrs. Greenlease’s favorite work of art in the collection. Appropriately it hung over the *prié-dieu*, reflecting how it might have been experienced within a domestic setting during the mid-eighteenth century, when it was produced. Three additional objects were displayed in the recessed wall to the right of the west library entrance. They included the *Saint Cecilia* sculpture by Ergott Bernhard Bendl, which was suspended on the left side, an almost life-size Crucifixion in the middle, and, after it was purchased in 1978, the *Holy Family* by Crespi was placed on the far right. Exhibited in the recessed glass case to the left of the west wall entrance were a monochrome wood sculpture of a *Madonna* of c. 1500-25 by the Master of Elsloo [?] and the crystal once thought to be of Byzantine provenance, which was set atop a pedestal to the left of the sculpture. On the angled wall to the left, Francesco Trevisani’s *Madonna and Child with Saint Liborius* was displayed after its acquisition in 1979.

Between the floating wall at the front of the gallery and the back, north wall, there was a Z-shaped floating wall, on which the mid-fifteenth-century Cleolinde panel attributed to the Master of the Saint George Legend was displayed. The Andrea di Bartolo *Madonna* hung opposite it, so that the richly-hued panels were situated in close proximity to one another, showcasing two of the most important and visually compelling works in the collection at the
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153 See cat. no. 8.
154 See cat. nos. 7, 12.
155 See Kornbluth, "Early Byzantine Crystals: An Assessment," 32 n. 64.
156 See cat. no. 6.
gallery’s center.¹⁵⁷

As the collection grew in size, the works were shifted around within the gallery to accommodate the new arrivals. For instance, when it was acquired in 1978, the large *Madonna and Child with Infant Saint John* by Il Bachiaccia became the focal point of the north wall, replacing the smaller painting by Tiepolo, which was then shifted to the narrow, angled wall to the left. As shown above, paintings by Andrea di Bartolo, Tiepolo, and Il Bachiaccia and the sketch by Murillo were rightfully privileged in the display of the collection. However, there appears to have been no arrangement of the other objects according to chronology, medium, or subject. Perhaps the intent was to highlight these few works and to install the remainder in a manner that balanced the room visually. It is not certain who arranged the display of objects in the gallery. Considering the time-consuming nature of Father Van Ackeren’s position as university president, it is unlikely that he would have been able to curate the collection. However, it is conceivable his assistant, the Yale-educated Father Lakas, oversaw the collection’s display, particularly given his interest in the public display of art.¹⁵⁸

---

¹⁵⁷ An understanding of what else was displayed on this wall is incomplete, because there are no available photographs showing those vantage points.

¹⁵⁸ As mentioned above, Father Lakas coordinated the display of art in public spaces, such as the procession of Treasury Room objects that took place in the church of Saint Francis Xavier across from the Rockhurst campus.
the early 1990s, William Valk, an associate professor in the university’s Communication and Fine Arts Department, proposed the construction of a facility that would combine a place to display the Treasury Collection, which was still on view in the Van Ackeren Gallery in the Greenlease Library, with a space for rotating art exhibitions, which were typically installed across campus from the library at Massman Hall.\footnote{At the time, rotating exhibitions were displayed in the student union building, Massman Hall.}\footnote{Sherry Best, “Rockhurst Reflections” Rockhurst Community: A Faculty and Staff Communiqué, 8: no. 6 (2001): 1.} Former gallery director, Sherry Best later commented on the habit that she and Valk had in referring to the new building as “my gallery,” by stating, “I suppose the only person who can legitimately call it ‘my gallery’ is Mrs. Virginia Greenlease, because her generosity built both the collection and the building.”\footnote{Fellow Board of Directors member, Bill Dunn Sr., donated part of the labor for the job, which his company J.E. Dunn Construction built.} As she had done a quarter of a century earlier for the Van Ackeren Gallery, in 2000 Mrs. Greenlease generously funded the construction of the present building that houses the collection, which is located between Van Ackeren and Sedgwick Halls.\footnote{Kasper, Rockhurst, 76, 348.} The structure’s glass foyer mirrors the previous gallery’s design. A partition divides the gallery space into two rooms, with the south end featuring rotating exhibitions, and the north end housing the permanent art collection.

Although Father Van Ackeren enthusiastically supported the project, he did not live to see its completion. After Van Ackeren’s death on 2 May 1997, college president, Peter Ely, S. J. reflected, “There are few institutions which are marked by the life of one man in the way that Rockhurst has been marked by Father Van Ackeren.”\footnote{Kasper, Rockhurst, 76, 348.} When the new building opened, the Treasury Collection was officially renamed the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art and the space was dedicated as the Greenlease Gallery, thus honoring the two individuals most
responsible for assembling Rockhurst’s permanent art collection. After Sherry Best served as curator for the collection from 2000 to 2003, Anne Pearce was appointed director of the Greenlease Gallery. In addition to teaching studio art as a professor at Rockhurst, she oversees the care of the permanent collection and the installation of four rotating exhibitions annually.

Today, visitors to the Greenlease Gallery encounter at its entrance a plaque with an inscription that thanks Virginia for her generosity to Rockhurst. Likewise, near the Greenlease Library’s entrance hang two photographic portraits. One shows Mr. Greenlease wearing a French-cuff shirt and a dark suit with a kerchief in his pocket and sitting near a stack of red, leather-bound books, to commemorate the library that he helped fund. The other depicts Father Van Ackeren dressed in black clerical attire, with his arms folded across his chest and his head tilted slightly to his left. The position in which he is depicted, standing in front of the prized Il Bachiacca painting, makes it seem as if the Virgin Mary and Christ Child are gazing down over his shoulder approvingly. That Father Van Ackeren chose to have his official portrait taken in front of one of the most important works in the collection he built with Virginia Greenlease and, to a lesser extent, Ted Coe, conveys the significance of the collection as an important outcome of his presidency and contribution to improving education at Rockhurst by making fine art accessible to its students.

Fortuitous Timing

The works that Virginia Greenlease obtained for Rockhurst were purchased at a time when market prices for religious art were historically low. In his analysis of price fluctuations

---

163 The plaque in the gallery foyer reads, “Erected in the year 2000 thanks to the generosity of Mrs. Virginia Greenlease.”
for the sale of European art from 1970 to 1997, dealer and one-time director of Christie’s London auction house, Christopher Wood (1942-2009), found that works of religious art did not fare well on the market, primarily because their subject matter had fallen out of fashion.\footnote{Wood designated this period, lasting from 1970 to 1997, as “The Great Art Boom,” when a large number of private individuals diverted their newly acquired wealth into the art market, but not toward the purchase of religious works. Wood explains that “[religious works] did not appeal to the modern buyer … because either they do not like them, or understand them, or both. In today’s politically correct climate, crucifixions, saints in agony, decapitations, or anything unduly bloodthirsty or licentious, are absolutely out of favor. As for the Madonna, most people today think she is an American pop star.” See Christopher Wood, ed. The Great Art Boom 1970-1997 (Exeter, UK: BPC Wheatons, Ltd., 1997), 12.} This fact proved fortuitous for the assembly of Rockhurst’s collection, which occurred precisely during this period. Thus, museum-quality sacred works were available at fairly reasonable prices. The timing of a recession that negatively impacted the art market from 1974 to 1975, also proved advantageous for Virginia, who at the time was intent on obtaining more works for the Van Ackeren Gallery’s opening.\footnote{Ibid.} During this one-year plummet Mrs. Greenlease purchased the \textit{Madonna of Humility} by Andrea di Bartolo and two wood statues, the \textit{Saint Cecilia} by Bendl and the supposed Master of Elsloo sculpture. Just as the market was beginning to recover, she acquired the \textit{Holy Family} by Crespi and \textit{Saint Mark the Evangelist} by Tiepolo, which both contributed significantly to the collection’s overall quality.

The objects that Mrs. Greenlease purchased for the collection aligned with Woods’ description of what was available to serious collectors at the time. He explains that, since Old Master paintings were less and less available, collectors typically purchased either drawings from more renowned artists, or paintings that offered “first rate examples of [work by] second rate artists.”\footnote{Ibid.} The latter is certainly true of the Rockhurst collection, for the dimensions of the paintings that Virginia acquired were relative to the importance of the artists who painted them.
For instance, because the major works by famous artists demanded higher prices, she procured only smaller works, like the bozzetto by Tiepolo and ink drawing by Murillo, whereas she could afford larger works either from the early careers of well-known artists such as Cortona, or from lesser-known, but still important, painters such as Antiveduto Grammatica and Il Bachiacca.

Conclusion

Over the course of three decades, Mrs. Virginia Greenlease and Father Maurice E. Van Ackeren, S.J., formed a profound bond of friendship and close collaboration that culminated in establishing the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art that is now on view in the Greenlease Gallery at Rockhurst University in Kansas City, Missouri. The collection originated with a sculpture by César Bagard that Virginia and her husband, Robert C. Greenlease, donated to the Jesuits in October of 1967, on the occasion of the opening on campus of the Greenlease Library, the construction of which the couple had fully funded. Virginia and Robert felt a deep sense of personal commitment to the Jesuits at Rockhurst because of the support and spiritual solace that that religious community had provided them at the time of the tragic death of their only son, Bobby.167 To show their gratitude for the Jesuits’ steadfast act of kindness, the Robert C. Greenlease family donated generously to Rockhurst and created a legacy there in honor of their son.168 After her husband’s death in 1969, Mrs. Greenlease continued her philanthropic role at the university. A major focus of her efforts was to finance the purchase of works of art that she and Father Van Ackeren selected, with the intention of improving education at Rockhurst by
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167 See n. 3.
168 See n. 9.
making fine art accessible to its students. To navigate the art market, the priest and his patron relied upon the expertise of Ted Coe, who was the Curator of European Art at the Nelson Gallery of Art in Kansas City, Missouri. Under Coe’s guidance they assembled a collection of early fifteenth- to mid-eighteenth-century sacred works of a variety of media of German, Austrian, Spanish, French, and Netherlandish provenance, with paintings that represent the diverse styles associated with the schools of Siena, Florence, Venice, Bologna, and Rome.

We have seen that the Bagard statue, along with the early religious works that the Greenlease family donated, such as textiles, metalwork, and wood and polychromed statues, were placed in the Treasury Room located on the first floor of the Greenlease Library. In 1975, when that location was outfitted with glass display cases, a climate control system, and floating walls that allowed for more exhibit space for paintings, it was reopened as the Van Ackeren Gallery and the fourteen objects installed there at the time were named the Treasury Collection. Just prior to the gallery’s opening, Virginia Greenlease acquired the *Madonna of Humility* by Andrea di Bartolo as a centerpiece to the collection. While a preparatory sketch of the *Virgin of the Immaculate Conception* by Murillo and a few more sculptures were added to the collection, during the last decade of her artistic patronage at Rockhurst, Virginia only purchased Italian paintings, such as the *Madonna and Child with Infant Saint John* by the Florentine painter, Il Bachiacca and the *Saint Charles Borromeo Venerating the Holy Nail* by the Roman Caravaggista artist, Antiveduto Grammatica. However, Mrs. Greenlease’s favorite acquisition was the *bozzetto of Saint Mark the Evangelist* by the Venetian master, Giambattista Tiepolo.

The works that Virginia Greenlease obtained for Rockhurst were purchased at a time when art market prices for religious art were historically low, because their subject matter had
fallen out of fashion. This timing proved fortuitous for the assembly of Rockhurst’s collection, so that museum-quality sacred works were available at fairly reasonable prices. For their purchases, Father Van Ackeren and Mrs. Greenlease sought out works of the highest quality available within the range that Virginia could afford. As a result, they procured smaller works from famous artists, such as Tiepolo and Murillo, whose output demanded higher prices, and larger works either from the early careers of well-known artists such as Cortona, or from lesser-known, but still important, painters such as Antiveduto Grammatica and Il Bachiacca. Although relatively small in size, the collection was well suited for its purpose as an educational tool. Out of all of the objects that Mrs. Greenlease bequeathed to Rockhurst, only the forged “Byzantine” crystal proved to be an unfortunate choice. Today the collection named in honor of Father Van Ackeren, whose vision secured its establishment, is on display at the Greenlease Gallery, which is named after Virginia, the generous benefactor who made it all possible.

169 See n. 129.
Andrea di Bartolo Cini was born in Siena between 1358 and 1364 to the painter Bartolo di Fredi Cini (1353-1410), and his wife, Bartolomea di Cecco. The couple had nine children, of whom Andrea was the only one to outlive the parents. Andrea’s decision to become an artist meant that he followed in the footsteps of his father and his grandfather, Maestro Fredi (or Manfredi), who was a student of Niccolò di Ser Sozzo (active 1334-63), who had studied with the Lorenzetti brothers, Pietro (1280-1348) and Ambrogio (1290-1348). As a young boy, Andrea apprenticed with his father, who painted in the style of Simone Martini (1284-1344), a leading Sienese artist of the prior generation. He was thus trained in a traditional manner, which fostered the continuation of his family’s legacy, as well as that of the city’s rich, artistic heritage, which included important painters such as Duccio di Buoninsegna (1255-1319) and the aforementioned Simone Martini and Lorenzetti brothers.

---

During the second half of the Trecento, Bartolo di Fredi ran one of the most successful workshops in Siena, which he leased with his colleague, Andrea Vanni (1332-1410). This bottega reached its productive peak in the 1380s, at a time when Andrea was of an age and skill level that allowed him to contribute to many of his father’s projects in Siena, as well as in the nearby towns of Montalcino and San Gimignano. The earliest documentation of Andrea as a painter dates from 1389, when he helped his father and Luca di Tommè (1330-1389) on an altarpiece (now lost) for the chapel of the shoemaker’s guild (Arte dei Calzolai) in Siena Cathedral. Soon thereafter, Andrea likely began to work independently.

Over the next three decades, Andrea di Bartolo executed a number of projects in Siena, and, as was typical for artists of the period, he was accomplished in using a variety of media. For instance, he completed frescoes for the dome of the Saint Victor Chapel (1405-06) in Siena’s cathedral, for which he also painted wooden statues (1409-10), by Francesco di Valdambrino

---


179 Bomford, Art in the Making, 9.
of two of the city’s patron saints, Ansanus and Crescentius. Additionally, he illuminated manuscripts, designed stained-glass windows, and completed polyptychs such as one for the church of S. Petronella (1413), now the Franciscan convent of the Osservanza, of which four panels remain. Andrea’s early output was stylistically dependent upon the work of Bartolo di Fredi, but after his father’s death, he painted more in the manner of Taddeo di Bartolo (1362-1422). Other of his works, such as a *Coronation of the Virgin* of 1405-07 (Galleria Franchetti, Ca’ d’Oro, Venice), show a Venetian influence in that they depict dark flesh tones more in keeping with Byzantine tradition and feature elaborate, gold-tooled, tapestry patterns in the background. Scholar Gaudenz Freuler observes that the artist’s ability to alter his Sienese style in this manner exemplifies his aptitude for absorbing foreign influences and shows a versatility that allowed him to produce art that appealed to a wide clientele.

While assisting his father on projects for the Franciscans of Montalcino and the Dominicans of Siena, Andrea likely became acquainted with the patrons who later commissioned him to complete works that were destined for churches and monasteries outside of Siena. For

---


183 Freuler, "Sienese Dominicans in Venice," 584-86.

184 Ibid., 584; "Andrea di Bartolo Cini," 331.

example, Tommaso d’Antonio Caffarini (d. 1434), a former prior of the church of S. Domenico in Siena, who later became prior of the Dominican convent of SS. Giovanni e Paolo in Venice, seems to have been instrumental in facilitating a number of the artist’s commissions. These include two panels probably made for the church of SS. Giovanni e Paolo that depict that church’s titular saints with Saints Bartholomew and Peter (University of Nebraska Art Galleries, Lincoln) and a Nativity, or possibly a Madonna of Humility (untraced), for the Camaldolese church of S. Michele in Murano. For the Dominican nunnery of Corpus Christi in Venice, which Caffarini helped to establish, Andrea completed a polyptych entitled Saint Catherine of Siena with Four Dominican Nuns of the Third Order of 1384-98 (Museo Vetrario, Murano), and a small devotional panel (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.) that depicts a Madonna of Humility with a kneeling nun on the obverse and a Crucifixion on the reverse.¹⁸⁶ One of Andrea’s earliest independent works is an Assumption of the Virgin with Saint Thomas and Two Donors of c. 1394 (Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond) that a woman named Onesta commissioned in memory of her husband, Ser Palimedes, a merchant from Urbino who also knew Caffarini.¹⁸⁷ The artist’s last work was probably a fresco, Saint Francis and the Virgin of Humility of 1424-28, that he completed at the church of S. Francesco in Treviso.¹⁸⁸ While scholars believe that Andrea exported paintings from his workshop to areas outside of Siena, his Treviso fresco securely positions him in the Veneto, at least toward the end of his life. The patron for that work was Scolaio di ser Lodovico, a Franciscan friar who likely met Andrea at Montalcino and later hired the artist after Scolaio had moved to the convent of S. Francesco in

¹⁸⁸ For reproduction of surviving fragments, see Freuler, "Sienese Dominicans in Venice," 579, figs. 10-12.
Of the many religious subjects he portrayed, Andrea specialized in creating panels of the Madonna of Humility, such as the example that belongs to the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art.

Andrea’s professional ties to the Dominicans also had devotional and personal undertones. For instance, his aunt, Suor Pia Buonanotte di Magister Fredi, was a Dominican tertiary who served with Saint Catherine of Siena (1340-1380), and his daughter, Battista, also likely joined the order. In addition, his family tomb was located at the church of S. Domenico, which housed an important relic of Saint Catherine, and where he had also designed the sacristy windows and painted the first altarpiece that was dedicated to Saint Catherine of Siena (now lost). When Andrea died on 3 June 1428, he was buried near his parents by the refectory of the Dominican convent and, sixteen years later, his wife was also laid to rest there. As a last sign of his devotion to the order, Andrea bequeathed twenty books to the Dominicans.

Andrea’s significant real estate purchases include a large country property (1409), a house in the S. Antonio parish of Siena (1417), a tract of land in the area of S. Maria a Tressa (1425), and a workshop in the Tolomei contrada, or neighborhood, (1425) and attest to his
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189 Ibid., 571, 577-78; Steinhoff, Sienese Painting, 61-62.
191 For ties between Sienese painters and Dominicans, see “The Painter within the Province,” in Cannon, Religious Poverty, Visual Riches, 341-43.
193 Andrea’s altarpiece of Saint Catherine was placed in the entrance area of the church. See "Sienese Dominicans in Venice," 571-72 n. 6; Douglas, A History of Painting in Italy, 3: 135.
195 Osti, "Andrea di Bartolo."
professional success. Not only did Andrea run a prosperous workshop and train his sons Giorgio and Ansano to continue the family’s artistic tradition, but he was also actively involved in his community. From 1409 to 1424, he held a number of public offices, including the posts of supreme magistrate of the republic (Supremo Magistrato della Repubblica, November-December, 1409), officer of the court (Ufficio di Savio del Concistoro, January-February, 1411), administrator (Regolatore, 1413), and official of merchandise (Ufficiali di Mercanzia, 1422). He also served as one of Siena’s four exchequers (Quattro della Biccherna) who were responsible for collecting and managing city revenues.

This prolific artist’s career lasted four decades. Yet, as Langton Douglas observed in 1908, by that time modern art critics and historians had “entirely forgotten” the painter. Van Marle (1923) made a similar observation and complimented Andrea’s technical aptitude as “praiseworthy,” but also belittled the artist’s works as “entirely lacking in inspiration.” Likewise Freuler (2006) commended Andrea’s skill, while also bemoaning the “monotonous” nature of the painter’s Madonna of Humility compositions. However, as Hans Belting and others have shown, it is precisely this practice of replication that was central to the period’s art production, as patrons often commissioned copies of works with which they were familiar.

201 Gaudenz Freuler, "The Production and Trade of Late Gothic Pictures of the Madonna in Tuscany," in Italian Panel Painting of the Duecento and Trecento, ed. Victor M. Schmidt (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006), 427-41. Although there are thirteen known panels, only nine survive and one should assume that quite a few more have been lost.
perhaps to demonstrate an affiliation with a confraternity or parish where the painting, for instance, was displayed.\textsuperscript{202} Scholar Anabel Thomas makes the relevant point that it made economic sense for an atelier to replicate works. The process saved time and effort because new compositions would not have to be continually conceived and employees retrained to execute them.\textsuperscript{203} Therefore, while some scholars may judge duplicate works as uninteresting, for an artist such as Andrea, this practice helped to account for his success, as evidenced in his repetition of the Madonna of Humility theme.

Beginning with Giorgio Vasari (1511-74), the artistic accomplishments of Sienese painters in general have been marginalized in favor of those from Florence in the literature on Italian Renaissance writing.\textsuperscript{204} This attitude generated disinterest in the subject and artists, Andrea di Bartolo included, fell by the wayside.\textsuperscript{205} Further contributing factors to the oversight of this artist include a lack of documentation for him and, early on, his paintings were incorrectly attributed to other painters such as Simone Martini, Bartolo di Fredi, and Taddeo di Bartolo.\textsuperscript{206} Moreover, while Trecento Sienese art has received much attention in the literature, the period during which Andrea was active, from the late fourteenth to the early fifteenth centuries, has


\textsuperscript{203} Thomas, \textit{The Painter's Practice}, 214.


been largely ignored. More recently, as Luke Syson notes in his introduction in the catalog for the exhibition, *Renaissance Siena: Art for a City*, at London’s National Gallery (2007), the tide is turning in regard to the study of Quattrocento art in Siena.\(^\text{207}\) Historians and art historians alike are beginning to investigate this period, as demonstrated in the National Gallery show and another one, *Painting in Renaissance Siena, 1420 to 1500*, held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1988).\(^\text{208}\) Additional contributions are found in a collection of essays in *Renaissance Siena: Art in Context* that A. Lawrence Jenkens (2005) published and in the work of Judith Steinhoff (2006), whose demonstration of artistic pluralism in Quattrocento Siena counters Millard Meiss’ contention that, after the Black Death in 1348, Sienese art became stagnant.\(^\text{209}\)

This is not to say that the career and oeuvre of Andrea di Bartolo are completely unstudied. For example, scholars and connoisseurs Giacomo de Nicola (1921), Bernhard Berenson (1932), Henk W. van Os (1969), and Enzo Carli (1974) have corrected some of the misattributions of his works and have attempted to establish a chronology of the painter’s corpus.\(^\text{210}\) Giulietta Chelazzi Dini (1982) assessed some of the artist’s manuscript illuminations and Creighton E. Gilbert (1984), Gaudenz Freuler (1987), and Elisa Penserini (2012) researched his activity in the Veneto, and thus, expanded study of the artist beyond Siena.\(^\text{211}\) Bruce Hardin Suffield’s (2000) technical examination of a *Madonna and Child* painting by Andrea di Bartolo at Princeton University’s Art Museum provided insight into the artist’s use of materials and
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\(^\text{207}\) See the introduction in Syson, *Renaissance Siena*.


\(^\text{209}\) A. Lawrence Jenkens, *Renaissance Siena: Art in Context* (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University, 2005); Steinhoff, *Sienese Painting*.


techniques and into how he might have assembled his panels into polyptychs.\textsuperscript{212} Other researchers have tried to reconstruct some of the artist’s disassembled polyptychs by analyzing panels from different collections that are comparable in terms of their iconography and compositions. For instance, Samson Laine Faison (1941), Gertrude Coor (1956/57, 1961), Henk W. van Os (1970/71, 1974), Federico Zeri (1977), and Laurence B. Kanter (1983) have discussed the likelihood that panels by Andrea that belong to the Walters Art Gallery (Baltimore), the Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York), and the Nationalmuseum (Stockholm) were once part of the same altarpiece.\textsuperscript{213} Also, Luca Fiorentino (2014) posited that five panels by Andrea that depict scenes of the life of S. Galgano at the Museo Nazionale di S. Mateo (Pisa) and another of the same subject at the National Gallery of Ireland (Dublin) come from the same predella.\textsuperscript{214}

Despite this scholarship, much of Andrea di Bartolo’s corpus remains to be studied, including the \textit{Madonna of Humility} at Rockhurst University that has received only scant attention in the literature. Qualitatively, this painting stands out in the Rockhurst collection and is one of its better known works. Before Rockhurst acquired the painting, it belonged to German art collector Dr. Hermann Schwartz and was displayed as part of Schwartz’s collection of late medieval art in exhibitions held at the Suermondt-Ludwig Museum in Aachen (13 May – 16 July 1961), the Hessischen Landesmuseum (Hesse State Museum) in Darmstadt (August 1961[?]),

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Fiorentino, "Il ciclo galganiano," 137-48.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
and the Villa Hügel in Essen (1968). Until now any discussion of this panel has been limited to brief entries in the catalogs that accompanied these exhibitions and to favorable reviews that mention this painting as a featured highlight in the Aachen and Darmstadt shows. In 1969 van Os cited this panel as one of thirteen known images of the subject by Andrea di Bartolo. The most recent reference to this painting appears in Freuler’s 1987 essay as a footnote in which he posits that this panel might be a part of a missing polyptych that Andrea completed for the Camoldolese church of S. Michele in Murano. Apparently, Freuler was not aware of the painting’s whereabouts, since he noted that it still belonged to Hermann Schwartz, even though Rockhurst had acquired the work fifteen years prior. Since its arrival in Kansas City, the 
Madonna of Humility has been displayed at Rockhurst, first in the Van Ackeren Gallery (1972) and then in the Greenlease Gallery (2000) and it is depicted on the cover of a small, pictorial guidebook to the former gallery published in 1985. From 13 May 2003 until 28 February 2005, Rockhurst loaned the painting for display in the Renaissance galleries of the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art in Kansas City, but no accompanying literature was produced at the time.

The Kansas City panel is one of thirteen known Madonna of Humility paintings attributed

---

215 For the Aachen and Darmstadt shows, see Hermann Schnitzler, Aachener Kunstdichter: Mittelalterliche Kunst der Sammlung Hermann Schwartz, ed. Ernst Günther Grimme (Aachen: Verlag des Aachener Museumsvereins, 1961), 21: 32-33, cat. no. 73. I have been unable to consult the catalog for the Essen exhibition.
217 The Kansas City painting is reproduced as fig. 63 in Os, Marias Demut, plate 10A, figs. 62-74. See also Meiss, "The Madonna of Humility," 437; Gilbert, "Tuscan Observants," 114; Freuler, "Sienese Dominicans in Venice," 578 n. 48; Williamson, The Madonna of Humility, 156.
219 Van Ackeren Gallery pamphlet, 1980, Van Ackeren Gallery files, box 209, GLA.
220 Ian Kennedy to Verna Lutz, 21 April 2003 and 7 December 2004, Andrea di Bartolo file, GGA.
to Andrea di Bartolo. However, four of these are no longer extant. What little scholarship exists related to this painting focuses solely upon its attribution. The discussion below will expound further upon this subject as well as explore aspects of the painting, including its iconography, original form and context, and the place that it occupies within Andrea’s oeuvre. This virtually unstudied painting merits a careful analysis because it typifies a subject and style at which the artist excelled. Additionally, the panel serves as an especially well-preserved example of an early Quattrocento Sienese painting, a subject that deserves more scholarly attention than it thus far has received.

1. Andrea di Bartolo  
*Madonna of Humility*  
c. 1400-24  
Tempera and gold on wood panel  
Without frame: 90.805 x 57.15 cm x 2.54cm (35 ¾ x 22 ½ in x 1in.).  
With frame: 95.25 x 63.5 x 5.08 cm (37 ½ x 25 x 2 in.)  

A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family  


*Description*: In contrast to depictions of the Virgin regally enthroned upon a dais, this painting portrays her sitting humbly upon the ground with the Christ child in her lap. Mary and her son are placed centrally against a gold background. Jesus offers his mother a flower, either a rose or a carnation, known as a “pink,” with his right hand, and with his left he grasps a bird, probably a

---

221 For lost works, see Os, *Marias Demut*, figs. 62, 65, 70-71; Berenson, *Homeless Paintings of the Renaissance*: figs. 52, 55.  
goldfinch, although its original color is now faded. Above the pair is a choir of ten music-making angels, evenly distributed between two cloud banks on the right and left. Two additional angels float near the top of the composition. The one on the left presses its palms together in a gesture of prayer and the one opposite crosses its arms across its chest in a sign of humилиatio, or submission. This position references Mary’s pose in scenes of the Annunciation, when she submits to the Angel Gabriel’s announcement that she will bear the son of God.223

The top of the curved panel was trimmed, possibly during the nineteenth century. The procedure removed some angels from the uppermost portion of the composition, leaving behind some angels’ wing tips on both sides, a fragment of a halo on the upper left side, and a partial face on the right. Below the angels, Mary sits upon an orange cushion with four tassels that are subtly striated with gold. The fabric of the pillow has a pomegranate pattern rendered in sgraffito, which is a panel painting technique that artists used to create decorative patterns, by scraping paint away to reveal an underlying layer of gold leaf.224 Beneath the cushion is a verdant carpet of vegetation that is sprinkled with three-leaf clovers, white flower petals, and red strawberries. The landscape’s horizon line is curved downward and echoes the arch at the top of the now-rounded panel. The painting’s base is rectangular and set into a gilded frame that conforms to its warp. The frame, which probably dates from the nineteenth century, has spandrels with pierced foliate ornament that decorate the two top corners.

Mary wears a lilac-colored dress under a voluminous blue mantle with an ivy-green lining. An ivory-colored cloth drapes over her left arm and across her lap, where the Christ child sits. The infant Jesus is clothed in a canary-yellow robe that is cinched at the waist with a white,
cloth belt. A pink cloak with a narrow, linear gold trim is draped over the infant’s right shoulder and covers the lower half of his torso, leaving his dangling legs exposed below the knee. The angels’ robes and cloaks are painted in various combinations of blue, pink, orange, green, and yellow. The scene is chromatically balanced with two, blue-cloaked angels on each side of the composition and an angel wearing a lavender robe that matches the color of Mary’s dress floating behind the Virgin’s right shoulder. Additionally, the angel above Christ’s head is wearing a yellow gown, whose color corresponds to Christ’s garment. Also, the lowest cloud bank on the left is tinged with blue and the one above it accented in pink, while for the opposite side, the reverse is true. The holy figures and angels all have pink lips and cheeks, brown eyes, and blonde hair. Except for those on the lower left cloud-bank, each angel’s hair is intertwined with a persimmon-colored ribbon, the ends of which flutter in the wind.

Incised stylus marks are visible on the painting’s surface. They define the contours of the figures of the Madonna, Child, and angels, separating them from the areas covered with paint and gold leaf.225 Red bole, a clay-like substance that was applied before gold leaf to give the precious metal a warm tonality, is visible in areas where gold has been lost in the background and on the figures’ haloes and the areas of embellishment on their garments.226 The once ivory flesh tones of the figures now appear greenish, as the *terra verde* that the artist applied as a base for the skin hues is visible due to paint loss.227

The compass lines the artist used to score the circumferences of the halos are clearly

---

evident. Like pearls on a string, a continuous row of circular punch marks embellishes the inner and outer edges of the angels’ haloes and the inner edge of the Virgin’s halo.²²⁸ A row of double-concentric circles, each with a concave center, defines the outer edge of Mary’s corona and the entire contour of Christ’s halo, including the outline of an incised Greek cross.²²⁹ The cross has three arms of equal length and breadth that extend outwardly from the infant’s head to the halo’s rim, where the ends widen. The central span of each halo is decorated according to figural groupings. The haloes of the angels at the top of the panel are embellished with a single row of double-concentric circles with a concave center and the music-making angels below them have coronas displaying a row of hexa-circles, which consist of six circles surrounding a central one to form the impression of a six-petaled flower.²³⁰ A circlet of hexa-rosettes, or a flower with six petals and a circle at its center, decorates the central bands of Jesus’ and Mary’s haloes. On Christ’s corona, the spaces between these floral motifs are decorated with a single pair of vertically aligned circles.²³¹ For the Virgin’s halo the corresponding space is embellished similarly, but with a double-concentric punch with a flat center, and each hexa-rosette has a simple circle tooled into the surface above, below, and to each side of its form.²³² The combination of different punched motifs in a repeated pattern that appear on the haloes of the Madonna and Child is known as the cluster style and is typical of Sienese workmanship.²³³

²²⁸ For the circle punch, see Mojmír S. Frinta, _Punched Decoration on Late Medieval Panel and Minature Painting: Part I. Catalogue Raisonné of all Punch Shapes_ (Prague: Maxdorf, 1998), 10-13, 90. For an explanation of tooling and punchmarks, see Bomford, _Art in the Making_, 24-26.
²²⁹ For the double-concentric punch with concave center, see Frinta, _Punched Decoration_, 104.
²³⁰ For the hexa-circle, see ibid., 471.
²³¹ For the hexa-rosette, see ibid., 487.
²³² For the differences between varied double-concentric motifs, see ibid., 104.
²³³ For variations between Sienese and Florentine late medieval halo styles, see Erling S. Skaug, _Punch Marks from Giotto to Fra Angelico: Attribution, Chronology, and Workshop Relationships in Tuscan Panel Painting c. 1330-1430_ (Oslo: Nordic Group, 1994), 2: 494-96.
Each angel’s hem is punched with the same design that appears on its halo. The pattern of the Virgin’s garment embellishment is similar to that of her halo, except that the simple circles surrounding each hexa-rosette are missing [Cat. no. 1.1]. The infant Jesus’ robe is not punched, but rather decorated with a faux Arabic script done in mordant gilding, a process by which a pattern is painted in glue to which gold leaf is applied.234 Two sets of parallel lines frame the calligraphic script and on the innermost edge there is a row of Gothic crockets, consisting of three decorative knobs, which might reference the Trinity. This pattern also appears on the edges of Mary’s mantle and on the border of the white cloth that she holds. The negative space between the motifs decorating the figures’ haloes and their garments is stippled to create a textural, volumetric surface that should “sparkle like millet grains,” as Cennino d’Andrea Cennini (c. 1360-1427) described in his fifteenth-century guide to artistic practice, Libro del’Arte, or The Craftman’s Handbook.235 To produce this effect, the artist used a rectangular multi-pronged tool to create multiple sets of impressions to cover the area completely. In contrast, the three arms of a Greek cross on Christ’s halo are not stippled, which emphasizes their shape. Emblazoned on the right shoulder of the Virgin’s dress is an elaborate, diamond-shaped design, known as a Stella maris, or star of the sea, a medieval motif that was popular in Marian imagery and which referenced the Virgin’s name and her role as protector of maritime travelers.236

Two winged figures flank the Virgin and Child and play stringed instruments, as the rest listen attentively. The angel on the right holds a lute and the one on the left supports a smaller
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234 For faux Arabic script, see Bomford, Art in the Making, 43. For Cennini’s instructions on how to make mordant and gild with it, see Cennini, Craftsman’s Handbook, 96-98.
235 Cennini, Craftsman’s Handbook, 85.
version of the instrument known as a gittern [Cat. nos. 1.2-1.4].

The surface of each of the pear-shaped instruments is embellished with four diamond-shapes that were each outlined in black and likely decorated with four white dots, but that are now somewhat abraded. The angels’ wings and clothing are striated with gold lines that descend from the upper right to the lower left at a consistent forty-five degree angle, no matter the figure’s placement within the composition. These subtle striations would have added to this painting’s overall glittering effect, particularly for a devotee, who viewed the painting under the illumination of a flickering candle. The angels float overhead against the painting’s gold ground, in a spatially flattened dimension that symbolizes heaven. Perhaps their inclusion implies that the Madonna of Humility is appearing as a vision. Along the earth’s horizon line the dark contours of a few plants pierce the gold background as if to connect the earthly and heavenly planes like stitches linking two fabric panels. This fusion of elements acts as a bridge between the two realms and underscores Mary’s dual role as earthly mother and heavenly queen.

**Condition Description:** The painting is in stable and good condition. The support is a wood panel that is 2.54 cm (1 in.) thick whose structure is sound and has never been thinned or

---


The frame was likely added in the nineteenth century and was shaped to accommodate the panel’s convex warp, the degree of which appears to be appropriate for the painting’s size and age. Since the addition of the frame, it appears that the panel’s curvature has increased by approximately .3175 cm (1/8 in.) on the left side, where the panel no longer aligns exactly with the lower inside edge of the frame. The panel is rounded at the top, where it was unevenly cut, slicing into the profiles, haloes, and wings of two angels that face each other from opposite sides in the uppermost portion of the panel. The base of the rounded arch begins at 66.675 cm (26 ¼ in.) from the panel’s bottom edge. The clouds beneath the angels show areas of paint loss, perhaps resulting from prior cleanings, abrasion, or filling in areas where pastiglia or corbel decoration was possibly removed. Throughout the background, small areas of gold leaf have worn away to reveal the red bole underneath. Some areas of gilding have been restored. These include a leaf-shaped patch next to the Christ child’s left shoulder, around the Virgin’s halo, and on the right and left edges of the panel, where narrow, rectangular, vertical strips of re-gilding are clearly evident. The mordant gilding along the bottom edge of the Virgin’s robe is original, but the areas near the Madonna’s chest and head have been re-gilt following the original design. On the Virgin’s face and hands, the underlying preparatory layer of terra verde gives her otherwise ivory flesh tone a greenish tint. A swath of a noticeably different hue of blue that surrounds the Virgin’s head and shoulders and extends down along the diagonal edge of her cloak on the figure’s right side indicates that the area has been repainted. Due to age and

---

241 Bailey, GGA.
242 Heffley, GGA.
243 Ibid. Heffley completed a microscopic examination that showed mechanical cracks had developed in the repainting, which indicates a nineteenth-century date for the restoration. He suggested that later cleanings may have blanched the surface, which amplified the mismatched color.
fluctuations in environmental conditions, laminar cleavage, or fracture that is parallel to the surface of the paint film and underlying layers is evident on the sides of the incisions that the artist made into the gesso to delineate the cloth folds. The grass, plants, orange pillow, and angels are in good condition. The left edge of the panel appears to have been cut, which has made visible a cross-section of tunnels that beetles bored into the wood. Additional beetle holes are visible on the reverse of the panel. According to a 1985 conservation report, beetle holes that once were apparent across the painted and gilded surfaces, revealing the white gesso layer underneath, were in-painted. At the back of the panel and located at its center is a round hole that measures 3.18 cm (1 ½ in.), where, perhaps, an original batten was attached. Two square holes on the panel’s bottom edge may have resulted from the removal of old, square nails. Additionally, during the same treatment, the laminar cleavage was filled, flaking set down, and the painting was also cleaned.

Attribution and Date: Art historians and connoisseurs Rudolf Örtel (1960), Henk van Os (1969), and Federico Zeri (1971) all attributed the Madonna of Humility at Rockhurst University to Andrea di Bartolo Cini. These scholars based their attributions on comparisons that they made between this and other paintings of the same subject by Andrea. As mentioned above, van Os published thirteen illustrations of Madonna of Humility paintings, including the Greenlease
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244 Bailey, GGA.
245 Ibid. The in-painting was completed with pigmented mixtures of beeswax and carnauba.
246 Ibid; Bomford, Art in the Making, 13.
247 Bailey, GGA.
248 Ibid.
249 Örtel’s 1960 attribution is mentioned in Schnitzler, Aachener Kunstblätter: Mittelalterliche Kunst der Sammlung Hermann Schwartz, 21: 32-33; Grimme, "Mittelalterliche Plastik in der Sammlung Hermann Schwartz," 80. For Os’s attribution, see Os, Marias Demut, 73-73, fig. 63. Zeri’s attribution is referenced in Betty Mont to Van Ackeren, 27 February 1974, Andrea di Bartolo Acquisition file, GGA.
example, all of which he attributed to Andrea di Bartolo. Each of these images depicts the Virgin seated upon the ground with her head inclined toward the Christ child, who sits on her lap. Mary’s features are the same in each rendition, displaying lightly stenciled eyebrows, a small mouth, and a long, straight nose. Her blonde hair is parted in the middle, with narrow, wavy segments that frame her face and cover her ears, except for the lower lobes. Like nine of the panels van Os attributed to Andrea di Bartolo, the Kansas City example also depicts a curved horizon line and a verdant landscape of three-leaved clovers and sprinkled with white and red dots that represent flower blossoms. To date, these are the only paintings with which the Greenlease example has been compared.

Although they depict different subjects, the Greenlease Madonna of Humility can also be compared to an Assumption of the Virgin of c. 1384 (Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond) that the artist signed. Each painting portrays a celestial chorus of music-making angels that wear green, lavender, pale blue, and rose-colored gowns and overlap each other, some positioned en face and others shown in side- and three-quarter profiles. The variety in the angels’ poses in both the Richmond and Kansas City examples adds a sense of liveliness to each composition, while also showcasing Andrea’s technical skill in modeling faces from different angles. In both works the angels have delicate facial features and blonde hair that is gathered back from their faces in a single narrow roll across the top of their foreheads and divided into even segments along a central part along the sides of the face, before culminating into a thick, wavy tendril at the back of the neck. The feathers on the angels’ wings in both paintings are rendered in the style of Bartolo di Fredi, as seen, for example, in the Coronation of the Virgin of 1383-1388 at

---

250 The Assumption panel is signed along the lower edge “ANDREAS BARTOLI DE MAGIS FREDI” and is dated 1394. See Anne B. Barriault and Kay M. Davidson, Selections from the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts (Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 2007), 202-03.
Montalcino, a project that Andrea helped his father to complete.\textsuperscript{251} Like his father, Andrea partitioned the wings into horizontal panels of color and scored them with parallel, diagonal gold lines. He contoured the top edges to appear as inverted curves, with feathered tips that delineate each wing’s bottom span. The wings’ side edges extend from above the angels’ shoulders to below the back of their knees and are shaped like narrow, tapering tubes. Also, the motif that appears in the Greenlease example of two praying angels, one with its arms held against the chest, and the other with its hands pressed together, appears in a painting of the \textit{Madonna of Humility} at the National Gallery in Washington D.C. that is attributed to Andrea di Bartolo.

Another painting that has not been considered in comparison to the Greenlease work is the fresco that Andrea completed at the church of S. Francesco in Treviso (1424-28).\textsuperscript{252} Each work depicts at the top of its composition and near the center two angels whose wings create a silhouette of negative space between them that suggests a vertical path to the celestial sphere and links the Virgin on earth and the heavens above. Additionally, the Treviso fresco and Kansas City painting both include two angels positioned opposite each other who respectively strum a lute and a gittern with the same rose-shaped sound box. Andrea painted a similar lute in the Ca’ d’Oro \textit{Coronation of the Virgin} (1405-07).\textsuperscript{253} Also, the Ca’ d’Oro Madonna’s hands are shaped like those of the Greenlease Virgin, with long, narrow fingers that are nearly equal in length and with index and little fingers bow outward at the middle joint. A similar rendering is found in the left hand of a figure of Saint Augustine attributed to Andrea (Milan, Brera).\textsuperscript{254}

The decorative gold patterns that the artist used in this painting are consistent with those

\textsuperscript{251} Freuler, "Bartolo di Fredi’s Altar," 29; "Sienese Dominicans in Venice," 583, fig. 18.
\textsuperscript{252} For illustrations of the Treviso fresco, see "Sienese Dominicans in Venice," 579, figs. 10-12.
\textsuperscript{253} Ibid., 583, fig. 17.
\textsuperscript{254} Luisa Arrigoni, Emanuela Daffra, and Pietro C. Marani, \textit{The Brera Gallery} (Milan: Artistici e Storici, 1998), 64.
that appear in other works attributed to Andrea di Bartolo. For instance, the Greenlease painting’s *Stella maris* design appears in a repeated pattern that embellishes the Virgin’s cloak in a *Coronation of the Virgin* (Milan, Brera). A similar, but less intricate, version of the same motif appears on books that Saints John the Evangelist and Mark (?) hold in paintings at the University of Nebraska Art Galleries in Lincoln. The cushion’s *sgraffito* pattern, which consists of a large teardrop shape atop an inverted ‘V’ that is surrounded on four sides by comma-shaped flourishes, is replicated in paintings by Andrea, including on the Virgin’s dress in the Stefaniano *Madonna of Humility*, on a cloth of honor depicted in the Princeton *Madonna and Child*, and also in a *Virgin and Child Enthroned with Saints John the Baptist and James Major* at the Philadelphia Art Museum. Suffield, who as mentioned above conducted a careful analysis of the Princeton panel, calls this a “bursting pomegranate” motif and explains that the pattern displays irregularities because, rather than using pricked patterns, Andrea drew them freehand. Likewise, the Greelease pillow has an irregular pattern. The Virgin’s mantles as they are depicted in the Princeton and Kansas City paintings are both blue with green linings. The portrayal of the Christ child in each of these works is also comparable, displaying a short neck, ears that sit low near the jawline, and a small mouth with a shadow that defines the areas just above and below the lips. Both figures’ light brown eyebrows are stenciled from the inner points
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255 Freuler, "Sienese Dominicans in Venice," 585, fig. 20; Arrigoni, Daffra, and Marani, *The Brera Gallery*, 64.
256 Freuler, "Sienese Dominicans in Venice," 582, fig. 16b.
259 Ibid., 25. A chemical analysis completed on the Princeton panel shows that the green paint was made from malachite and the blue from azurite, which is a less expensive substitution for lapis lazuli. A similar chemical analysis could serve well for comparison for the Greenlease panel. Cennini warned against using the cheaper azurite, which is a carbonate of copper, because it would discolor over time. See Cennini, *Craftsman's Handbook*, 38, 93.
of the nose bridge to the middle of the brow bone and yellow and brown hair strands with white highlights that delineate their swirling locks. Their tunics are embellished in gold at the cuffs and collar and show a vertical crease at the collar’s midpoint. Each portrays Christ holding a bird in his left hand, although, rather than offering his mother a pink with his right hand, as in this painting, the Princeton Jesus makes a blessing gesture. The possibility has not yet been considered in the literature that a source for the Greenlease composition might also be a painting of a Madonna and Child that Andrea’s father, Bartolo di Fredi, completed and which now belongs to the Museo Comunale in Certaldo, Italy. Aspects of his father’s image that Andrea incorporated into the Greenlease composition include the Christ child giving his mother a pink flower; the positions of the figures’ upper torsos, incline of their heads, rendering of hair and features; the use of yellow, pink, and green hues; and the delineation of a vertical fold at the mid-point the collar of Jesus’ tunic.

An aspect of this panel that securely links it to Andrea di Bartolo is the punch work. As Erling S. Skaug (1994), Mojmír S. Frinta (1998), and others have shown in their studies of late medieval Tuscan punched decoration, each workshop rendered unique patterns that were prototypical of its output.

Therefore, assessing a panel’s decorative tooing designs can tie that work to a specific workshop and, thus, help to identify authorship. In his overview of Sienese works from 1330 to 1430, Frinta included numerous examples by Andrea di Bartolo, but did not include the Kansas City Madonna of Humility. To date, the Greenlease painting has not undergone a sphragiologic study, or assessment of its punch work.

---

260 For a complete list of scholars who have contributed to this discussion, including Judith Steinhoff, Joseph Polzer, Andrew Ladis, Norman Muller, and others, see the bibliography in Skaug, Punch Marks, 2: 554-66.
261 Skaug points out that, while the use of punch work can signify a workshop of origin, it cannot securely identify which person within that atelier might have actually used the punches. See ibid., 1: 45.
262 For sphrasiology, see ibid., 34-48.
analysis of this type will serve to verify that the attribution of the Kansas City painting to Andrea di Bartolo is correct.

Tooling marks exhibited in this painting that also appear in other works attributed to Andrea include the multi-prong, circle, double-concentric circle, hexa-circle, and hexa-rosette types.\(^{263}\) A multi-prong punch was used to create a textured background for decoration on the Greenlease figures’ haloes and on their garment cuffs, collars, and girdles. This stippling appears in at least twenty works attributed to Andrea, including two Madonna of Humility paintings (Museum of Fine Arts, Montreal and Princeton University Museum), an Enthroned Madonna with Four Evangelists (Walters Gallery, Baltimore), and a Madonna della Cintola with Donors (Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond).\(^{264}\) A plain circle punch that was used in succession to follow the contours of the Greenlease angels’ haloes and the inner edge of Mary’s corona is incorporated similarly on the Virgin’s halo in the Princeton University painting. Also, a double-concentric circle punch with a flattened center that embellishes the haloes of the Kansas City Virgin and Christ is displayed on the panel of a Crucifixion by Andrea at the Toledo Museum of Art.\(^{265}\) The hexa-circle that decorates the haloes and garment details of the Greenlease music-making angels appears in at least ten works by Andrea, including several Madonna of Humility paintings (Detroit Institute of Arts; Monastery of S. Marco, Mombaroccio, Italy; The Frick Pittsburgh; National Gallery in Washington, DC).\(^{266}\) The most common motif shared among works attributed to Andrea is the hexa-rosette, which Frinta notes is found in twenty-eight of the artist’s paintings, including two that depict the Madonna of Humility (Museo

\(^{263}\) For a description of punch tools and their usage, see ibid., 58-69; Frinta, Punched Decoration, 100-01, 104, 471, 482, 507.

\(^{264}\) Frinta, Punched Decoration, 69, 71, fig. Aea2c.

\(^{265}\) Ibid., 107, fig. CC11b.

\(^{266}\) Ibid., 479, fig. L29a.
di S. Stefano, Bologna; Stoclet Collection, Brussels).\textsuperscript{267} Since punch tools were expensive they were often handed down from father to son, as Frinta points out was the case with Andrea, who inherited the tools from Bartolo di Fredi.\textsuperscript{268} Indeed the circle, the hexa-circle, and hexa-rosette that appear in the Greenlease painting are found in numerous paintings by Bartolo di Fredi, such as the Montalcino triptych of 1388, which, as we have seen above, Andrea helped his father to complete.\textsuperscript{269}

Since Andrea was a conventional painter and did not alter his style much over the span of his forty-year career, dating the artist’s works is difficult.\textsuperscript{270} Indeed, during a 1971 visit to the New York gallery of Frederick Mont, Inc., Professor Zeri posited that Andrea di Bartolo completed this work at the end of the Trecento, but when Mont sold the painting to Virginia Greenlease, he dated it to c. 1410.\textsuperscript{271} Zeri’s dating of the panel is plausible because, as the Richmond Assumption panel shows, Andrea was an accomplished master by 1394, and a mature artist clearly painted the Greenlease panel. Mont’s dating is also reasonable because this painting was done in the manner of Bartolo di Fredi, a style to which Andrea adhered at least until his father died in 1410.\textsuperscript{272} Van Os designated this painting as one of Andrea’s earliest independent works and associated it with an undocumented Virgin lactans, now missing, that depicted a chorus of music-making angels. If this panel was part of Andrea’s Murano altarpiece,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{267} Ibid., 90, 507, fig. La89b. Although Frinta notes that a double-concentric punch with a concave center, a punch that Andrea di Bartolo used, was common to the period, he did not include the shape in his study because of the irregular nature of its impressions. For problematic issues related to the identification of punched motifs, see Skaug, \textit{Punch Marks}, 2: 405-06.
\item\textsuperscript{268} For Bartolo di Fredi’s use of the circle, hexa-circle, and hexa-rosette punches, see Frinta, \textit{Punched Decoration}, 10, 93, 479, 482, 507; figs. C11a, L29, L37, La89b.
\item\textsuperscript{269} Ibid., 479, 507; figs. L29a, La89b.
\item\textsuperscript{270} Freuler, "Andrea di Bartolo Cini," 330.
\item\textsuperscript{271} Andrea di Bartolo, Acquisition file, GGA.
\item\textsuperscript{272} Berenson, \textit{Homeless Paintings of the Renaissance}, 38; Freuler, "Sienese Dominicans in Venice," 582.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
as van Os suggested, then a late Trecento to early Quattrocento date would be appropriate. However, the upper portion of the Rockhurst panel compares closely to that of the S. Francesco fresco of c. 1424 to 1428 in Treviso, which was likely one of the last works that Andrea painted. The compositional similarities between the Kansas City and Treviso works suggest that they may have been completed around the same time, which would indicate that Andrea painted this work in the Veneto. It is also possible that the Franciscan friar who commissioned the fresco was familiar with this panel from having seen it previously in Siena or elsewhere. Perhaps when Scolaio commissioned Andrea to paint the Treviso fresco, he recalled having seen this painting and requested a similar composition for the S. Francesco work. Without documentation we will never know for certain, but the level of technical skill evident in this work and similarities it shares with other works from the period make it plausible that the panel dates from c.1400 to c.1424.

**Provenance:** On 3 June 1974, Virginia Greenlease purchased this devotional work by Andrea di Bartolo Cini from New York City art dealers Frederick and Betty Mont of Frederick Mont, Inc. and promptly donated it to Rockhurst University. The painting was initially offered for sale to Mrs. Greenlease via a letter that Betty Mont wrote to Father Van Ackeren on 27 February 1974. The Monts must have just acquired the panel themselves, because in her letter Mrs. Mont mentioned that the connoisseur Federico Zeri had visited their gallery the week prior, at which time he confirmed the attribution of this painting to Andrea di Bartolo. The Monts obtained the work from a prominent art collector and wealthy German industrialist, Hermann
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273 Purchase receipt, 3 June 1974, Andrea di Bartolo Acquisition file, GGA.
274 Betty Mont to Van Ackeren, 27 February 1974, Andrea di Bartolo: Acquisition file, GGA.
Schwartz, and his wife, Maria, who resided in the Hardter Wald (Hardt forest) outside Mönchen-Gladbach (North Rhine-Westphalia). The Munich art dealer Xaver Scheidwimmer acted as an intermediary for the transaction. Schwartz’s collection of late medieval works, which also included mid-thirteenth to fifteenth-century sculptures of the Virgin, was regarded as one of the most outstanding of its kind in Germany. Scheidwimmer noted that the painting had belonged to the Schwartz family for several generations, which likely accounts for its excellent state of preservation. Nothing is known about the painting’s provenance prior to its acquisition by the Schwartz family.

**Iconography:** The Virgin’s position on the ground likely provided a visual analogy of humility for the contemporary viewer, who understood the association between the Latin words for ground (humus) and humility (humilitas). The latter is referenced in the Bible as an essential virtue. For instance, Luke 14:11 states, “He that humbleth himself shall be exalted.” With its emphasis on the mother-child relationship, the less formal depiction of Mary made her more approachable to devotees. Simone Martini is credited with the invention of the Madonna of Humility subject. His first painting of this theme appears to be a damaged tympanum fresco

275 For the Schwartz’s collecting practices and maintenance of their collection, see Schwartz, "Living with Gothic Sculpture," 85-91.
276 Betty Mont to Van Ackeren, 27 February 1974, with attached telegram, Xaver Schiedwimmer to Mont, Andrea di Bartolo: Acquisition file, GGA. Xaver’s grandson, who continues to run the family business (Oskar Scheiwimmer Kunsthandel, Inh.) in Munich, confirmed that Schwartz was a client, but was unable to locate any documents in the firm’s archives that indicated that this painting ever passed through the dealer’s premises. E-mail, Scheidwimmer to Whittaker, 14 November 2013, GGA.
278 Os, *Sienese Altarpieces*, 2: 75.
of c. 1339-43 at the church of Notre-Dame des Doms in Avignon, France. This mode of portraying the Virgin swiftly became popular in Italy, particularly in Siena, which is known as the *Civitas virginis*, or City of the Virgin, after its patron saint.\(^{281}\) After its introduction, the Madonna of Humility type spread to Germany, Spain, and France, which speaks to its quick and broad dissemination in international Gothic art. Its propagation coincided with the spread of mendicant values fostered by the Franciscans and Dominicans, the two religious orders for which Andrea completed the most commissions.\(^{282}\)

Theories vary as to the source of the Virgin’s pose, in which she is seated upon a pillow on the ground with the infant Christ in her lap. Meiss suggested that the Virgin’s position originated from scenes of the Nativity, while van Os posited that the pose evolved from the seated Virgin Annunciate.\(^{283}\) Although these two scholars disagree on the origin of the composition, they do concur that the subject first appeared in Tuscany, unlike Georgiana Goddard King, who posited that the source was “Woman of the Apocalypse” iconography found in Spanish illuminated manuscripts.\(^{284}\) Expanding upon the work of her predecessors, Beth Williamson has shown more recently that the Madonna of Humility and Woman of the Apocalypse images are not homogenous in either composition or iconography because they each developed differently according to regional tastes.\(^{285}\) For instance, the white cloth upon which


\(^{282}\) For more on Franciscans, Dominicans, and their affinity for the subject of the Madonna of Humility, see King, "The Virgin of Humility," 474-77; Hecht, "Madonna of Humility," 11; Freuler, "Sienese Dominicans in Venice," 570-86.

\(^{283}\) Ibid.

\(^{284}\) King, "The Virgin of Humility," 474-91.

the infant Jesus sits in his mother’s lap is particular to Sienese paintings from this period. At the
time, the cloth’s color was associated with Dominican nuns and, thus, with Saint Catherine of
Siena, who was a devotee of the Madonna of Humility.286 When this type of representation of
the Virgin first made its appearance in the late Middle Ages, it was new and, in a sense,
“modern” for its day.287 The fact that patrons continued to commission artists like Andrea di
Bartolo to paint this subject, seven to eight decades after it originated, demonstrates its enduring
popularity.288

Images of this type sometimes depict the infant Jesus holding one or, as in this case, more
than one attribute. The carnation that Jesus offers to his mother with his right hand is also
known as a “pink.”289 The flower references Christ’s Passion, because it was believed that the
first carnation sprang from the tears that Mary shed on the road to Calvary. Additionally, its
scent smells like cloves, which are shaped like the nails that pierced Christ’s flesh on the cross.
The color of the goldfinch that Christ clutches in his left hand has faded. Typically the bird is
depicted with black and white feathers and a characteristically red head, as shown in a painting
of the Madonna and Child with saints John the Baptist, Zenobius, and Reparata by Florentine
artist Andrea di Cione, also known as Orcagna, (1308-1368) at the Metropolitan Museum of Art
in New York.290 The bird’s coloration and habitat led to its association with the Passion, because
its red-tinted face invoked the idea of blood and sacrifice, and its home among thistles and

288 Berenson, Homeless Paintings of the Renaissance, 40; Williamson, The Madonna of Humility, 156-164. Williamson discusses how interest in the Madonna of Humility had not subsided by the early fifteenth century.
thorns, recalled the Crown of Thorns that Jesus wore during the Crucifixion.\textsuperscript{291} The goldfinch was depicted in paintings of the Christ child as early as the second half of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{292} The portrayal of Christ holding a bird also references an apocryphal story that relates that, while at a riverbank, a five-year-old Jesus molded clay into twelve sparrows that he brought to life.\textsuperscript{293} When the winged creatures flew out of his hands, their flight symbolized the soul’s ascent to heaven, and thus symbolized Christ’s resurrection from the dead.\textsuperscript{294} Etymologically, the Italian terms for goldfinch (\textit{cardellino}, \textit{cardino}, or \textit{cadarello}), and for the lark (\textit{calandrello}) are similar.\textsuperscript{295} According to the iconographer Herbert Friedman, this play on words would have appealed to the Italians’ fondness for anagrams, which may explain how the two fowls became interchangeable as symbols of the Passion.

\textit{Format and Function:} To date, no one has fully considered the original form of this painting by Andrea di Bartolo. The painting’s original patron, location, or appearance is unknown because there is no documentation for its commission. Nevertheless, an assessment of the panel’s structure, as it relates to comparable works, may provide some clues regarding its original format and function. As we have seen above, the panel’s present frame was probably added during the nineteenth century, perhaps as a replacement to an earlier damaged one albeit one of a different shape since the panel was cut down from its original size. The new frame seems to have been


\textsuperscript{292} Ferguson, \textit{Signs and Symbols}, 17. The goldfinch also appears in another Van Ackeren collection painting, a \textit{Madonna and Child with Infant Saint John} by Il Baciccio. See cat. no. 2.


\textsuperscript{295} Friedmann, \textit{The Symbolic Goldfinch}, 22.
made to resemble the rectangular ones that frame a majority of known Madonna of Humility paintings. These are rendered in *pastiglia*, or patterned and gilded layers of gesso. Each example has an arch that spans the frame’s inside top edge to form a triangular spandrel in each corner and there are decorative scallops on the arch’s inner edge and corbels at its springing points.  

Andrea’s workshop probably did not make these frames, since this task was typically relegated to a carpenter. Nevertheless, their general shape, minus the scalloped edges, is replicated in wood for the Greenlease painting. Another clue to this panel’s original format is found in rectangular sections that have been re-gilded and that are positioned at each side of the composition, below the clouds and stopping just short of the garden’s horizon line. A comparison of this part of the painting with the same area in other *Madonna of Humility* paintings by Andrea di Bartolo that van Os illustrated reveals that the areas were probably once covered with an embossed strip of gold that replicated the tooled design of the Virgin’s halo.

Perhaps the original strips were damaged and became detached over time, or maybe they were purposefully removed.

However, one compositional element missing from all of the paintings with this type of frame is a heavenly chorus. Therefore, they cannot help to reconstruct fully the appearance of this panel before the angels were cut from its composition. As Freuler and van Os pointed out, the *Madonna of Humility* painting by Andrea that compares most closely to this one is the *Virgin lactans* that Freuler believed was the other possible candidate for the central section of the missing Murano altarpiece. The paintings are comparable because they represent rare examples

---

298 For comparative images, see van Os, *Marias Demut*, figs. 65, 67-68, 71, 73-74.
of the subject in which the artist incorporated an angelic chorus. However, the other work is not
rounded at its apex. Rather, it narrows into a trapezoidal shape.\textsuperscript{299} To accommodate this
tapering contour, the artist placed the groups of angels in the panel’s uppermost portion closer
together than those that appear below. If one considers the added height needed to accommodate
the angels that were excised at the top of the panel, then, originally, the Rockhurst panel would
have been a minimum of ten centimeters taller and could have been similarly shaped. The
placement of the angels within the Greenlease composition also supports this idea, since, like the
other candidate for the missing Murano altarpiece, their positioning suggests a trapezoidal
format. The lost altarpiece that Andrea painted for the Camaldolese church of S. Michele in
Murano was described in 1604 as having a “bel concerto di angeli” (beautiful choir of angels)
and that it was small.\textsuperscript{300} With its heavenly choir and smaller dimensions of 90.805 x 57.15 cm x
2.54 cm (35 3/4 x 22 1/2 in x 1 in.), for instance in comparison to the Richmond panel, which
measures 202.57 x 85.41 cm (79.75 x 33.63 in.), the Greenlease panting matches this description.

It is unfortunate that the whereabouts of the \textit{Virgin lactans} panel is unknown and that there is no
further description of other scenes that appeared in the Murano altarpiece, because both sources
would have provided helpful information in considering this painting’s original appearance.

In its present form, the Greenlease Madonna is a single, discrete panel, and,
compositionally, it can stand alone as such. That said, it may also once have been part of a larger

\textsuperscript{299} Ibid., fig. 62. The work differs slightly in that it presents the \textit{Madonna Lactans}, or nursing Madonna, which, as
mentioned earlier, is a variation of the Madonna of Humility type.

\textsuperscript{300} Freuler, “Sienese Dominicans in Venice,” 578 n. 48. Freuler cites Gilbert 113, 120 n. 55, who initially noted
Francesco Sansovino’s (1521-86) account, which was published in \textit{Venezia città nobilissima e singolare descritta
dal Sansovino}, Venice, 1604, p. 175. A century later, the Venetian art critic, Antonio Maria Zanetti (1679-1757),
wrote also of a small panel with the Nativity of our Lord by Andrea of Siena that was located under the church’s
choir (“Segue sotto il choro una pallina colla natività della del Signore, opera d’Andrea da Siena”). See A. Zanetti,
\textit{Descrizione di tutte le publiche pitture della città da Venezia}, Venice, 1733, 444. Freuler argues that this
composition might have been mistaken for a Nativity scene, since the term ‘Madonna of Humility’ was not yet used
at that time.
ensemble, as the 1985 conservation report for this painting suggests.\textsuperscript{301} Forest R. Bailey and Patricia Murray-Blake, who conducted the intervention in their private practice in Kansas City posited that the cross-section of beetle tunnels that are evident on the panel’s left edge was exposed when the present panel was removed from its original structure, perhaps a triptych or polyptych.\textsuperscript{302} Further support for this idea is found in the existence of two square holes on the panel’s bottom edge that were likely created when old, square nails were removed.\textsuperscript{303} Comparable evidence supporting this theory is found in Suffield’s technical report for the Princeton University Art Museum painting of the\textit{Madonna and Child} by Andrea di Bartolo, which notes that Andrea used square, wrought-iron nails to connect polyptych segments.\textsuperscript{304} In his essay, Suffield proposes that the Princeton panel constituted the central scene of a polyptych that included flanking images of Saints Anthony Abbot, Dorothy (Galleria Nazionale dell’Umbria, Perugia), and Savinus (Musée du Petit Palais, Avignon) and that was topped by a pinnacle painting of the blessing Christ (Detroit Institute of Arts).\textsuperscript{305} The widths of the Princeton and Greenlease paintings differ only by 2.35 cm and their heights may also have been nearly comparable, considering the added height of the missing top of the Greenlease panel.\textsuperscript{306} So it is plausible that the Greenlease painting was once situated between two panels depicting saints and with a pinnacle containing another scene attached at the top. Indeed, in his overview of Sienese altarpieces from 1215 to 1460, van Os provides several examples of polyptychs that depict the Madonna of Humility, including one by Taddeo di Bartolo that was reframed during the

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{301} Bailey, 1985, GGA.  
\textsuperscript{302} For exposed worm channeling on a panel as evidence that it was once part of a larger assembly, see the introduction in Timothy J. Newberry and Laurence B. Kanter,\textit{Renaissance Frames} (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1990). For condition report by Heffley see n. 242.  
\textsuperscript{303} For the use of square nails in altarpieces see Bomford,\textit{Art in the Making}, 14.  
\textsuperscript{304} Suffield, "Andrea di Bartolo’s Madonna and Child," 17-32.  
\textsuperscript{305} For an illustration of the proposed configuration for the polyptych, see ibid., fig. 15.  
\textsuperscript{306} Ibid., 17-32.
nineteenth century (Szepmuveszeti Museum, Budapest). During the 1800s, when the current frame probably was added to the Greenlease painting, many polyptychs were divided into separate panels and placed into contemporary frames. It is conceivable that this was the case for this painting.

Context: Music-making angels first appeared in Italian religious works during the fourteenth century and remained a popular subject throughout Andrea di Bartolo’s career, as their depiction in the Greenlease Madonna of Humility and other paintings by the artist exemplify. Typically, celestial musicians were portrayed playing instruments that were prevalent at the time, as in this case, the lute (lauto) and its smaller version, the gittern (chitarra), which are both featured prominently in the foreground. The artist illustrated the two stringed instruments accurately, which suggests a close familiarity with their structures. For instance, the sound box’s rose shape is precisely rendered. Also, the course of strings, five for the gittern and nine for the lute, are pictured correctly. They are delicately stenciled in light brown and extend from a horizontal bridge at the base, across the body, and up the entire length of the neck, which is angled and lined on both sides with tuning keys. In addition, the artist was attentive to the angels’ precise
handling of the instruments so that the informed viewer would understand that the heavenly musicians are not just holding the lute and gittern, but actually playing them. To support the instruments, the two angels wrap their left hands around each instrument’s neck and depress the strings with their fingers to play the notes. Meanwhile, the fingers of the right hands are bunched together as if holding a plectrum (guitar pick), to create sound by plucking the strings. Indeed, at the time that this painting was created, musicians used this method, and it was only after 1490 that they began to strum with their hands instead of a pick. In his study of late medieval instruments, musicologist Howard Mayer Brown noted that the period’s works of art often paired the lute and gittern, as they are in this scene. This coincidence led the scholar to believe that these two instruments were likely played together. For the audience, the inclusion of the accurately illustrated lute and gittern would have added a dimension of sound to the experience of viewing this painting, encouraging the devotee to imagine the sonorous sounds of a heavenly concert.

Conclusion: After Simone Martini introduced the Madonna of Humility type in the early fourteenth century, that subject disseminated quickly across Europe and coincided with the spread of the values and tastes of mendicant religious orders. For devotees, the portrayal of Mary as a humble mother seated upon the ground with her child made her more approachable. We have seen that the Madonna of Humility panel at Rockhurst University can
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312 For performance technique, see “The 15th-Century Lute,” 12. Page cites Inventione et Usu Musicae, by music theorist and composer Johannes Tinctoris (1445-1511), which was likely published in Naples, 1481-83.
313 Ibid., 20.
314 Brown, “Ambivalent Trecento Attitudes,” 107. Brown’s assessment is relevant to this work, especially because one of the paintings in his study was an Assumption of the Virgin, (Montepulciano Cathedral) by Taddeo di Bartolo (c. 1362-1422), whose work influenced Andrea’s later output.
securely be attributed to Andrea di Bartolo, a Sienese painter who was active from the late fourteenth to the early fifteenth centuries, specialized in portraying this subject. In terms of its subject and style, the Rockhurst *Madonna of Humility* exemplifies a continuation of Sienese tradition that Martini initiated and that remained popular, particularly in Siena, the *Civitas Virginis*, whose patron saint was the Virgin.

The Rockhurst painting is one of thirteen similar paintings that Henk van Os attributed to Andrea, only nine of which survive. Of the remaining examples the Rockhurst panel is the only one that depicts a chorus of music-making angels and portrays Christ holding a bird in his left hand and a carnation in his right. A possible source for this composition might be a painting by Bartolo di Fredi at the Museo Comunale in Certaldo, Italy, which also depicts the infant Jesus handing his mother a pink flower. The Rockhurst panel no longer retains its original shape as it was cut down along its upper edge, probably during the nineteenth century. This process removed a few angels from the composition’s upper portion. The painting’s present frame replicates those of several surviving rectangular-shaped *Madonna of Humility* paintings attributed to Andrea that have either a curved or ogival arch at the top with decorative spandrels in each corner. Considering the symmetrical placement of angels in the panel’s top portion and the painting’s central focus on the Madonna and Christ child, this work either stood alone as a single, probably private, devotional panel, or perhaps might have been part of a triptych or polyptych, with one or more images of saints flanking each side.\(^{315}\) Freuler suggested that this

\(^{315}\) Williamson, *The Madonna of Humility*, 163. For this type of altarpiece, the Madonna of Humility panel was placed centrally with a varied number of saints or donors, or a scene of the Annunciation, situated on the periphery all positioned in order of rank, beginning with the most important figure placed to Mary’s right side. For examples, see Michel Lacotte, "Observations on Some Polyptychs and Altaroli by Ambrogio Lorenzetti," in *Italian Panel Painting of the Duecento and Trecento*, ed. Victor M. Schmidt (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006), 191; Gail E. Solberg, "Altarpiece Type and Regional Adaptations in the Work of Taddeo di Bartolo," ibid., 202.
painting might constitute the central panel of a missing altarpiece that Andrea completed for the Camaldolese church of S. Michele in Murano. However, without documentation we will likely never know the original form, location, or patron for this work. Yet, as his surviving examples of the subject, the Rockhurst panel in particular, exemplify that Andrea di Bartolo excelled at painting the Madonna of Humility type and the artist’s patrons clearly recognized that talent. Today, this work stands out as one of the finest objects in the Van Ackeren Collection.

---

FRANCESCO D'UBERTINO VERDI, also called IL BACHIACCA

Florence, 1494-1557

On 1 March 1494, Francesco d’Ubertino Verdi, called Il Bachiacca, was born in Florence to a goldsmith (orafo), Ubertino di Bartolomeo (1446/7-1505), and his wife, Francesca di Benedetto di Niccolò. Francesco was the second of four male children, three of whom survived, including his older sibling, Bartolomeo (1484-1526-9), and a younger brother, Antonio (1499-1572), both of whom, like Francesco, became artists. During their careers, Francesco and Antonio were each known by the nickname “Bachiacca,” a term that associated them with the Mugello farming district outside of Florence, where their family came from. In Florence, the family lived in the parish of S. Paolo. When Francesco was eleven years old, his father died. Either shortly before, or thereafter, the boy joined his brother, Bartolomeo, also called Baccio, who was a trusted assistant in the Florentine bottega of the important Umbrian painter, Pietro Vannucci, called Perugino (1446-1523). As an apprentice, Francesco learned to paint in

317 For the most comprehensive monograph on the artist, see Robert G. La France, Bachiacca: Artist of the Medici Court (Florence: L. S. Olschki, 2008), 1-94. The artist is referred to as either “Bacchiacca” or “Bachiacca,” but, as La France notes, the latter form is the proper one, since the artist wrote “FRANC. BACH. FACI” on his only signed work, the ceiling of a terrace that adjoins the living quarters of Duchess Eleonora di Toledo at the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence. See Charles Colbert, “Bacchiacca,” in The Dictionary of Art, ed. Jane Turner (London and New York: Macmillan Publishers Limited and Grove Dictionaries, Inc., 1996), 3: 13-14; Matteo Mancini, “Francesco di Ubertino, detto Bachiacca,” in Dizionario biografico degli italiani (Milan: Treccani, 1998), http://www.treccani.it/biografie/ (accessed 8 October 2014); La France, Bachiacca, 127.

318 La France, Bachiacca, 32.


320 La France, Bachiacca, 32-33, 38.


oil in the Netherlandish manner (*alla fiaminga*) and excelled in rendering flora and fauna.\(^{323}\)

Other painters who influenced Il Bacchiacca’s early style were Fra Bartolommeo (1472-1517) and Raphael (1483-1520), who he likely encountered as an apprentice when the artist from Urbino was briefly associated with Perugino’s Florentine workshop from 1505 to 1508.\(^{324}\)

Precisely when Il Bacchiacca left the *bottega* is unclear, but by 1515, he was collaborating in the circle of Andrea del Sarto (1486-1530) with Francesco Granacci (1469-1543), Franciabigio (1482-1525), and Jacopo Pontormo (1494-1557).\(^{325}\) The artists sometimes worked together to complete commissions for wealthy Florentines. For instance, in 1515 on the occasion of the wedding his son, Pierfrancesco, Salvi Borgherini commissioned this group of artists to complete a suite of decorations for the couple’s bedroom.\(^{326}\) Contemporaries coveted the Borgherini’s famous decorative ensemble, which included Il Bacchiacca’s first securely dated works, six panels for the nuptial bed that depict Old Testament scenes of the *Life of Joseph* (1515).\(^{327}\) Another wealthy Florentine, Giovan Marie Benintendi, commissioned two works from the artist in 1523, consisting of a *Baptism of Christ* (Staatliche Museen, Berlin) and a

---


Legend of the Dead King (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden). In 1525 Il Bacchiacca traveled to Rome, where he spent time with his colleagues Giulio Romano (1499-1546), Gianfrancesco Penni (1490-1528), and Benvenuto Cellini (1500-1571). In his autobiography, Cellini referred to the Florentine artist as one of his “dearest friends” and related an amorous escapade that involved Bachiacca and a beautiful, Roman courtesan named Pantisilea. However his time in Rome did not last long and he returned to Florence before imperial troops sacked the papal city in 1527. Two years later, the painter joined the Arte dei medici e speziali, the Florentine guild of doctors and pharmacists to which painters also belonged.

Regarding his personal life, Francesco and his younger sibling Antonio were married to sisters Tommasa and Dorotea di Carlo, respectively. Francesco and his wife had three sons: Ubertino, Bastiano, and Carlo. Francesco and Antonio jointly owned farmland north of Florence in their ancestral region of the Mugello and, after 26 January 1535, resided together on the south side of the Via dell’Agnolo in Florence in a bustling neighborhood in the parish of S. Ambrogio, which was home to a number of other successful artists.

Early in his career, Francesco had completed projects that were likely intended for the Medici, including a frontispiece for the family’s genealogy book (Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Florence, ms. Med. Pal. 225, fol. 1r) and a predella that was made for the Martyrdom of Saint Achatius altarpiece (Uffizi, Florence) that Alfonsina Orsini de’ Medici

---


329 Morelli, Italian Painters, 103; Nikolenko, Francesco Ubertini, 2; La France, Bachiacca, 7.


331 Nikolenko, Francesco Ubertini, 3.

332 La France, Bachiacca, 73.

333 Ibid., 35.

(1472-1520) probably commissioned. However, the first fully documented project that II Bachiacca completed for the Medici was commissioned in conjunction with the 1539 celebration of the wedding of Duke Cosimo I de’ Medici (1519-1574) and Eleonora di Toledo (1522 -1562) and comprised two canvas paintings depicting the Return of Cosimo from Exile and Lorenzo’s Visit in Naples. According to the early modern biographer of artists, Giorgio Vasari (1511-1574), those who were chosen for this important project were Florence’s “most excellent young painters.” From approximately 1540 to 1555, Francesco worked for the duke and duchess. Soon thereafter, he and his brothers adopted the surname Verdi, perhaps, as Bacchiacca scholar Robert La France posits, to reflect their elevated status as Medici court artists. Subsequently, the artist was known as Francesco d’Ubertino Verdi.

For the ducal couple II Bachiacca painted triumphal arches for festivities and created designs for costumes, as well as impressive tapestries for the Medici’s new residence at the

---


337 Vasari, Lives, 2: 246. For an explanation of the symbolic importance of this project as the first commission for Duke Cosimo I de’ Medici, see Mary A. Watt, "Veni, Sposa. Love and Politics at the Wedding of Eleonora di Toledo," in The Cultural World of Eleonora di Toledo: Duchess of Florence and Siena, ed. Konrad Eisenbichler (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004), 30-33.

Palazzo Vecchio.\textsuperscript{339} In addition, he completed frescoes for the Palazzo Pitti’s grotto and a ceiling decoration for the terrace adjoining the duchess’s living quarters. The latter is his only signed work.\textsuperscript{340} The duke capitalized on Il Bacchiacca’s skill in accurately painting nature’s minute details by having the artist decorate the walls of his scrittoio, or small study, with depictions of various species of insects, fish, animals, and plants with medicinal values.\textsuperscript{341} Vasari praised these works as being “painted divinely well and in oils.”\textsuperscript{342} Moreover, the humanist philosopher Benedetto Varchi (1503-1565) suggested that, because of their accuracy in depiction, they would provide excellent visual aids for the study of biological species.\textsuperscript{343} On 25 July 1556, the artist bequeathed his sketches of fish and animals to the ducal collection.\textsuperscript{344} Il Bacchiacca’s last Medici commission was to design the textiles for the nuptial bed of Francesco I de’ Medici (1541-1587) and Joan of Austria (1547-1578). However, he died before its completion and Vasari took over the project.\textsuperscript{345} On 5 October 1557, the day of his death, Il Bacchiacca was buried at S. Ambrogio in Florence, a popular burial place for artists, and where his father (d. 1505) and mother (d. 1541) had been laid to rest before him. La France explains that the location of the family’s tomb is unknown and equates its loss with the decline in the

\textsuperscript{339} Merritt, "Bacchiacca Studies," 136; Candace Adelson, "The Tapestry Patronage of Cosimo I de' Medici: 1545-1553" (PhD diss., New York University, 1990); La France, \textit{Bacchiacca}, 77.
\textsuperscript{342} Vasari, \textit{Lives}, 2: 444-45.
\textsuperscript{344} La France, \textit{Bacchiacca}, 32-33, 40-43, 81-88.
\textsuperscript{345} Ibid., 88.
Verdi’s critical fortunes.  

For nearly two decades, Il Bachiacca was esteemed as a talented painter in the court of Duke Cosimo I. Yet, Vasari did not devote an individual biography to him, only mentioning him instead in the *vite* of other artists in the *Lives of the Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*. As scholars Antonio Pinelli, Elizabeth Pilliod, and La France have argued, by not writing a discrete biography for Francesco, Vasari marginalized the artist. For early art historians who relied upon Vasari for biographical information, this omission signaled to them that Il Bachiacca was unimportant, which led them to ignore his work in general. During the late nineteenth century, connoisseur Giovanni Morelli (1816-1891) assessed Bachiacca’s style and concluded that many of the works of this “remarkable painter” were incorrectly attributed to better known artists. In the early twentieth century Arthur McComb (1926) and Robert Salvini (1934) compiled lists of the artist’s known paintings; Lada Nikolenko (1966) authored a short monograph on the artist; and Howard Merritt (1958) and Charles Colbert (1979) each wrote a
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346 Ibid., 40-43.
348 Vasari mentions Il Bachiacca and his work in the biographies for Perugino, Pontormo, Francesco Granacci (1469-1543), Franciabigio (1482-1525), Niccolò Tribolo (1500-1550), and Aristotile da Sangallo (1481-1551).
350 *Bachiacca*, 9-20. Some early writers who briefly mention the artist are Pellegrino Orlandi (1753), Filippo Baldinucci (1728), Luigi Lanzi (1834), and Georg Nagler (1849).
doctoral dissertation focused on Il Bachiacca. Coinciding with its 1961 acquisition of a *Virgin and Child* of the mid- to late-1530s by Il Bachiacca, the Baltimore Museum of Art featured an exhibition that was the first ever dedicated to the artist. In her discussion of the artist’s corpus, curator Gertrud Rosenthal likened Il Bachiacca’s tendency to quote other painters’ works as “plagiarism,” “pilfering,” and “theft.” Whereas three years prior, Merritt expressed an alternative point of view, evaluating Francesco as an “ingenious compiler,” rather than as an outright copyist. More recent scholarship considers the importance of workshops in contemporary artistic production and does not devalue an artist for adhering to these traditional practices. Instead, recognizing that these borrowings served as tributes to earlier artists and exemplified the artist’s knowledge and erudition. The key was for a painter to incorporate previous figures and compositions in new ways, to signify *ingegno*, or creativity, a trait that, as will be discussed below, is exemplified in the artist’s interpretation of a *Madonna, Child, and Infant Saint John the Baptist* at Rockhurst University. To date, La France has contributed the most to the study of Francesco d’Ubertino Verdi, with his dissertation (2002) and monograph (2008). Yet, La France’s comprehensive overview of the artist and his general oeuvre still leave much room for discussions of the artist’s individual works, including the painting in the Van Ackeren Collection.

2. Francesco d’Ubertino Verdi, called Il Bachiacca

*Madonna and Child with the Infant Saint John* 
c. 1518

---

355 La France, "diligente dipintore."; *Bacchiacca*. 
Oil on canvas, [transferred from panel?]
108 x 84.5 cm (42 1/4 x 33 1/8 in.)

A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family


Description: This painting depicts the Madonna, Christ child, and infant Saint John the Baptist in a verdant landscape that recedes far into the distance. The three holy figures are placed centrally within the composition and dominate the painting’s foreground. Their positions form a triangle with Mary at the apex, the Christ child to her left, and the infant Saint John seated on the ground to her right. Jesus sits upon a grassy knoll underneath an azure sky in which a few scant clouds float in the upper right. Mary supports her son in the crook of her left arm and holds him at the waist with both of her hands. Mary and Jesus glance down at the infant Saint John, who sits with his back to the viewer and with his right leg tucked underneath his body. In contrast, Jesus is presented frontally, with fully exposed genitalia, which emphasizes his humanity.

Jesus bends his right leg and stretches the left one out straight. In his right hand, he holds a shallow gold dish that may represent the baptismal cup that Saint John used to pour water on Christ’s head during the sacrament of baptism. Jesus extends his right arm diagonally across his chest, thereby keeping the gold plate as far away from his cousin as possible. In his right hand, Saint John grasps his attribute, a reed staff, at the top of which is a Greek cross, with four arms of equal length. In his other hand, John clenches a goldfinch (*Carduelis carduelis*), a black-
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winged bird with a white-tufted breast and red-tinted face that symbolizes Christ’s Passion.\textsuperscript{357}

This painting’s color is lush and highly saturated, particularly in the areas of Mary’s pomegranate-colored gown and her midnight-blue mantle, which has an ivy green lining. The Virgin’s mantle drapes over her left shoulder, wraps around her back, and falls across her knees. Its voluminous fabric provides a backdrop that contrasts, and thus emphasizes, the infant cousins’ dimpled, cream-colored flesh and pudgy knees, elbows, and pink-tinged cheeks. The Virgin wears a gold, braided ribbon that spans her hairline and keeps her auburn hair pulled away from her face and her diaphanous veil in place. In spite of this accessory, a single tress of her hair escapes and falls over her right shoulder, separating into three curly tendrils with golden highlights. A broad expanse of the Virgin’s alabaster skin is visible above the rectangular cut of her gown and the lower edge of her mantle falls across her bare foot. Mary and Christ share a familial likeness, for both have heavy-lidded eyes; wide, round faces; small, pointed chins; and thin, coral-colored lips that are slightly pursed. The Virgin’s forehead appears bulbous and protrudes abnormally. A subtle chiaroscuro, or light and dark, defines the figures’ facial features, including their brows, the right sides of their noses, and the creases found above their chins (mentolabial fold), at the sides of their mouths (buccolabial folds), and above their top lips (philtral ridges).

Mary is depicted in contemporary dress. At the neckline of her gown, a gossamer strip that appears to be the fixed hem or drawstring of her camicia runs parallel along the horizontal length. The white linen undergarment is also evident in the slash of the Virgin’s right sleeve,

where the sleeve attaches to the bodice. Just to the left of the slash on the Virgin’s shoulder, there is a gold star with eight points. The symbol, which was more typical of medieval paintings, is positioned above the Baptist and at the apex of an implied triangle that links the infant Saint John with the Christ child, signifies the Madonna’s role as the Star of the Sea (Stella maris).

The black band at the neckline of Mary’s gown is embellished with fictive gold thread. Parallel gilt lines run along the band’s top and bottom edges, and two faint concentric circles with a row of dots between them appear at Mary’s sternum. The circles encompass a seven-leafed flower that may symbolize the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. Sprouting below the circles is a floriated pattern that extends outwards into a flourish of tendrils that twist along the band, looping around five-leafed flowers that may be violets, and therefore symbols of the Virgin’s humility. They could also signify the five wounds that Christ suffered when he was nailed to the cross.

Anchoring the composition structurally is the mirrored position of the Virgin and Child. Their linked forearms create the apex of an inverted triangle, with Mary’s elbow aligning with the hillside incline on the left, and Christ’s arm, conjoined with the knoll on the right. Both sides of the painting show a narrow dirt road that disappears into a grove of trees. The curve of the path on the left mirrors the rounded edge of a fold in the Virgin’s cloak. This juncture forms
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358 Ferguson, Signs and Symbols, 277; Steinberg, The Sexuality of Christ, 52-57.
360 Ferguson, Signs and Symbols, 35. The seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, which include wisdom, understanding, counsel, knowledge, fortitude, piety, and fear of the Lord, are enumerated in Isaiah 11:2.
362 Ferguson, Signs and Symbols, 53.
another point of cohesion between the composition’s middle ground and foreground. In addition, the mossy-green hill slopes into the direction of the Virgin’s green cloak, which echoes the hillock’s contour.

The infant Christ sits upon an eroded mound that forms a grassy pedestal, which is covered with delicate, three-leaf clovers that may reference the Trinity. Against this backdrop of dirt in the painting’s lower right quadrant appears a columbine (*Aquilegia vulgaris*), whose tall stalk extends from a leafy base. The Latin root for the name of the purple flower is *columbina*, or dove, a bird which references the Holy Ghost and derives from the dove-like shape of the flower’s petals. The bloom’s hue also represents Mary’s sorrow. To the left of the columbine plant is a dandelion with jagged leaves and a bud that has not yet blossomed. Near the dandelion, which is often depicted in scenes of Christ’s deposition and of the Pietà, appears a single, pink bloom, which may be a carnation, which is an attribute of the Virgin. Two, very small, lightly painted figures walk on a path on the left towards a bridge in the background. One seems to make an effort to catch up to the other pedestrian. The varnish is darkened in this area, which makes the pair barely discernible. A bluff on the left rises above a river that flows under a stone bridge that is bracketed with fortified towers at each end. Each of the three round arches that support the bridge is decorated with a roundel at its apex. Beyond the viaduct stand northern European style buildings, with columnar towers and slate-shingled,
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367 Ibid., 44-46, 79-84. The carnation was imported from Tunis in 1270, and was often depicted with the grass and wild strawberries of paradise.
gabled roofs. Dark green conifers and deciduous trees spring from the hill on the left and the meadow opposite it. Their branches and leaves catch the sun’s rays from the left, casting shadows on the opposite side. On the right side, village buildings with peaked roofs blend in with the forest line and, in the distance, atmospheric perspective is used, incorporating hues ranging from the deep turquoise in the middle ground to the mountains cloaked in a silvery gray mist on the horizon.

Gilded accents are found on the Virgin’s headband, the dish, and on the Greek cross at the top of the Baptist’s staff. The delicately outlined haloes of the Virgin and Saint John and the infant Jesus’s more elaborate, cruciform-shaped, nimbus are also fashioned in gold. Christ’s halo, known as tri-radiant patée, or tri-radiant form, is inscribed with three arms of a Greek cross that may represent the Holy Trinity or may signify rays of light. The Greek-cross-like contour mirrors the shape of the cross on Saint John’s staff. While the artist focused on creating a natural, believable setting for the Virgin and Child, these gold accents emphasize the depicted subject’s sacred nature.

Condition Description: The painting appears to be in very good condition. An examination with ultraviolet (UV) light showed areas of later paint that were added to a narrow strip along the border of the Virgin’s bodice. These additions appear as dark recesses along the inner edge of Mary’s right arm and on the inside border of the cloak, which drapes over her left shoulder. A wider section of previous restoration, measuring 1.9 x 3.8 cm (¾ x 1 ½ inches) is evident on the tuft of the white camicia at the center of its top fold where the sleeve is attached to the bodice. Abrasion to the paint film is evident under UV light, especially on the faces of the Madonna and
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368 Schiller, Iconography of Christian Art, 1: 138.
Christ Child. One scratch originates from the middle region of the left side of the Virgin’s forehead and extends diagonally, nearly reaching the inside edge of her right eyebrow. There is a t-shaped scratch on Christ’s forehead. Considering the shape of the flaw, someone may have made the sign of the cross in front of Christ’s forehead and scratched the surface in the process. Two smaller scratches appear below his left eyelid, and another one is located on his stomach. A minute scratch extends downwards from the goldfinch’s beak. All of these damaged areas have been fully restored and are therefore not apparent under normal viewing circumstances.

There are, however, two other areas in which previous in-painting can be detected without the aid of a UV light. They include a small triangular area located to the right of the Virgin’s right knee and below her forearm, and an elliptical-shaped section mid-way between the faces of Mary and Jesus. The edges of both areas of in-painting appear to have an uneven surface, indicating non-uniform losses to the paint film. This may have occurred during a previous restoration effort. The varnish has darkened the foreground from the columbine plant on the right to Saint John the Baptist and the goldfinch on the opposite side. The darkened varnish extends up the left side of the scene to the middle ground. There are areas of minor loss in the gold leaf, including the gold that articulates the black band decorating the Virgin’s dress and the halos. A few minor losses appear in the gilded areas. For this study the painting was not removed from its frame. So, it was not possible to determine whether it was originally painted on poplar, as was typical for Italian paintings from the period. Most likely the Greenlease painting was originally painted on panel, but then transferred to the present canvas support. The transfer probably occurred during the nineteenth century when interventions of this sort were common.
Attribution and Date: Richard Öffner was the first scholar to associate this painting with Il Bachiacca. In his 1925 assessment of this work, which he completed when it was in possession of the Fearon Galleries, Öffner compared the Virgin and Child with the figures of a woman and infant standing on the left in Il Bachiacca’s painting, entitled *Preaching of John the Baptist* of 1515-21 (Szépművészeti, Budapest), and the infant Saint John the Baptist with a similar figure that appears in a *Holy Family with Saint John the Baptist* of c. 1520 (Pinacoteca Ambrosiana, Milan). Before then, the painting had been attributed to Francesco’s teacher, Pietro Perugino. A year later, Arthur McComb supported Öffner’s attribution. Observing that this painting resembles images of the Madonna and Child that Raphael painted in Florence from 1505 to 1508, McComb proposed that there must be a lost work by Raphael upon which Francesco based his composition. In 1965 Francesco Abbate hypothesized that this painting represented a transitional point in Il Bachiacca’s career. He cited as evidence the way in which the many small figures that appear in the artist’s Borgherini panels contrast with the few, monumental ones rendered in this scene. The following year, Nikolenko wrote her monograph on the artist and compared this painting’s background to that of a *Leda and the Swan* (1510-1515) by Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) at the Borghese Gallery in Rome. As in the left background of Leonardo’s work, this scene shows a village on a steeply inclined hill bluff and, in a valley
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369 Richard Öffner, *Bacchiacca 1494-1557. The Blessed Virgin, Christ, and Infant Baptist. A Study* (New York: Fearon Galleries, 1925). I have been unable to locate the pamphlet, but it is mentioned in the following sources: McComb, "Francesco Ubertini (Bacchiacca)," 145, 158, 161, 165, fig. 30; Richard Öffner, *A Discerning Eye*, ed. Andrew Ladis (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State Press, 1998), 304. In his essay, McComb relates Öffner’s findings. At the time of Öffner’s assessment, the painting was known as the Cook Madonna, for its owner, Sir Frederick Cook.

370 McComb, "Francesco Ubertini (Bacchiacca)," 160-61, fig. 30; La France, *Bacchiacca*, 49. However, Abbate’s hypothesis presupposes Francesco’s lack of invention, by suggesting that he was incapable of designing a composition in which the figures hold a combination of attributes in a way that does not appear in any other known painting. See below for further discussion on this point.


below, a winding river that flows under a bridge that has three rounded arches. Other similarities that Nikolenko did not mention include that each depicts an array of carefully articulated flowers and foliage in the foreground and a black and white bird with a red-tufted head. Also, the Greenlease Baptist and one of Leda’s offspring (Castor or Pollux), who sits on the ground to her right, both have similar springy, golden locks. Around the time that this image was likely painted, c. 1515-18, Francesco created several copies of Leonardo’s painting, Leda and the Swan, which explains why the compositions would share some similar elements.373

In his 1989 volumes on Umbrian paintings dating from the Duecento to the early Cinquecento, Filippo Todini suggested a different author for this work, Bachiacca’s brother, Bartolommeo, also known as Baccio.374 Todini linked the Greenlease painting to another devotional work of the same subject from the Tolentino collection in Rome, which features a Christ child that is similar, in terms of its modeling of the face, hair, and halo, to the one depicted in the Kansas City work. However, the rendering of the Tolentino Virgin follows the tradition of Perugino, showing Mary with a slim figure, narrow shoulders, and a slender face, in contrast to the Greenlease Virgin, who is depicted with a sturdier frame, broad shoulders, and a wide face.375 As Abbate and others have noted, the Madonna and Child with Infant Saint John appears more Raphaelesque in approach, particularly in terms of its palette, composition, and configuration and modeling of figures. Among the eight works that Todini attributed to Bartolomeo, for the reasons mentioned above, this painting stands out as an anomaly and, therefore, in my opinion, his attribution of this painting to Francesco’s brother is incorrect.

373 For illustrations, see La France, Bachiacca, 152-54, cat. nos. 14-16.
375 Ibid. Todini based his 1989 attribution on a photograph and cited its location as “Fearon Galleries, New York (1925).” Seemingly, he was unaware that the painting had belonged to Rockhurst since 1978.
La France, who undertook the most recent study of this work (2002, 2008, 2013), posits instead that the painting is the result of the collaborative efforts of Francesco and Bartolommeo. To support his hypothesis, La France cited the difference in figural rendering between the Borgherini and Greenlease scenes. Whereas Abbate considered the difference in figural rendering between the smaller figures in the Borgherini panel and the more heroic-sized ones depicted in the Greenlease painting as evidence of a shift in Francesco’s style, La France interpreted the disparity as evidence that Francesco had rendered the background scenery and flora in the foreground, but that his brother, Bartolommeo had painted the Greenlease figures.\(^{376}\) However, the figures’ sizes and the quality of their modeling may be indicative of the type of work in question, rather than of the artist’s identity. To be specific, the Borgherini’s smaller, less detailed figures are more suited to its format as a decorative spalliera, just as the larger figures in the Greenlease painting are more appropriate for a medium-sized devotional painting.\(^{377}\) Regardless of whether one, or more, artists painted this work, some aspects of its composition and style are undeniably linked to Francesco and therefore suggest his involvement in its execution, if not his authorship of the entire work. For instance, the bridge and the village that appear in the middle ground on the left are direct quotations from his Borgherini panel of 1515, entitled The Brothers’ Second Visit to Egypt (National Gallery, London) and the accurate rendering of the columbine plant exemplifies the exacting type of botanical painting at which Francesco excelled.\(^{378}\) Further, extant preparatory drawings by Francesco at the British Museum, London and Christ Church Picture Gallery, Oxford depict a nearly identical figure of

\(^{376}\) E-mail correspondence. La France to Whittaker, 22 August 2012; La France, "diligente dipintore," 329-33, cat. 20; Bachiacca, 49, 281-83, fig. 109; "Three Brothers and One Altarpiece: A Connoisseur’s Proposal for Bachiacca in Borgo San Lorenzo," in Renaissance Studies in Honor of Joseph Connors (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2013), 497.  

\(^{377}\) La France, Bachiacca, 49-50, 281-83, cat. no. 122. Although Rockhurst acquired the painting in 1978, this entry incorrectly gives the date of 1957.  

\(^{378}\) La France also mentions this point. See ibid., 283.
Saint John the Baptist, with his curly hair, distinctive forelock, and the awkward tuck of the right leg. Additionally, the British Museum drawing, which Philip Pouncey attributed to Il Bachiacca (1950), a designation with which I agree, shows the same modeling of fleshy folds on the belly and inner thighs of the Christ child as in the Greenlease rendition and mimics the poses of Saint John reaching out to Jesus, who pulls away. However, La France suggests that this sketch is not a preparatory drawing for this painting, but rather Francesco’s copy of his brother’s drawing or finished design. While this is a possibility, if Francesco intended to replicate his brother’s design, then the sketch of the infant Baptist’s pose should duplicate exactly the Greenlease version. Rather, the Greenlease depiction of Saint John incorporates three particular aspects of the British Museum drawing, including the facial features of the first figure on the left, the middle figure’s pattern of hair curls and general position, and the detailing of the right hand and shading of flesh folds on the torso of the right figure. Therefore, if Francesco sketched these images, which scholars agree that he did, it is likely that instead of copying his older brother’s work, he was investigating creative solutions for the Baptist’s pose, an experiment that seems to have culminated in the Greenlease figure.

In a 2013 article La France compared the anatomy and use of chiaroscuro in the figure of the Virgin in the Greenlease painting to that of Saint Sebastian depicted in an altarpiece with the flanking figures of Saints Macarius and Vincent, located in the parish church of S. Lorenzo, Borgo S. Lorenzo. The general formats of these two paintings are very similar, with a trio of saintly figures featured prominently in the foreground in a lush landscape filled with delicate
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379 La France, "diligente dipintore," 331-32; Bachiacca, figs. 69, 71.
plants and colorful flowers that sprout from a patch of brown soil in the lower register. In the background of each, there is a mountain with Northern European style buildings on the left, and on the opposite side, hills that recede into the distance and a bank of clouds floating overhead. Since the S. Lorenzo altarpiece is, like the majority of Il Bachiacca’s paintings, undocumented, La France determined its authorship by employing Morelli’s connoisseurial approach, through which he detected a difference in the shapes of Saint Sebastian’s left ear with the right ears of the two flanking saints. This observation led him to conclude that each of the three Verdi brothers was responsible for one of the S. Lorenzo figures, and that Bartolomeo painted the figure of Sebastian, which he compares to the Greenlease Virgin. However, each saint is presented at a different angle, which may account for the variation in each ear’s form. Besides, such a comparison may be problematic, because Morelli clearly specified that Il Bachiacca did not paint a characteristic shape of ear. A case in point is found in the fact that the ears of the S. Lorenzo Sebastian and the Greenlease Virgin do not match, which, if Francesco painted both of them, would make sense, according to Morelli’s observations.

Aspects in this painting that La France cited as diverging from works that are securely attributed to Francesco d’Ubertino Verdi, including the “broad handling of the bodies, faces with prominent brows, and particularities of the landscape,” are all evident in additional examples of the artist’s corpus. For instance, the prominent brow that La France mentions, along with the

383 La France, "Three Brothers," 494-96.
384 Morelli, *Italian Painters*, 104. Using his methods of connoisseurship, Morelli identified seven characteristics of Bachiacca’s art. They include: (1.) foreground landscapes with wedge-shaped, light grey rocks, trees, bushes, a town, and towers in the middle distance, (2.) figures with long bony fingers, (3.) like Franciabigio, a predominant use of blue, (4.) figures with brown hair and glazes of yellow for highlights, (5.) no characteristic form of ear, (6.) close fitting sleeves that reach below the knuckle, a style adopted from Lucas van Leyden engravings, and (7.) draperies with ‘V’ folds.
385 I thank Robert La France for the observations regarding this painting that he shared with me during a visit of 30 August 2011 to the Greenlease Gallery and subsequent e-mail correspondence. La France suggests that the Greenlease painting inspired the later Florence, Moscow, and Pittsburgh works by Bachiacca. See also La France, *Bachiacca*, 281-83.
Virgin’s pointed chin and the angle at which her head is tilted are similarly articulated in each of the extant paintings by Bachiacca of the *Virgin and Child with Saint Elizabeth and the Infant Saint John* (Arciconfraternità della Misericordia, Florence; private collection, Moscow; Frick Art and Historical Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania). Additionally, each of these depictions of Jesus shows a similar physiognomy. For instance, they all display a rotund belly that spills over a triangular expanse of skin that is positioned above the infant’s small, uncircumcised genitalia. Also, the left foot of Jesus in the Greenlease painting is rendered with the same shallow arch and simplified contour that defines the left foot of the infant Saint John in the pictures mentioned above. Further, the shape and positioning of the Virgin’s right foot is repeated in each of the aforementioned scenes. Each shows her bare foot, visible from underneath the hem of her gown, and a distinctive shadow that defines the recess between the big toe and second, longer digit. Other points of comparison include the gold star that is painted on the Greenlease Madonna’s right shoulder, which also appears on the Moscow Virgin’s cloak, and Mary’s sleeve slash, which is duplicated in the attire of two women, who kneel in the lower left corner of Bachiacca’s *Descent from the Cross* (Uffizi, Florence) of 1515 and, also along the inner left arm hole, of the Magdalene’s dress as depicted in his painting of a *Noli me Tangere* (Christ Church Picture Gallery, Oxford) from before 1515. These examples show a familiar repetition of form that singles Francesco d’Ubertino Verdi out as this painting’s likely author. However, without documentation, the definitive authorship of this work may remain a mystery. As for the dating of the Greenlease *Madonna and Child with Infant Saint John*, McComb, and later, Nikolenko, suggested c. 1520 and La France proposed a slightly earlier date of c. 1515-18, which is the

386 Ibid., plates 38-40.
387 Ibid., cat. no. 2, plate 46.
388 Ibid., 282.
period during which the artist transitioned from Perugino’s workshop to the circle of Andrea del Sarto.\textsuperscript{389} La France’s date for the creation of the Greenlease painting seems accurate.\textsuperscript{390}

**Provenance:** Of the works in the Van Ackeren collection, Il Bachiacca’s *Madonna and Child with the Infant Saint John the Baptist* has the most complete provenance. When Virginia Greenlease purchased this painting for Rockhurst University in 1978, New York dealer Frederick Mont provided the painting’s ownership history and vouched for its authenticity, citing its earliest known owner as Queen Christina of Sweden (1626-89). Clearly such a provenance would have benefited the dealer in terms of securing a profitable negotiating point for the painting’s sale. However, it remains unclear how this list was compiled and there is no known documentation for this provenance.\textsuperscript{391}

A photograph of this painting located in the Berenson Library archives at Harvard University’s Villa I Tatti provides the earliest record of this painting’s provenance.\textsuperscript{392} Written on the back of the photograph, dated 14 April 28, is an inscription that states that “Duveen,” perhaps British art dealer, Joseph Duveen (1869-1939) of the Duveen Brothers firm in London, sent the photograph, although to whom is not clear. A provenance is listed on the verso as “Fearon Galls., Florence.” Since Mont’s provenance mentions Fearon Galleries in New York, perhaps the painting first belonged to the inventory of the firm’s Italian branch, before it was shipped to New York. This may have occurred between the time when Solly owned the painting and before, the painting passed through the Ehrlich Gallery, New York (1928-31[?]). Afterward, the painting entered an unidentified private collection, from which the New York art dealers,

\textsuperscript{389} McComb, “Francesco Ubertini (Bacchiacca).”; Nikolenko, *Francesco Ubertini*, 25, fig. 19.
\textsuperscript{390} La France, *Bacchiacca*, 283.
\textsuperscript{392} Artist File: Il Bachiacca, Berenson Library, Villa i Tatti, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Florence.
Frederick and Betty Mont of Frederick Mont, Inc., “rediscovered” the work. In 1978 the Monts sold the “Ubertini Madonna” to Virginia Greenlease, who immediately donated it to Rockhurst University. The painting was likely so-named, because Mont referred to Vasari’s use of the diminutive form of Il Bachiacca’s given name, Francesco d’Ubertino.

Iconography: The depiction in this painting of members of the Holy Family seated upon the ground in a natural setting has its origin in the iconography of the Madonna of Humility, a type of Marian representation that originated during the late fourteenth century. This type of portrayal was intended to invoke an empathetic response, by encouraging the beholder to identify with the figures depicted. For example, the Van Ackeren’s Madonna of Humility by Andrea di Bartolo (1360-1428) is an earlier Sienese rendition of the subject that incorporates a gold-leaf background, while early Florentine renditions often positioned Mary and Jesus in front of an elaborately painted cloth of honor. Instead the Greenlease scene portrays Mary silhouetted against a vast, blue sky, but the effect is similar because the juxtaposition draws the viewer’s focus to the Christ child and his mother, which in turn enhances the painting’s function as a focal point for prayer.

The encounter portrayed in Il Bachiacca’s painting is not derived from the New
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393 Sydney J. Freedberg to Frederick Mont, 13 May 1977, Il Bachiacca: Acquisition file, GGA. The private collector in New York, who probably obtained the work from the Fearon Gallery in 1931-35 and then, from whom the Monts acquired it, remains unidentified.
395 Friedmann, The Symbolic Goldfinch, 38; Nuttall, From Flanders to Florence, 38-40, 202. See also cat. no. 1.
Testament, but from late medieval literature, such as the *Meditations on the Life of Christ* by an anonymous author[s] known as the Pseudo-Bonaventure and the *Volgarizzamento delle vite dei SS. Padri* by Fra Domenico Cavalca (1270-1342), who resided in nearby Pisa a few centuries prior to the completion of this work.\(^{398}\) The Greenlease narrative may have a basis in the latter text, which relates that Saint John’s parents, Elizabeth and Zechariah, traveled to Bethlehem to introduce their infant son to his cousin, Christ, who, at the time, was six months old. Although, not all of the key figures of this tale are represented here, the cousins do not meet one another again until they are five, and then seven, years old. Therefore, since Christ appears less than a year old here, judging from his pudgy, undeveloped physiognomy, probably the earlier meeting is referenced in this scene.\(^{399}\) Typical of early sixteenth-century Italian representations of him, the infant Jesus is posed frontally, with his genitalia fully exposed, in order to emphasize his humanity.\(^{400}\) By the eighteenth century, however, this type of nude presentation was considered in poor taste and genitalia was often covered up in an expression of modesty.\(^{401}\) It has never been noted in the literature that this painting was also similarly censored. Evidence for this appears in the 1928 photograph of this painting mentioned above, which shows that a semi-transparent cloth was painted over the genital area of Christ.\(^{402}\) One corner of the diaphanous fabric originated in the inside crease of the infant’s right thigh, fell across the top of his left thigh, and slipped between the Virgin’s left middle and ring fingers. The folds draped


\(^{399}\) Lavin, "Giovannino Battista," 87 n. 19.

\(^{400}\) Steinberg, *The Sexuality of Christ*, 9-16.

\(^{401}\) Ibid., 71-72, 188.

\(^{402}\) See n. 81.
downwards in inverted arches and the fabric was doubled over in the area of the penis, perhaps to provide additional coverage. It is not clear when this alteration was implemented, nor when it was removed, although the timeline suggests that, between 1928, when the photograph was taken, and 1978, when Rockhurst acquired this work, the work was restored to what was likely close to its original appearance.

As a harbinger of Christ’s death, the goldfinch that John the Baptist holds typically appears in scenes like this one that depict Jesus as an infant. The bird’s coloration and habitat led to its association with the Passion, because its red-tinted face invoked the idea of blood and sacrifice, and its home among thistles and thorns, recalled the Crown of Thorns that Jesus wore during the Crucifixion. Also, a medieval legend related that, when a goldfinch flew by Christ on his way to Calvary and tried to pull a thorn from the Savior’s brow, a drop of Christ’s blood dripped onto its face and tinged its feathers crimson. According to American ornithologist and curator of birds at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of Natural History, one of the earliest depictions of the goldfinch appears in a Florentine painting of c. 1270 by the Maestro della Maddalena (Acton Collection, Florence). In his comprehensive overview of the goldfinch’s appearance in European paintings and sculptures, Friedmann observes that the overwhelming majority of representations of that bird occur in Florentine works of art, as exemplified in the Greenlease painting. In keeping with his specialized skill, Il Bachiaccia painted the goldfinch

404 Ferguson, Signs and Symbols, 17.
405 Friedmann, The Symbolic Goldfinch, 9, 33-34, 121, 131, 134; Lavin, "Giovannino Battista," 94 n. 49.
406 Friedmann cites a 10:1 ratio of goldfinch depictions in Florentine works of art versus those that appear in works from the rest of Europe. For the history of the depiction of the goldfinch, see Friedmann, The Symbolic Goldfinch, 3, 62-63, plate 33.
407 Ibid., 1-9.
in an anatomically correct fashion.

The presentation of iconography in this composition closely compares to that of Raphael in his incorporation of a reed cross and a black and white, red-tufted bird in the *Madonna del Prato* of 1506 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and the *Madonna del cardellino* (*Madonna of the Goldfinch*) of 1507 (Galleria degli Uffizi), respectively. Also, the Greenlease scene mirrors the configuration of figures in Raphael’s *Madonna, Child, and Saint John the Baptist* of 1508 (Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest), except that the Kansas City version inverts the children’s upper body poses, with Jesus reaching toward the infant Saint John, who turns his back away from his cousin. The timing of Raphael’s association with Perugino in Florence coincided with Francesco’s apprenticeship in that master’s workshop. Since it was during this period that Raphael painted the aforementioned Marian images, it seems reasonable to posit that the young Francesco must have been aware of Raphael’s compositions and then quoted them in the Greenlease work. If in this painting Il Bachiacca does reference the Urbino master’s work, then he did so by making some clever alterations. For instance, Raphael’s *Madonna of the Goldfinch* shows the cousins “playing nicely” together, with the infant Saint John gently cupping the bird in his hands and Jesus carefully petting it. In contrast, Il Bachiacca inserts a mischievous bent to his narrative, by portraying a Christ child who refuses to share with his cousin. In turn, the infant Baptist either offers or antagonizes Christ with the goldfinch. Also, as La France and others have pointed out, the juxtaposition of each child holding an attribute typically associated with the other presents a spirited, narrative twist.\(^{408}\) I would argue that, in this instance, Francesco’s creative interpretation demonstrates that, counter to early critical opinion of the artist, he did indeed exercise a sense of *ingegno*, as an early sixteenth-century

---

\(^{408}\) Ferguson, *Signs and Symbols*, 17.
audience would probably have understood the symbolic significance of the objects depicted as well as the humor that their inversion implies.  

In its portrayal of the Virgin and an infant Jesus this work also relates to Leonardo da Vinci’s painting of the *Madonna, Child, Saint Anne and a Lamb* of c. 1508 (Louvre, Paris). In Leonardo’s painting, the Virgin acts with parental concern, restraining Jesus as he plays too rambunctiously with a lamb. The Greenlease scene possesses a similar story-telling quality, the type of which scholar Martin Kemp suggests shows the “past actions and imminent intentions” of the figures depicted. The past action implied in the Greenlease scene pertains to a, perhaps involuntary, exchange of “toys” between Jesus and John the Baptist and the imminent intention inferred is that Christ will eventually accept the goldfinch that his cousin offers, and thus accept his fate of crucifixion, since the goldfinch, like the lamb in Leonardo’s painting, signifies the Passion. Additionally, the Christ child gazes down at another allusion to his imminent death, the staff with a cross at its end that the infant Baptist holds in his right hand. Thus, a devotional work that symbolizes Jesus Christ’s ultimate sacrifice for humanity is related in a scene that depicts two cousins who delight in the acts of sharing, antagonizing, and absconding with each other’s ‘playthings’.

If the small, shallow, gold bowl that Jesus holds is a paten, upon which the Host is placed during the celebration of the Eucharist, then it would serve as another Passion symbol in this composition. However, the saucer is not flat like a paten. Rather, it resembles a saucer that Il Bachiacca depicted in a contemporary *Baptism of Christ* of c. 1520 (Akademie der bildenen

---

411 Ibid., 213-18.
Künstle, Vienna). The baptismal scene portrays an adult Saint John holding a cross-shaped staff and baptizing Christ. He pours water from a gold cup, like the one that Christ keeps away from his cousin in the Greenlease composition. I would suggest that Francesco’s inclusion of both the reed cross and baptismal cup, emphasize the presence of Saint John and his role as the Baptist. For a Florentine audience in particular, the depiction of Saint John in this image would have been imbued with both sacred and civic significance. Aside from being the city’s principal patron saint, John the Baptist also represented the sacrament of baptism. When a child received this sacrament at the baptistery dedicated to this saint in Florence, he or she was not only anointed as a Christian, but also as a citizen of Florence.\(^4\) As Stefanie Solum discusses in her 2001 dissertation, the depiction of Saint John the Baptist with the Madonna and Child is an iconographical type that began appearing in the Florentine domestic sphere around 1455-1460.\(^5\) That, sixty years later, the same subject appears in this painting demonstrates the pervasiveness of this theme in Florentine iconography.

**Format and Function:** In 1501, Leonardo da Vinci displayed a cartoon, now lost, with a triangular composition that depicted the Virgin, infant Christ, Saint Anne, and a young Saint John the Baptist.\(^6\) Leonardo’s configuration of figures is thought to have influenced the work of several artists who were active in Florence during the early sixteenth century, including Lorenzo di Credi, Andrea del Sarto, Raphael, and Fra Bartolomeo. Leonardo’s influence on the

---


latter is shown in the positioning of Mary, Jesus, and the infant Baptist in Fra Bartolomeo’s unfinished *Saint Anne* altarpiece of 1510. As La France has observed, the Greenlease composition replicates the placement of Mary, Jesus, and the infant Baptist in the altarpiece, which indicates that it probably served as a source for Il Bachiacca.

As a tender, sacred, familial scene, the Greenlease painting adheres to the period’s *maniera devota* (devotional manner). This painting’s size and subject suggest that it served as a private devotional work, perhaps for a wealthy Florentine. A contemporary voice might have described the lush treatment of surface and subject in this painting as *devota e bella* (devout and beautiful). Thus, not only would the painting have been pleasing to view, but it would have served as a focal point for religious contemplation, protected the home and its inhabitants, and offered instruction, likely directed to the household’s women and children. As Raphael scholar Bette Talvacchia observes, paintings of this type were often commissioned for a newlywed couple. In particular, Talvacchia discusses two works that Florentine merchants commissioned Raphael to paint on the occasions of their weddings, including the aforementioned *Madonna del Cardellino* (Galleria degli Uffizi) of 1506 and a compositionally related work of

415 La France, *Bachiacca*, 282. La France also notes that Fra Bartolomeo’s composition recalls Leonardo’s *Adoration*, but with the figure of the infant Saint John the Baptist replacing the kneeling magi in reverse.


419 For more on the use of images for religious instruction in the household, see Crum, "Controlling Women or Women Controlled?,” 37-41; Nuttall, *From Flanders to Florence*, 231-35; Musacchio, *Art, Marriage, and Family*, 191-228.
1507, the *Holy Family with Saints John the Baptist and Elizabeth* (Alte Pinakothek, Munich).\footnote{Florentine merchant Lorenzo Nasi commissioned the *Madonna del Cardellino* and fellow merchant and member of the Calimala guild, Domenico Canigiani, commissioned the *Holy Family with Saints John the Baptist and Elizabeth*. See Talvacchia, *Raphael*, 74-76.}

The Uffizi painting measures 107 x 77 cm, which compares closely to the Kansas City’s dimensions of 108 x 84.5 cm, suggesting that it could have served a similar purpose.

Considering this painting’s likeness to Raphael’s Marian images of 1505 to 1508, it is feasible that someone related to the patronage network that the Urbino master had established while in Florence, may have commissioned this work. With Raphael in Rome, painting at the time for the Medici pope, Leo X (r. 1513-21), and for Sienese banker Agostino Chigi (1466-1520) at Villa Farnesina, it would have been logical for a client to hire Il Bachiacca, a painter whose success relied in part on his ability to emulate the style of other artists.\footnote{For instance, Il Bachiacca created a copy Michelangelo’s *Doni Tondo* of 1506 for a client. See La France, *Bachiacca*, 162-63, cat. 23.}

Scholars Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, Jacqueline Musacchio, and Roger Crum, to name a few, have shown that domestic sculptures and paintings were often used as teaching tools within the Italian Renaissance home.\footnote{Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, "Holy Dolls: Play and Piety in Florence in the Quattrocento," in *Looking at Italian Renaissance Sculpture*, ed. Sarah Blake McHam (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 111-27; Crum, "Controlling Women or Women Controlled?", 37-50; Musacchio, *Art, Marriage, and Family*, 208.} The Greenlease *Madonna and Child with Infant Saint John* fits precisely in this category, as the following quote from the early-fifteenth century teachings of Dominican Fra Giovanni Dominici (1356-1419) relates:

> “The first regulation is to have pictures of saintly children or young virgins in which your child, still in swaddling clothes, may take delight and may thereby be gladdened by acts and signs pleasing to childhood…It is well to have the Virgin Mary with the Child in arms, with a little bird or apple in His hand…So, let the child see himself mirrored in the Holy Baptist clothed in camel skin, a little child who enters the desert, plays with the birds, sucks the honeyed flowers, and sleeps on the ground. It should not be amiss if he sees Jesus and the Baptist…depicted together…For this you should know that the representation of angels and saints are permitted and intended for the instruction of the
unlearned.”

That these words from a century prior resonate with this painting’s subject shows that the function of these paintings changed little over time. According to the Dominican friar, a household painting such as this that depicts the infants Christ and Baptist would have provided the perfect learning opportunity for children, for this scene strikes a true chord for anyone who has ever observed the natural instincts that are aroused in children at play. Likewise, the Virgin would have served as an exemplar for any young mother, whose role was to supervise her children’s religious instruction. Additionally, in light of this scene’s honest depiction of human behavior, Mary’s demeanor might also have encouraged a mother to exercise patience in dealing with her offspring. To make her more relatable to a sixteenth-century audience, Mary is dressed in contemporary attire. Underneath her gonna, or dress, she wears a camicia, or white cotton or linen undergarment that protected the skin from chafing and also protected expensive fabrics from sweat and body oils. The particular attention that Il Bachiacca paid to his rendering of the embroidery pattern on the Virgin’s garments might imply an awareness of the craft of his younger brother, Antonio, also called Bachiacca, who was an expert embroiderer at the court of Duke Cosimo I de’Medici. There he designed and stitched clothes for the duke’s wife, Duchess Eleonora di Toledo, and their children. Also, while the bird is a sacred symbol, its inclusion here also references a contemporary, secular tradition in which children played with captive birds.

423 Dominici, Regola, 34.
425 For an illustrated example of Antonio’s embroidery, see Agnolo Bronzino’s portrait of Maria di Cosimo I in Niccoli, Moda a Firenze: 89, 174, 181, fig. 34.
goldfinches and other fowl for amusement.\textsuperscript{426} In order to prevent these creatures from flying, their wings were clipped and children either held them, as John does in this painting, firmly grasped in the hand, or they were tethered to a string. A visual example of the long-standing practice is found in a portrait of 1545 that Il Bachiaccia’s fellow court artist and friend, Agnolo Bronzino, painted of the young son of Duke Cosimo I, Giovanni de’ Medici holding a goldfinch (Galleria degli Uffizzi, Florence).

\textit{Context:} Patrons prized devotional paintings such as this not only for their sacred subjects, but also for the social prestige that they garnered, for their purchase reflected the owner’s level of cultivation, good taste, and financial status.\textsuperscript{427} For instance, while the use of red, blue, and gold for the Virgin’s garments adhered to Florentine pictorial tradition, the incorporation of those pigments also signified the costliness of the painting. Thus, the expensive use of medium reflected the patron’s ability to afford such an object.\textsuperscript{428} For Mary’s cloak, there is a generous application of ultramarine, which is made from lapis lazuli, an expensive stone that had to be imported to the West from Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{429} The continued stability of the hue in this painting indicates that the artist used a high quality of material for this commission, again reflecting the

\textsuperscript{426} Friedmann, \textit{The Symbolic Goldfinch}, 109, 115.


\textsuperscript{428} David Bomford, \textit{Art in the Making}, 30.

\textsuperscript{429} For the significance of color use in Italian Renaissance painting, see Baxandall, \textit{Painting and Experience}, 81-85. For the coloring and embellishing of fabric with metallic thread, see Currie, "Textiles and Clothing," 348-49.
original patron’s wealth.\textsuperscript{430} The cranberry hue of Mary’s gown, while symbolizing charity, also referenced the period’s most expensive cloth dye, which came from the red Kermes beetle.\textsuperscript{431} Another indicator of the patron’s investment in this work is the use of gold for the figures’ haloes and the embroidery that adorns the edges of the Virgin’s gown. Humanists of generations prior had fostered a tradition of admiration for artistic skill, by proposing that painters should shun the use of gold leaf in paintings in favor of replicating its appearance through the blending yellow and white pigments. As theorists, like Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472) in his treatise De Pictura or On Painting (1435), had argued for skill, gold ground paintings fell out of favor in the late fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{432} Nevertheless, during the early sixteenth century, as the Greenlease painting demonstrates, the use of gold had not been entirely abandoned, as such works clearly still appealed to wealthy patrons.

Additionally the amount of landscape displayed translates into the number of hours the artist labored on the work, hence owner’s cost.\textsuperscript{433} The background is distinctly Netherlandish in manner, or alla fiamminga, which is a style that, through its association with the Burgundian court, carried aristocratic intonations of wealth, clout, and erudition.\textsuperscript{434} As discussed above, Francesco’s teacher, Pietro Perugino, was one of the foremost practitioners of alla fiamminga in

\textsuperscript{430} For the importance of using quality material for pigments, especially in the rendering of the Virgin and her garments, see Cennino Cennini, \textit{The Craftsman’s Handbook, Il libro dell’arte} (New York: Dover, 1954), 60-61. A lower quality blue pigment made from a carbonate of copper that was German in origin was sometimes substituted as a less expensive alternative to lapis lazuli. However, the pigment oxidized over time and turned green. Here the blue hue has withstood the test of time. On patron contracts and materials, see Baxandall, \textit{Painting and Experience}, 5-11; Bomford, \textit{Art in the Making}, 30-32.

\textsuperscript{431} Monnas, \textit{Merchants, Princes, and Painters}, 78.


\textsuperscript{433} Baxandall, Painting and Experience, 17-18.

Florence. The Greenlease painting’s background showcases the artist’s familiarity with the Netherlandish style, in the rendering of the winding dirt paths that disappear into the forest, the buildings with peaked roofs that were foreign to central Italy, and a suggestion of great distance through the use of atmospheric perspective. A comparison of the Greenlease background with that of a *Madonna del Sacco* (Palatine Gallery, Palazzo Pitti, Florence) of 1495 by Perugino shows how evident the master’s style is in Francesco’s scenic landscapes. Both show a similarly attired Virgin positioned in the composition’s center and sitting in front of a valley that appears in the distance. In the Pitti version, the infant Baptist kneels behind Mary and the infant Christ, with an angel supporting his back, sits on a white *sacco*, or cylindrical pillow, in front of her. The middle grounds of both depict brown- and green-hued hills with leafy trees sprouting at the top. On the left in the distant background of Perugino’s painting appear craggy, blue and grey-shaded peaks. Opposite there is a valley with a river that winds underneath a bridge with flanking peaked towers. The Greenlease background shows the same elements, but the scene is flipped, demonstrating, perhaps, a formulaic approach to incorporating the master’s approach, which was typical for the period. Although the painting’s background is distinctly northern in flavor, the inclusion in the foreground of softly modeled figures adheres to Tuscan tradition and the combination of the two is manifestly Florentine in its approach.

In Florence, a painting that was instrumental in introducing the Flemish style to the city’s

---

435 For a scientific analysis of how Perugino was the Florentine artist who best approximated the Netherlandish manner, see Nuttall, *From Flanders to Florence*, 31, 81-82, 135, 172-73. For Perugino’s importance in disseminating the northern style in Florence, see Luciano Bellosi, "The Landscape ‘alla fiamminga’," in *Italy and the Low Countries: Artistic Relations. The Fifteenth Century*, ed. Victor M. Schmidt, et al. (Florence: Centro Di, 1999), 101; Rohlmann, "Flanders and Italy," 100; Nuttall, *From Flanders to Florence*, 31, 81-82, 135, 172-73.

artists was a triptych of 1475, entitled *Adoration of the Shepherds*, by Hugo van der Goes (1430/40-82) that the Medici banking agent, Tommaso Portinari, had shipped to Florence from Bruges.\textsuperscript{437} Il Bacchiacca would have been familiar with this famous painting, which was on public display at Sant’Egidio, the church at the hospital of S. Maria Nuova. This is evident in the flowers in the Greenlease painting’s lower register, particularly the columbine plant that is articulated so beautifully, which recall flora in the foreground of the Portinari Altarpiece. Another important source of this style came in the form of prints from northern artists, such as Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528) and Lucas van Leyden (1494-1533), and, later, from engraved copies of northern works by the Italian artist, Marcantonio Raimondi (1480-1534).\textsuperscript{438} These circulated widely among Florentine workshops, including those of Perugino, with whom the artist trained, and Andrea del Sarto, with whom the artist later worked.\textsuperscript{439} As the Greenlease painting exemplifies, during the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries there was a veritable culture of northern imitation in Florentine painting.\textsuperscript{440} Therefore, a northern-influenced picture such as this, with its accurately rendered flora and use of highly saturated colors in the foreground, coupled with a mist-laden background of craggy peaks, winding paths and streams, and conical, northern-styled roofs, would have had great appeal among a wealthy Florentine audience. By the time that Il Bacchiacca was active as a painter, the Netherlandish style was beginning to be considered old-fashioned. Yet, as the existence of the Greenlease painting

\textsuperscript{437} Miller, "Miraculous Childbirth," 249-61.  
\textsuperscript{438} See “Prints in the Artist’s Workshop” and Sharon Gregory, *Vasari and the Renaissance Print* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012), 161-228.  
\textsuperscript{439} Canfield, "Reception of Flemish Art," 35-42; Nuttall, *From Flanders to Florence*, 105-17, 135-40, 151; La France, *Bacchiacca*, 53-54; Gregory, *Vasari and the Renaissance Print*, 165-70, 177, 181-82.  
exemplifies, clearly many patrons preferred this manner of painting, even if, by the time that Francesco painted it, the style was considered somewhat retrograde.  

Conclusion: As a devotional work intended for a domestic interior, the Greenlease Madonna and Child with Saint John the Baptist would have provided a focal point for private worship within a residence, supplemented instruction as a teaching tool for the home’s occupants, and embellished the home’s decor. Öffner, McComb, and Harvard University professor and Fogg Art Museum director, Sydney Freedberg noted the latter point when they described this painting as one of the finest and most attractive of Il Bachiacca’s larger pictures. For a Florentine audience, specifically, the inclusion of Saint John in this image would have been imbued with both sacred and civic significance. Aside from being the city’s principal patron saint, John the Baptist also represented the sacrament of baptism. When a child received this sacrament at the baptistery dedicated to this saint in Florence, he or she was not only anointed as a Christian, but also as a citizen of Florence. The painting was a pious work and because of its expensive use of gold and display of the Netherlandish style, it also signified the patron’s elite status and cultivated tastes.
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441 For more information on the specific use of these prints by a number of the period’s Florentine artists see “Prints in the Artist’s Workshop” and “Vasari, Prints, and Imitation” in Gregory, Vasari and the Renaissance Print, 161-284. See also “The Relationship of Prints to Vasari’s Concept of Design and the Education of an Artist” in Sandra Lee Underwood, “Vasari on Prints and Printmakers” (M.A. thesis, University of Kansas, 1969), 87-130.  
442 Öffner, Bacchiacca 1494-1557. The Blessed Virgin, Christ, and Infant Baptist. A Study. References to this publication appear in McComb, “Francesco Ubertini (Bacchiacca),” 145, 158, 161, 165, fig. 30; Öffner, A Discerning Eye, 304. In his essay, McComb also relates Öffner’s findings and a copy of his description of this painting from that publication appears in Il Bachiacca: Acquisition file, GGA. For Freedberg, see Sydney J. Freedberg to Mr. Frederic Mont, 13 May 1977, ibid.  
The Italian painter Antiveduto Grammatica was born to Sienese parents while they were journeying to Rome. According to the early modern artist biographer Giovanni Baglione (1566-1643), prior to departing Siena for Rome, the painter’s father, Imperiale, sensed that his wife, Artemesia Camoja, would deliver their child en route to the papal city. Heeding his intuition, Imperiale reserved a room at an inn, where indeed a son was born, whom he duly named “Antiveduto,” or “foresight,” an unusual name that commemorated the new father’s prediction of the inconvenient birth. Once in Rome, the couple brought their child to Saint Peter’s to be baptized and settled into the nearby Borgo Vaticano, where a large expatriate Sienese community dwelled.

Around the age of ten, Antiveduto apprenticed for at least one decade with a Perugian artist, Giovanni Domenico Angelini (c.1550-1600), who lived in his Roman neighborhood. Under Angelini’s tutelage, Grammatica developed exemplary skills as a portraitist by painting portraits of illustrious men, or uomini illustri, such as Greek philosophers, Roman emperors, and

---


446 Papi, Grammatica, 7; Riedl, Grammatica, 22.

447 No works attributed to Angelini survive and little is known about him, except that he seems to have been well established and kept three to four apprentices in his studio, which was located near the church of S. Agostino and later was moved to Piazza Navona. See Papi, Grammatica, 8; Riedl, Grammatica, 24.
Italian writers that contemporary collectors avidly acquired. His ability to produce these “teste” accurately and with great naturalism afforded him the opportunity to earn a modest living in Rome, where a flourishing market for the genre existed. According to Baglione, Antiveduto was second to none in Rome in painting these kinds of historical portraits, which earned him the moniker “gran Capocciante,” or “great painter of heads.” His work attracted distinguished patrons such as Cardinal Federigo Borromeo (1564-1631), the Venetian banker Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani (1564-1637), and the Florentine Medici family’s emissary, Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte (1549-1626).

Around the age of twenty-one, Grammatica began to work independently in a studio located near the church of S. Giacomo in Augusta, in the vicinity of the Piazza del Popolo. Soon thereafter, a newcomer to the city, Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio (1571-1610), joined Antiveduto’s bottega, where he worked for several months. The professional paths of Grammatica and Caravaggio remained linked in at least two respects. First, Grammatica adopted Caravaggio’s use of tenebrism, a heightened chiaroscuro that is characterized by a dramatic
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448 Papi, Grammatica, 8. Grammatica copied Angelini’s renderings, which were replicated from the Medici family’s collection in Florence.

449 Papi identifies a favorable market for artists who responded to the Roman aristocracy and clergy who desired the popular portraits of famous men, or “teste”. Angelini seems to have profited in this arena, as did Lorenzo the Sicilian, who “painted them by the dozens,” and the young Caravaggio, who “made three a day.” See ibid., 8-9; Zygmunt Waźbiński, Il Cardinale Francesco Maria del Monte (1549-1626): Il <<dossier>> di lavoro di un prel ate (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1994), 2: 79-84, 312 n. 62, 313.

450 Baglione, Le vite, 292-93.

451 Silvia Danes Squarzina, "The Collections of Cardinal Benedetto Giustiniani. Part I: Documents for the History of Collecting. Published with assistance from the Provenance Index of the Getty Information Institute," The Burlington Magazine 1136, no. 129 (1997); “The collections of Cardinal Benedetto Giustiniani. Part II: Documents for the History of Collecting, Published with assistance from the Provenance Index of the Getty Information Institute,” The Burlington Magazine 1139, no. 140 (1998). Neither of Giustiniani’s inventories (1600, 1620) attributes a work to Antiveduto Grammatica, although each lists numerous anonymous paintings that he potentially could have painted. The 1610 inventory identifies one canvas painting of Charles Borromeo and the 1620 inventory denotes five images of the saint, including two engravings, one panel painting, and two more of unknown media, but there is no evidence that any of these references the Greenlease painting.

452 Papi, Grammatica, 10; Fumagalli, "Antiveduto Grammatica," 275.
contrast between light and dark. Second, both men became Cardinal del Monte’s preferred artists, a point that is reflected in the fact that a 1627 inventory of the cleric’s collection shows that he owned ten works from each painter, which suggests that their paintings were equally well regarded. As Italian scholar Gianni Papi has noted, since many of Del Monte’s paintings were unsigned, the number of works by Grammatica that the cardinal owned is likely higher, as some works by Antiveduto have been falsely attributed to Caravaggio, or to some of that Lombard painter’s followers. While Cardinal del Monte collected paintings by masters such as Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), Michelangelo (1475-1564), Raphael (1483-1520), Andrea del Sarto (1486-1530), and Titian (c. 1488/78-1576), he preferred the Caravaggesque approach and prominently displayed contemporary works in that style, including ones by Grammatica, in his residence at the Palazzo Madama, which was a Roman center of intellectual and cultural exchange.

Antiveduto completed works for both private and public settings in Rome. His first public commission was for the high altar of the church of S. Stanislao dei Polacchi. He also painted an altarpiece for a side chapel in the church of the Madonna della Scala in the Trastevere quarter of Rome. Early modern artist biographer Giulio Mancini (1558-1630) wrote that this altarpiece, which dates to the 1590s and depicts the recently canonized Dominican saint,

453 Papi, Grammatica, 14.
455 Only 144 of the 590 works in the Del Monte collection are securely attributed, and 276 of these are “teste,” the genre for which Antiveduto was particularly known. Therefore, it is possible that he painted some of the anonymous works. See ibid., 567; Papi, Grammatica, 7-9.
456 For the inventory of Cardinal del Monte’s works by Grammatica, which included paintings of a musician, a philosopher, saints, mythological themes, and Old and New Testament scenes, see Waźbiński, Il Cardinale, 2: 203, 216, 567, 576-79, 588, 590-93, 599-600, 610. For the history of Cardinal del Monte’s residence, see Francesco Cossiga, Palazzo Madama (Rome: Editalia, 1984).
458 Baglione, Le vite, 293.
Hyacinth, was well received and demonstrated Antiveduto’s ability to paint full figures just as successfully as three-quarter length portraits. Other religious works by the artist celebrated the founders of two religious orders. For the Camaldolese monks in Frascati, Grammatica painted, and gained popular critical acclaim for, the *Dream of Saint Romuald* of c. 1619, and, for the Jesuits in Rome, he completed an altarpiece for the chapel of Saint Ignatius of Loyola in the church of the Gesù. Aside from remaining steadily employed in and around Rome, Antiveduto also exported a number of paintings to Spain.

Commenting on Grammatica’s temperament, Mancini stated that the artist was “affable in custom, Christian and civil,” but “very zealous” about his occupation. Baglione, on the other hand, described him as a “little obstinate,” but professionally decorous. Antiveduto’s skill and pride in his vocation is evident not only in the quality of his work, but also in the amount of time that he devoted to Rome’s artist guild, the Accademia di S. Luca, whose founding in 1593 coincided with the start of the artist’s career as an independent master. Grammatica was one of the Academy’s earliest members and took on a variety of roles, including treasurer (1604), vice-president (1619), and president (1622). However, after a two-year term as president, he was forced to resign, because his actions dismayed some members. To be specific, to raise funds for the fiscally-challenged guild, he proposed selling its prized work by Raphael, a *Saint Luke Painting the Madonna* of circa 1510, and replacing it with a copy. Subsequently, Grammatica
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459 Mancini, *Considerazioni*, 1; Baglione, *Le vite*, 293.
463 Raphael’s painting carried symbolic importance, not only because it depicted the artists’ patron saint, Luke, but also because it was a gift from the organization’s founder, Federico Zuccari (1540/41-1609). See Wąźniński, *Il Cardinale*, 2: 221-25; Baglione, *Le vite*, 293-94; Fumagalli, "Antiveduto Grammatica," 275; Riedl, *Grammatica*, 59. For the painting by Raphael that Grammatica wanted to sell, see “The History of the Accademia di S. Luca, c. 1590-1635: Documents from the Archivio di Stato di Roma” at [http://www.nga.gov/casva/accademia/intro.shtm](http://www.nga.gov/casva/accademia/intro.shtm).
experienced a professional downfall, which Baglione believed led to the artist’s death two years later. During his career Antiveduto identified himself as a Roman, but the artist maintained ties to his Sienese community, and, in keeping with the terms of his will, was buried in the cemetery of Saint Catherine of Siena on Via Giulia in Rome.

The art historians and authors of monographs on Grammatica, Gianni Papi (1995) and Helmut Philipp Riedl (1998), concluded that the artist’s dismissal from the academy likely tainted his critical fortunes and, consequently, led to a general omission of his work from the pantheon of Caravaggesque painters. In his 1994 study of Cardinal del Monte and his art collection, Zygmunt Ważbiński also pointed out that scholars have overlooked Grammatica’s importance to the cardinal and his circle and that the subject deserves more study. Even though early seventeenth-century art connoisseurs in Rome and abroad clearly held Antiveduto in high esteem, today he is largely forgotten.

More recently, Grammatica has begun to attract some critical attention with the inclusion of his work in recent exhibitions that focused upon the
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467 Baglione, *Le vite*, 294; Riedl, *Grammatica*, 65; Ważbiński, *Il Cardinale*, 2: 577-79. For example, in comparison to contemporaries, such as Orazio Gentileschi (1563-1639) and Artemesia Gentileschi (1593-1656), Antiveduto has received a minimal amount of scholarly attention.
individual artistic contributions of the Caravaggisti. However, Papi argues that the term “follower,” in reference to Grammatica, diminishes his role as an accomplished Roman Baroque artist. The most sought-after painting by Antiveduto for these exhibitions is a Saint Cecilia with Two Angels (Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga, Lisbon) of c. 1620. The Van Ackeren Collection’s painting attributed to Grammatica that depicts Saint Charles Borromeo Venerating the Holy Nail is similar to the Saint Cecilia in terms of its size, style, and format, but it has been little studied in comparison. In 2005, Rockhurst loaned its Grammatica painting to the Worcester Art Museum for the exhibition, “Hope and Healing: Painting in Italy in a Time of Plague 1500-1800,” which art historian Franco Mormando, S. J. curated. The Van Ackeren painting is featured in a short entry in the accompanying exhibition catalog and is also briefly mentioned in scholar Pamela Jones’ related essay on plague imagery, which to date constitutes the only mention of this work in the scholarly literature. The Van Ackeren painting is in fine condition and exemplifies the artist’s keen ability to paint accurate likenesses and capture devotional intensity. It stands with Andrea di Bartolo’s Madonna of Humility and Il Bachiaccà’s Madonna and Child with Infant Saint John the Baptist as one of the Greenlease Gallery’s finest works and merits more scholarly consideration than it has thus far received. The following essay will expand upon Jones’ interpretation of this scene, by discussing for the first time an aspect of

---

this painting’s iconography that has never before been considered. To be specific, rather than replicating the distinctive form of the sacro chiodo, or Holy Nail, in Milan that was such an important part of Saint Charles Borromeo’s hagiography, Antiveduto Grammatica depicted a more familiar local relic, the Holy Nail at the church of S. Croce in Gerusalemme in Rome. The latter sacred object served as an appropriate substitute for both Grammatica and Roman viewers, who likely were unfamiliar with the appearance of the relic in Milan.

3. Antiveduto Grammatica

_Saint Charles Borromeo Venerating the Holy Nail_

c. 1620

Oil on canvas

95 x 124.5 cm (37 ½ x 49 in.)

A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family


_Description:_ This horizontal, rectangular painting depicts the half-length figures of Saint Charles Borromeo (1538-1584) and two angels. The centrally placed saint is depicted in the act of venerating a prized relic of Milan, the sacro chiodo, or Holy Nail, that is affixed to a wooden cross that one of the angels holds before him. A thick, knotted rope with a noose at one end is slung around his neck to symbolize his reenactment of Pope Gregory the Great’s Roman penitential procession during a plague of 590 in his own diocese of Milan.471 A thin gold halo that hovers at an angle above Borromeo’s head denotes his status as a canonized saint, and his

scarlet garments indicate his clerical rank of cardinal. The saint’s bulky, crimson cape, or mozzetta, drapes around his shoulders and folds back to reveal a lining of cream-colored fur. A seam ripples across the fabric’s surface following the inside edge of the saint’s extended left arm. In the front, the garment falls to the elbows, and in the back, its length reaches beyond the frame’s edge. A pristine white, slightly rumpled, linen collar, or amice, encircles the saint’s neck. At each of his wrists, a narrow strip of a bleached alb’s tight sleeve peeks out from underneath the cuff edges of the saint’s cassock, whose scarlet color lends a pinkish hue to the white rochet’s gauzy, lightly-pleated, linen. The rochet, which is a garment that high ranking clergy wore for public appearances, has a cuff pattern consisting of a row of lace squares, with equally spaced clusters of three dots, possibly alluding to the Trinity.

One of the angels that flanks Saint Charles is suspended in the air behind him on the right as it sheaths a sword. The other angel on the left stabilizes the cross as the saint gazes towards the nail relic affixed to its center. As a complement to Borromeo’s richly colored apparel, the angels don sumptuous fabrics and the one on the left has a gem-encrusted collar. That angel is swathed in a deep, moss-colored, velvet robe with voluminous sleeves and a plum taffeta cape is attached at each of its shoulders with a gold button. The garment’s neckline has a border of gold and pearls. On the angel’s sternum, is a large, rectangular ruby that is set in a filigreed mount. An olive-green band of fabric cuts diagonally across the chest of the other angel. The textile’s

---


473 For the amice, see *High Fashion in the Church*, 8.

474 For the alb, see ibid., 7-8, 10, 18-19.
saturated hue repeats the color of the left angel’s clothing, and thus adds chromatic balance to the composition. The cherubic figure’s off-the-shoulder gold garment exposes its left arm and pectoral muscle, as the angled cut of the garment echoes the diagonal of the sword that the angel sheathes. The artist’s fluid brushwork differentiates between the varied textures of flesh, fur, satin, velvet, and jewels.

Light in the painting rakes diagonally from an unseen source located beyond its upper left corner and crosses the canvas, creating tenebristic pockets of light and dark that emphasized the central figure of Saint Charles, who stands in a three-quarter turn as he faces the cross. While Borromeo’s expansive forehead, prominent nose, and firm chin are illuminated, shadows delineate the wrinkles framing the saint’s mouth and eyes. Grammatica’s use of tenebrism almost makes palpable a pulse coursing through the vein that runs down the saint’s left temple. The two angels, one blonde and the other brunette, act as heavenly bookends to Saint Charles. Their creamy skin, pink cheeks, and abundant curly locks contrast with the saint’s pallid flesh, visible beard stubble, and closely shaved head. Although the angels’ right wings are fully illuminated, only the top ridges of their respective left wings catch some light; the remainder of their feathered appendages is obscured in darkness.

The artist’s dramatic use of chiaroscuro highlights the elegant hand gestures of all three figures. As Saint Charles stretches his left arm on a downward diagonal, opening his palm horizontally to the viewer, he gently places his right hand to his heart, delicately spreading all but his middle and ring finger. Suspended in the air behind Borromeo, the right angel gingerly grasps the sword’s hilt between its right index and middle fingers as it slides the blade into its scabbard. The angel on the opposite side stabilizes the cross with its arms and hands. The transverse beam of the cross is truncated, appearing disproportionately short in comparison to its
long, vertical shaft that spans the height of the canvas. The angel holding the cross gracefully points its index finger to the Holy Nail, thereby directing Saint Charles and, by association, the viewer, to focus intently upon the relic and cross.

**Condition Description:** The painting appears to be in good, stable condition. Under raking light, the canvas exhibits rough patches that may indicate a single, mended tear, an area with substantial paint loss, or a combination of the two. These areas include a narrow, horizontal streak that extends from the underside of the saint’s nose and nearly to the edge of his left jaw, a thin band that extends vertically along the bottom-most crease of Borromeo’s left index finger, an elongated diamond shape above the left angel’s head that measures about 7.62 cm (3 in.) in length, and two ten-centimeter (3.9 in.), semi-circular expanses along the painting’s upper edge, one located just left of center and the other in the right corner. There is also a narrow, diagonal, raised line that initiates at the left side of the painting, approximately 30 cm (11.75 in.) above the bottom edge and slopes on a sharp downward diagonal to a point on the bottom edge that is located 6.35 cm (2.5 in.) from the left side. Under black light, in-painting appears throughout the canvas, for instance in the background and where the figures’ flesh is exposed. Areas that remain untouched include, on the left angel, its wings, jeweled collar, hair, and the upper two-thirds of its face, and, on the figure of Saint Charles, his alb cuffs, rope, and halo, as well as in the upper third of the cross and the Holy Nail.

**Attribution and Date:** Scholars Gianni Papi (1990, 1992) and Helmut Riedl (1998) correctly
attributed this painting to Antiveduto Grammatica.\footnote{Gianni Papi, "Appunti: Pittura nella campagna romana," \textit{Paragone} 22, no. 485 (1990): 73-88; \textit{Grammatica}, cat. 44, fig. 32.} Papi initially considered the possibility that Antiveduto’s son Imperiale had painted the work, but concluded that his father created it.

To establish the authorship of this painting, Papi compared it to two signed and dated works by Grammatica, the \textit{Saint Cecilia and Two Angels} of c. 1620 mentioned above and an altarpiece at the church of S. Maria Corteorlandini in Lucca, entitled \textit{Madonna and Child with Saint Charles Borromeo and the Blessed Giovanni Buonvisi} of c. 1613-1614.\footnote{For illustrations of the Lucca altarpiece, see \textit{Grammatica}, 35, plate 17; Riedl, \textit{Grammatica}, 145, fig. 259.} Indeed the Lucca and Greenlease scenes display a comparable use of light that streams from an upper corner to illuminate a similar rendering in each of Borromeo’s distinctive physiognomy, including his temple and cheekbone, as well as a thin, gold halo that hovers at a similar vantage point above the saint’s head. Although in the Greenlease scene Saint Charles faces the viewer, and in the Lucca picture he twists his torso to turn his back to the audience, both works show the saint similarly posed with one arm extended and with the wrist bent slightly backwards, thumb stretched, and fingers delicately spread. Together, the two renderings appear to represent opposite views of an identical figure, which suggests that Grammatica painted both.

In his attribution of the painting of Saint Charles Borromeo, Papi also rightfully compared it to the picture of Saint Cecilia that Grammatica signed.\footnote{Mancini, \textit{Considerazioni}, 1: 245; Papi, \textit{Grammatica}, 72; Riedl, \textit{Grammatica}, 23, 65.} The canvases of both the Kanas City and Lisbon paintings are nearly identical in size and have similar compositions, with figures pushed to the foreground in a nondescript setting and that are cast in a luminous light. In addition, each composition shows a saint flanked by two angels, one brown-haired and the other...
blonde, that hold the respective saints’ attributes. Papi associated the date of the Van Ackeren painting with that of the Lucca altarpiece of c. 1613-1614. However, Riedl posited that the painting represents the mature work of Grammatica, when the painter showed a complete fidelity to the kind of naturalism evident in the Kansas City painting. Also, Riedl correctly felt that it was most similar to the Saint Cecilia of c. 1620 and therefore should be similarly dated.

Provenance: Although the size, subject matter, and horizontal format of Saint Charles Borromeo Venerating the Holy Nail suggest that the painting likely functioned as a domestic devotional work, no records exist to identify either its patron or its original location. However, considering the fact that Grammatica worked in Rome around the time that Borromeo was canonized in 1610, the possibility exists that it may have been commissioned to commemorate that occasion. Waźbiński noted a group of twenty paintings in Cardinal del Monte’s collection that were displayed in the gallery at the cardinal’s Palazzo Madama and which included depictions of holy individuals, including Charles Borromeo, in whose beatification and/or canonization processes the cleric was involved. Another of Grammatica’s patrons, Cardinal Giustiniani also owned several paintings of Charles Borromeo. Also, as mentioned above, Cardinal Federigo Borromeo, who was the saint’s nephew, was one of Grammatica’s important patrons, and, because Federigo himself was a cardinal and personally affiliated with the subject

478 Saint Cecilia and Two Angels measures 100 x 126 cm compared with the Saint Charles Borromeo painting, which measures 95 x 124.5 cm. For the Cecilia painting, see Papi, Grammatica, 48, 90. For more on Saint Cecilia as patron saint of music, see cat. no. 12.
479 Papi, "Appunti: Pittura nella campagna romana," 73-88; Grammatica, fig. 32; Riedl, Grammatica, cat. 34, fig. 55.
480 For a list of the other recently canonized saints whose images the cardinal hung on his palazzo walls, see Waźbiński, Il Cardinale, 2: 313.
depicted, it is likely that he would also have been interested in commissioning such a work. However, there is no evidence to link this painting to any of these three patrons.

The earliest, secure provenance for this painting links it to the estate of the fifth prime minister of Luxembourg, Emmanuel Servais, which Sotheby’s sold in London on 13 December 1978. In the estate’s sale catalog, this work was listed as a painting of the “Lombard School of c. 1600.”481 Servais collected during the mid- to late nineteenth century, but it is not clear when he acquired the Saint Charles Borromeo painting. The painting is next documented in the records of two New York dealers, Marco Grassi and then French and Company, before Virginia Greenlease purchased it for Rockhurst University in 1988.482

**Iconography:** The subject of this painting, Charles Borromeo, was born on 2 October 1538 to Count Giberto Borromeo and Margherita de’ Medici (no relation to the Florentine family of the same name) at the Castello di Vitaliana in Arona, located northwest of Milan near Lago Maggiore.483 As the second son of a noble family, Charles was destined for a religious life.484 At age seven he entered the Benedictine Abbey of Saints Gratianus and Felinus in Arona, where children from the area’s distinguished families often were sent to begin their ecclesiastical careers.485 An accomplished student, Charles was later educated in Milan and subsequently studied law at the University of Pavia.486 On 25 December 1559, a little less than three weeks
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482 I thank Marco Grassi for communicating with me his memories regarding this painting.
484 Jedin, *Carlo Borromeo*, 4-5.
485 Ibid., 5-6.
486 Ibid., 6.
after Borromeo graduated, his maternal uncle, Gianangelo de’ Medici, was elected pope and took the name Pius IV (r. 1559-1565). Soon thereafter, Borromeo joined his illustrious relative in Rome, where he served as the new pope’s most trusted assistant. On 31 January 1560, Charles became a cardinal and also received a deaconship and was named Administrator for the Archdiocese of Milan. He is most often depicted wearing a cardinal’s scarlet garments as he is in the Greenlease painting.

On 19 November 1562, while Borromeo was deeply entrenched in the business of the Council of Trent (1545-1563), his older brother Federico died, making Charles the next in line to inherit his father’s estate. It was a period of intense personal grief for the future saint that marked a turning point in his life in that, after much spiritual reflection, he chose to join the priesthood instead of taking over his family’s secular interests. Borromeo was officially ordained 17 July 1563 at the Roman church of S. Pietro in Montorio, where he had attended the Jesuits’ theological school and practiced the spiritual exercises of Saint Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit Order. Later that year, on 7 December, he was consecrated Archbishop of Milan, although, for the time being, he remained in Rome. Towards the end of his life, Charles became extremely stringent in his asceticism, spending countless hours praying with little rest, imposing upon himself grave penance, flagellating himself regularly, sleeping on a wooden board, and taking only water and bread for his meals, which left him physically
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487 Ibid., 7-8. Charles was first assigned the deaconship in Rome for the church of SS. Vito e Modesto, then later the church of S. Martino ai Monti, and, in 1564, the church of S. Prassede.

488 Ibid., 8-10.


490 Jedin, Carlo Borromeo, 13.
weakened and led to his death on 3 November 1584.\textsuperscript{491} He was canonized twenty-six years later, on 1 November 1610, when his feast day of 4 November was established.\textsuperscript{492}

The scarlet mozzetta that Saint Charles Borromeo wears in the Greenlease painting identifies him as a cardinal and the halo that hovers over his head designates his status as a saint. Perhaps also the lack of full cardinal’s regalia indicates a private moment of contemplation for Saint Charles.\textsuperscript{493} In either case, the presentation here of the archbishop of Milan as a Roman cardinal, who a decade prior to the creation of this painting was canonized in Rome would probably have held special significance for a Roman audience.

After his canonization, Saint Charles Borromeo became one of Italy’s most popular plague saints, primarily because of his efforts to quell a 1576 epidemic in Milan, which, due to his ministrations, came to be known as “la peste di S. Carlo,” or the plague of Saint Charles.\textsuperscript{494} When the pestilence struck the city between the end of July and beginning of August in 1576, members of the wealthier classes swiftly fled to the countryside, but Borromeo remained, never wavering from his obligation to minister to his flock.\textsuperscript{495} Many who tended to the plague victims later fell ill themselves, but the archbishop remained unscathed by the contagious disease, which


\textsuperscript{493} Evelyn Voelker, "Charles Borromeo's \textit{Instructiones fabricae et supellectilis ecclesiasticae}, 1577: A Translation with Commentary and Analysis" (PhD diss., Syracuse University, 1977), 229-30, 235.

\textsuperscript{494} Giussano, \textit{Vita di S. Carlo}, 277.

furthered his reputation as a holy man. The cardinal-archbishop performed charitable acts such as donating food and clothing to the poor and distributing the Holy Eucharist at the local lazaretto, the plague hospital located outside the city’s wall, to which he redirected income from his estate. He also erected crosses at Milan’s major intersections where Mass was celebrated, so that people could observe the rituals from their windows while quarantined in their homes. However, the aspect of his plague ministry that was considered most effective is the one that this painting references, his deployment of the sacro chiodo.

The combination of symbols, including the rope slung around Borromeo’s neck, the nail affixed to a cross, and the angel sheathing its sword, references this most renowned act by the saint, the reenactment in his own diocese of a penitential procession that Pope Gregory the Great (540-604) led in 590 as a response to a pestilence that had struck Rome. As the procession moved through the city, the early Christian pope and his entourage witnessed the Archangel Michael standing on top of the Roman emperor Hadrian’s tomb and sheathing his sword as a sign of the end of the plague. As that early pontiff and church father had done for the Romans a millennium prior, Charles invoked God’s mercy for the faithful in Milan by draping a noose
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496 Borromeo likely evaded contamination because he regularly washed his hands with vinegar after caring for the ill. Joining Borromeo in his efforts were the Barnabites, or regular clerics of Saint Paul, a religious order founded in Milan in 1530. However, the Jesuits resisted at first, because they did not want to lose their teaching staff. They considered the cardinal’s mandates to be unreasonable and felt that ministering to the ill was a death sentence. See Borromeo, Memoriale ai milanesi di Carlo Borromeo; Jones, "Serving the Poor," 137. For a contemporary reference to Borromeo as a holy man, see Martin, Roma sancta, 253.


499 "Architecture and the Assertion of the Cult of Relics," 90; Jones, "Serving the Poor," 137.

around his neck and carrying a cross as he walked barefoot on the city’s cobbled streets.\footnote{Borromeo persuaded Milanese officials to allow him to lead the procession to ward off the plague. Initially, the magistrates were against this idea, because they feared that the flow of humanity through the city’s streets would only spread the contagion, which it probably did. See Pamela M. Jones, “San Carlo Borromeo and Plague Imagery in Milan and Rome,” in \textit{Hope and Healing: Painting in Italy in a Time of Plague 1500-1800}, ed. Gauvin Alexander Bailey, et al. (Chicago: Worcester Art Museum in association with University of Chicago Press, 2005), 68. Three contemporary biographers also describe the scene, Besozzo and Giusanno (1610) and Bascapé (1592). See also Richard Schofield, "Architecture and the Assertion of the Cult of Relics in Milan's Public Spaces," in \textit{Reconstructions}, ed. Giulia Ceriani Sebregondi (Vicenza: Centro Internazionale di Studi di Architettura Andrea Palladio, 2004), 79; Pamela M. Jones, "Serving the Poor Sick with Humility, from the \textit{Lazaretto} of Milan to the Hospitals of Rome: Andrea Commodi’s \textit{S. Carlo Borromeo Venerating the Holy Nail} (c. 1621-22) in the Church of S. Carlo ai Catinari," in \textit{Altarpieces and Their Viewers in the Churches of Rome from Caravaggio to Guido Reni} (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2008), 153.} Between 3 and 6 October 1576, Charles led three processions, but only in the third one did he carry the \textit{sacro chiodo}, one of the most important relics in Milan.\footnote{Jones, “Plague Imagery,” 68-71.} Borromeo’s hagiographer, Giovanni Pietro Giussano (1548/52-1623), described the scene as follows: “[The archbishop] wore a purple pontifical cape in token of penitence…his train sweeping the ground instead of being carried in state. Round his neck he wore a rope like the halter of a condemned criminal; in his hand he carried a crucifix…”\footnote{Ibid., 70; Giovanni Pietro Giussano, \textit{Vita di S. Carlo Borromeo}, prete cardinale del titolo di Santa Prassede, arcivescovo di Milano, scritta dal Dottore Gio Pietro Giussano (Rome: C. Apostolica, 1610), 331-32. Quote also published in Jones, "Plague Imagery," 70. Jones cites Paolo Bisciola, \textit{Relazione verissima del progresso della peste di Milano}, 1577.} Giussano related further that during the third procession Charles refused to bandage a toenail that he ripped on an iron grate while walking barefoot during an earlier procession and that he “…bore the pain without flinching.”\footnote{Giussano, \textit{Vita di S. Carlo}, 392-94; Schofield, "Architecture and the Assertion of the Cult of Relics," 79-110; Jones, "Serving the Poor," 152. For another contemporary description of the procession, see Martin, \textit{Roma sancta}, 253.} Afterward, the cardinal led the Forty Hours devotion, the duration of which relates to the time that Christ spent in his tomb after his crucifixion and before his resurrection.\footnote{For the celebration of the Forty Hours devotion, see Mark S. Weil, "The Devotion of the Forty Hours and Roman Baroque Illusions," \textit{Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes} 37, no. 1974 (1974): 218-48; N. D. Mitchell, "Forty Hours Devotion," in \textit{New Catholic Encyclopedia}, ed. Bernard L. Marthaler (Washington, DC: Thomson Gale in association with The Catholic University of America Press, 2003), 5: 824; Jones, "Serving the Poor," 153.} As Pamela Jones notes, another contemporary account of the procession by Paolo Bisciola relates that Saint Charles carried a
The iconography of this painting references Borromeo’s emulation of Pope Gregory’s procession, as well as Saint Charles’ subsequent veneration of the Holy Nail. For instance, the angel sheathing its sword in the upper right corner references the vision that Gregory the Great witnessed when he and his followers passed Hadrian’s tomb, which later came to be known the Castel Sant’Angelo. The inclusion of the rope, cross, and Holy Nail in the painting in Kansas City recalls one of Charles Borromeo’s signature intercessory acts and the saint’s placement between the sacred relic he venerates and the sword being sheathed, which symbolizes the end of Milan’s plague, emphasizes his role as an effective thaumaturge. While Grammatica included a rope in his composition, rather than incorporating a black cross and depicting the saint wearing a purple cope, the artist shows him donning a red mozzetta and standing before a brown cross. This iconography contrasts with that adopted by Grammatica’s contemporaries such Andrea Commodi (1560-1648), who also portrayed Saint Charles venerating the nail, but who showed him wearing a purple cope and kneeling before a black cross to which the Holy Nail is attached. Commodi’s Saint Charles Borromeo altarpiece was created for the high altar of S. Carlo ai Catinari, the first church dedicated to Borromeo in Rome after his canonization in 1610. It is important to note that Commodi painted his picture for a religious order with Milanese connections, the Barnabites, whose members had helped Saint Charles minister to the afflicted in
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506 Ibid. Bisciola also commented on the blood that issued from Borromeo’s injured toe.
508 The author viewed this painting hanging on the wall in the church’s sacristy.
Milan and who processed with him during the 1576 plague.\textsuperscript{509} Moreover, that religious order stored primary and secondary relics associated with the saint in their church in Rome that included a shaving of the Holy Nail, the rope Saint Charles carried in procession, and a piece of Borromeo’s flesh.\textsuperscript{510} Considering the Order’s association with the Milanese saint and his relics, it is understandable why an accurate rendering would have been commissioned for their church that was dedicated to Saint Charles.\textsuperscript{511} Grammatica’s departure from historical accuracy in the Greenlease composition suggests that this work was likely intended for an audience not closely associated with Milan.

By incorporating a black cross and purple cope and showing Charles Borromeo’s foot dripping blood in their paintings, the aforementioned Commodi, as well as Orazio Gentileschi (1563-1639) and Giovanni Baglioni (1566-1643), provided visual references to the events of Borromeo’s third procession.\textsuperscript{512} Like the other artists, Grammatica also included a cross, Holy Nail, and angel sheathing a sword to reference the 1576 procession in Milan. However, his portrayal of Borromeo with a halo and a red mozzetta emphasized his status as cardinal and recently canonized saint. Also, while the other artists situated Borromeo in a chapel, Grammatica depicted him in a nondescript location, Antiveduto positioned the figures close to the picture plane, and illuminated them with an intense, tenebristic light. Thus, in contrast to the

\textsuperscript{509} Jones, “Serving the Poor,” 142.
\textsuperscript{510} Ibid., 142, 147.
\textsuperscript{511} Ibid., 142.
\textsuperscript{512} An example of an accurate depiction of Borromeo’s procession through Milan is found in an altarpiece of 1651-1657 by Pietro da Cortona, another artist whose work is represented in the Van Ackeren collection, at the high altar of S. Carlo ai Catinari. The scene shows Borromeo wearing a purple cope and processing with a black cross. For an illustration, see “Plague Imagery,” fig. 19. Carlo Bascapè (1550-1615), who was Novara’s bishop and Borromeo’s secretary and biographer (1592) wrote a letter in 1614 recommending that images of Carlo as a plague saint should depict him in purple penitential clothing and that he was dissatisfied with a painting intended for a Lombard church, which, like the Greenlease painting, depicted Saint Charles wearing scarlet instead of purple. Bascapè’s statement demonstrates the attention contemporary audiences paid to such iconographic particulars. Jones quotes Bascapè in ibid., 70.
narrative scenes of his contemporaries, Grammatica created an iconic devotional image of this important Counter-Reformation saint. This point, together with its horizontal format, suggests also that the painting was likely intended for use in a private residence, rather than a church.

One aspect of this painting’s iconography that is of particular interest and that could further link it to a Roman audience is the way the Holy Nail is depicted. It has never been noted that the relic affixed to the cross does not replicate the shape of the sacro chiodo in Milan, with which Saint Charles is closely associated. Rather, it resembles a related relic in Rome that is housed in the church of S. Croce in Gerusalemme. The story of the sacro chiodo of Milan, also known as the santo chiodo, santo freno, and santo morso, is recounted in The Golden Legend by Jacobus de Voragine. According to this text, 270 years after Christ’s death, Saint Helen, the mother of the Roman emperor Constantine, discovered in Jerusalem the nails used to affix Christ to the cross during his crucifixion. Accounts vary as to whether Helen found three or four nails used in Christ’s crucifixion. She is reported to have taken one or two of these relics and fashioned it/them into a horse bit for her son Constantine, which the people of Milan believe is housed in their cathedral. The nail relic in Milan has a tip that was bent to create a hook through which a metal loop was inserted and from which the relic is suspended upside down. A cylindrical metal band runs along the length of the nail, intertwines around its middle, and then twists and coils at its base. Due to its unusual, curved shape, the nail relic in Milan was believed to be one of those that had belonged to Constantine, and therefore was doubly sacred.
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514 A similar claim is made for another relic, referred to as the Holy Bit of Carpentras at Saint-Siffrein Cathedral in Carpentras, France. For comparative illustrations of the Milan and Carpentras relics, which look nothing alike and do not resemble the nail rendered in Antiveduto’s painting, see Maurice Mauris, "The Iron Smith," The Art Journal (1875-1887) 5 (1879): 202-08. For issues pertaining to the origin and authenticity of Holy Nail relics, see Edith W. Kirsch, "An Early Reliquary of the Holy Nail in Milan," Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz 30, no. 30 (1986): 569, 574; Schofield, "Architecture and the Assertion of the Cult of Relics," 80-84.
In this painting, Grammatica did not replicate this unique form. Instead, he rendered a regularly shaped nail that recalls the shape of the Holy Nail relic at S. Croce in Gerusalemme. A 1741 drawing of the Roman relic shows that it has the same bulbous cap and slightly bent shaft that Grammatica depicted in the Greenlease painting. While Antiveduto’s representation of the Milanese relic is not faithful to the object’s actual appearance, it is not unprecedented in its depiction. For instance, the nail that Marcantonio Bassetti (1586-1630) painted in his altarpiece of c. 1614, entitled *Saint Charles Borromeo Venerating the Holy Nail*, that remains *in situ* at an altar dedicated to Borromeo in the church of S. Sebastiano on Via Appia outside of Rome also bears a striking resemblance to the Roman relic. In contrast, Commodi’s altarpiece at S. Carlo ai Catinari accurately replicates the distinctive contours of Milan’s Holy Nail.515 As noted above, since the Barnabites were historically connected to Milan and stored secondary relics associated with the saint in their church in Rome, it is understandable that they would have commissioned a more accurate portrayal of *sacro chiodo* that was processed in Milan in 1576.516 It seems that those who knew what the relic actually looked like probably would be more insistent on an exact likeness. Whereas, perhaps for Grammatica’s audience, the Holy Nail at S. Croce presented a recognizable substitute for the Milanese relic whose appearance would have been unfamiliar to most in the papal city.517

**Format and Function:** As a result of Saint Charles Borromeo’s popularity, images in which he is depicted proliferated in the form of medals, altarpieces, pamphlets, and devotional works such as

515 Jones, “Serving the Poor,” 142.
516 Ibid., 142, 147.
Grammatica’s. Since he was active in Rome during the early decades of the seventeenth century, Antiveduto probably knew some of the contemporary paintings depicting Saint Charles, particularly the altarpieces at S. Carlo ai Catinari, which was located near the church of the Gesù for which Grammatica had made a painting for the altar-tomb of Saint Ignatius of Loyola. Considering that Antiveduto resided near Saint Peter’s at the time Borromeo was canonized there, he was also likely aware thirty-nine paintings of the saint’s life that Antonio Tempesta (1555-1630) painted for a celebration that took place at Saint Peter’s on the first anniversary of Saint Charles’s canonization. Tempesta’s ephemeral cycle was based upon “Quadroni,” or large canvas paintings, that depicted scenes from the saint’s life and which were hung on the nave piers in Milan’s Duomo when Saint Charles was beatified on 4 November 1602.

Additional images that Grammatica might have known include widely disseminated pamphlets depicting scenes from the saint’s life and portrait medals that were distributed on the day S. Carlo ai Catinari was dedicated. The printed pamphlets featured Saint Charles kneeling before an altar for the Forty Hour devotion and the medal incorporated iconography that Antiveduto used in his painting. To be specific, on its obverse is an image of Saint Charles kneeling with a rope around his neck before the Holy Nail and, on the reverse, two angels hold a banner bearing
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518 For instance, in 1610, the year Saint Charles was canonized, Cesare Bonino created a pamphlet of images of Borromeo, including one that depicts him walking through Milan’s streets, with accompanying text that states: “In occasione della peste il clero e un gran numero di fedeli portano processionalmente il Santissimo Chiodo in una grande croce di legno, con la corda al collo e a piedi scalzi.” (On the occasion of the plague the cleric and a great number of the faithful carried in procession the Holiest Nail on a large wooden cross, with the cord around his neck and with bare feet.) See Cesare Bonino, La vita e i miracoli di San Carlo Borromeo: Tra arte e devozione: Il racconto per immagini di Cesare Bonino (Milan: Jaca Book SpA, 2010), 119; Jones, “Plague Imagery,” 65-79; Jones "Serving the Poor," 185.


520 Ibid., 264-76; Boeckl, Images of Plague, 59; Jones, “Plague Imagery,” 65.

521 For early seventeenth-century examples of the Saint Charles Borromeo pamphlets and medals, see "Serving the Poor," 149.
the word *humilitas*.

Numerous artists, such as the aforementioned Bassetti, Baglioni, Commodi, and Gentileschi, as well as Domenico Fiasella (1589-1669), rendered paintings of Saint Charles Borromeo kneeling before an altar with a cloth frontal and a set of candelabra flanking a Holy Nail affixed to the front of the cross. These scenes typically show an angel sheathing a sword overhead and, sometimes, a countryside vista filled with a grim pile of plague victims. In contrast to these narratives, Grammatica’s composition is iconic, lacks extraneous detail and shows no discernible space. By bathing the figures depicted in a luminous light and pushing them to the foreground in a nondescript setting, the artist created a sense of immediacy for the viewer. The format presented in the Greenlease painting, with one brown-haired angel and one blonde one that flank the saint and hold identifying attributes, is repeated in Antiveduto’s painting of Saint Cecilia in Lisbon, mentioned above, as well as in a larger devotional work, entitled *Mary Magdalene at the Tomb* (Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg). The formulaic approach exemplified in these formats adheres to a style that was popular during the Counter-Reformation and which was designed to encourage piety.

**Context:** Accounts of how the Holy Nail was rediscovered and brought to Milan vary. Either
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522 In 2008, Pamela Jones convincingly argued that many contemporary images of the saint were likely based upon the painting by Gaspare Celio (1571-1640). Related works Jones discussed include an altarpiece of c. 1614 that Marcantonio Bassetti (1586-1630) painted and that remains in situ on an altar dedicated to Saint Charles Borromeo in the church of S. Sebastiano on the Via Appia in Rome and the aforementioned altarpiece by Commodi.

523 For a convincing argument of how these contemporary images of the saint were likely based upon the painting by Gaspare Celio (1571-1640) that was the first altarpiece at S. Carlo ai Catinari, which, as stated above, was the first church dedicated to Borromeo in Rome after his canonization in 1610, see Jones, “Plague Imagery,” 65-96.

524 Saint Cecilia, patron saint of musicians, is featured with instruments; Mary Magdalene who found Christ’s tomb empty, sits near Christ’s sepulcher.

525 The *Mary Magdalene at the Tomb* measures 120 x 157 cm. For the Magdalene painting, see Papi, *Grammatica*, 72, 118.
the Roman emperor Theodosius (347-395 CE) gave Milan’s fourth-century archbishop and patron saint, Ambrose, the relic, or the cleric came across it in a shop in Rome. Regardless of how Saint Ambrose obtained the Holy Nail, he then transported the sacred object from Rome to Milan, where he placed it in the cathedral of S. Tecla. This church had a particular relevance to the *sacro chiodo*, because it was founded in 345 during the reign of Constantius (r. 337-361), who was Constantine’s son and Saint Helen’s grandson. The Holy Nail remained in that church until 1461, at which time the bishop of Forli, Charles II, translated the relic to its present location in Milan Cathedral, which replaced S. Tecla as Milan’s Duomo and where it is suspended 141 feet over the church’s choir.526 Borromeo considered the relic’s location over the choir problematic because it made it impossible to view the Holy Nail. After processing it through the streets of Milan in 1576, he sought to increase visual access to the holy object. He held a series of councils in his diocese in which architecture and furniture that were appropriate for a church, as well as the storage and presentation of relics, were discussed. In 1577 Borromeo published his directives in a two-volume text, entitled *Instructiones fabricae et supellectilis ecclesiasticae*.527 Borromeo stipulated that the Holy Nail was to be processed annually on the 3 May feast of the Invention of the Cross and that a celebration of the Forty-Hour veneration should follow.528 Before Cardinal Borromeo intervened, the relic was hardly ever lowered from its perch.529

In 1578 Borromeo officially proclaimed the plague to have ended after it had claimed

527 For full translation of Borromeo’s directives, see Voelker, "Instructiones."
529 Ibid.; Schofield, "Architecture and the Assertion of the Cult of Relics." 94. Today the Holy Nail is lowered for special occasions with the “nivola,” a seventeenth-century fictive cloud on a pulley that supports a reliquary.
over 18,000 lives in the city since 1576.\footnote{11 August 1576 marks the official beginning of the plague in Milan. Compared to Florence and Venice, where nearly half of the population was lost, Milan did not suffer as greatly. This circumstance also added to Borromeo’s reputation for his effectiveness in combatting the plague. See Borromeo, \textit{Memoriale ai milanesi di Carlo Borromeo}: xxvii, 117; Voelker, "Instructiones," 31.} Fittingly, Borromeo made this proclamation in front of the church of Saint Sebastian on that plague saint’s feast day of 20 January.\footnote{Jones, "Plague Imagery," 67-68.} During his address, the thirty-eight-year-old cardinal, who by this time had served as Milan’s archbishop for twelve years, advised his audience to be grateful, not only for Saint Sebastian’s intercession, but also for the role the \textit{sacro chiodo} played in ending the pestilence.\footnote{Borromeo, \textit{Memoriale ai milanesi di Carlo Borromeo}, xxvii, 144, 157; Schofield, "Architecture and the Assertion of the Cult of Relics," 95.} Thereafter, Saint Charles promoted the veneration of the Holy Nail as a spiritual remedy for a plague, which many believed God had sent as punishment for sinful behavior and for which limited medical treatment existed.\footnote{For prayer as an effective cure for the plague, see "Architecture and the Assertion of the Cult of Relics," 79; Bailey et al., \textit{Hope and Healing}, 45-64, 17-79; Jones, "Serving the Poor," 137.} The Greenlease painting exemplifies his devotion to that relic, a devotion its viewers were intended to emulate.

\textit{Conclusion:} This painting of c. 1620 by Antiveduto Grammatica depicts an important Counter-Reformation saint, Charles Borromeo. He wears a scarlet \textit{mozzetta} to indicate his clerical status as a cardinal and the halo that hovers over his head references his canonization, which occurred on 4 November 1610 a decade prior to this painting’s creation. Grammatica’s accurate rendering of Borromeo’s visage exemplifies the painter’s talent for rendering portraits. Coupled with the dramatic use of tenebrism in this scene and the figure’s placement close to the picture plane, the artist’s portrayal must have created for the contemporary devotee a sense of immediacy, which conformed to the tastes and prescription of religious art in Counter-Reformation Rome. The
size, shape, and fine quality of this painting indicate that it was likely displayed in a Roman palazzo that belonged to a wealthy patron like Cardinal Del Monte, who favored Grammatica’s work and displayed it prominently in his residence.

The scene incorporates an iconography that is typical for Saint Charles, including a rope, angel sheathing a sword, and a cross with the Holy Nail affixed to the front. These attributes reference the 1576 penitential procession that Saint Charles led through Milan to ward off the plague that was afflicting the city, as Pope Gregory the Great had done in Rome a millennium prior, carrying a cross and wearing a rope around his neck. Following the procession of Milan’s prized relic of the Holy Nail, the sacro chiodo, Saint Charles led a Forty Hour veneration, which is also represented in this scene that emphasizes the saint as a devotional exemplar. As we have seen above for the first time, the shape of the Holy Nail depicted in this painting conforms to that of a related relic in Rome at the church of S. Croce in Gerusalemme, rather than the particular shape of the sacro chiodo in Milan with which Saint Charles is associated. It seems in its depiction here that the Roman relic served as a recognizable substitute for the Milanese relic, whose appearance would have been unfamiliar to most in the papal city.
PIETRO BERRETINI, also called PIETRO DA CORTONA

b. Cortona, 1597 - d. Rome, 1669

Pietro Berrettini, known as Pietro da Cortona, was the sole surviving child of Francesca Balestrari (d. 1628) and Giovanni di Lucca Berrettini (1561-1621). In the family’s hometown of Cortona in the region of Tuscany, Pietro’s father worked as a stonemason and his uncle, Francesco (d. 1608), and cousin, Filippo (1582-1644), were architects and builders. This early exposure to the family profession must have inspired the young Berrettini, because, in addition to developing into a fine painter, he proved also to be a talented and successful architect who undertook several major architectural projects. Pietro’s formal training as a painter began with a minor, local artist, Baccio Bonetti, who worked primarily as a copyist. Bonetti completed a few undistinguished altarpieces in Cortona, in part, because the city’s more prestigious commissions were awarded to outside artists. Pietro’s next instructor, Andrea Commodi (1560-1638), was one of those outside artists who worked periodically in Cortona. By the age of fourteen, Cortona was apprenticed to Commodi and was training in his Florentine workshop. In
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534 Jörg Martin Merz, “Cortona Giovane,” in Pietro da Cortona, 1597-1669, ed. Anna Lo Bianco (Milan: Electa, 1997), 55. Merz explains that Pietro da Cortona’s birthdate was originally thought to have been 1 November 1596 because of the date inscribed upon his tombstone. However, his baptism is recorded as 27 November 1597. Since baptisms took place close to birth, it is likely that the tombstone date is incorrect. Therefore, 1597 is now accepted as the year of his birth.


537 For the artist’s early years training, see Merz, "Cortona Giovane," 55; "Pietro da Cortona," 905-08; Giuliano Briganti, Pietro da Cortona: O della pittura barocca (Florence: Sansoni, 1982), 37-54.

538 Commodi periodically worked in Cortona between 1603 and 1616. See Merz, "Pietro da Cortona," 906-07.
1612, Pietro followed the master to Rome, where he continued to work in his atelier.\textsuperscript{539} Commodi’s compositions included architectural landscapes of the type that Cortona later incorporated into his own paintings.\textsuperscript{540} When he left Rome for a period, the master arranged for his student Pietro to transfer to the workshop of his friend Baccio Ciarpi (1578-1644).\textsuperscript{541}

Cortona’s work demonstrates classical overtones likely fostered through his study of antiquity, which began in Florence during his apprenticeship with Commodi, when he was introduced to a late humanist culture.\textsuperscript{542} In Rome, his studies continued as he came into direct contact with the remnants of antiquity, for instance at the Belvedere part of the Vatican Palace, which housed numerous examples of antique sculpture and which he visited frequently.\textsuperscript{543} The young Cortona also cultivated a friendship with the Roman antiquarian, Cassiano dal Pozzo (1588-1657), which may have further kindled his interest in classical culture. Cassiano, who was Cardinal Francesco Barberini’s secretary, encouraged the fledgling artist to contribute to his “paper museum,” a collection of drawings of ancient Roman works.\textsuperscript{544} Cortona obliged his friend making numerous drawings for him. As a consequence, his close observation of antique works seems to have contributed to his early compositions, which recalled antique sculptural friezes and featured classically-inspired figures.

\textsuperscript{539} Merz, "Cortona Giovane," 55-58; Briganti, "Pietro da Cortona."
\textsuperscript{540} Merz, "Cortona Giovane," 55.\textsuperscript{541} Maurizio Fagiolo dell’Arco, Pietro da Cortona e i "cortoneschi": Bilancio di un centenario e qualche novità (Rome: Bulzoni editore, 1998), 23. According to an early biographer’s account, when the youth moved to Ciarpi’s workshop, he arrived with the reputation of a “testa d’asino,” or slow learner. If indeed this was true, apparently he outgrew it, because in a letter he wrote to Cortona on 22 September 1634, Commodi graciously acknowledged that the former pupil had superseded his master. See Luigi Pellegrini, Le finezze de' pennelli italiani ammirate e studiate da Girapeno sotto la scorta e disciplina, ed. Guido Giubbini (Milan: Edizioni Labor, 1965), 40; Merz, “Cortona Giovane,” 56.\textsuperscript{542} Briganti, “Pietro da Cortona”; Merz, “Pietro da Cortona,” 906, 910.\textsuperscript{543} Briganti, "Pietro da Cortona.”\textsuperscript{544} Merz, "Pietro da Cortona,” 906. Pozzo also commissioned a few paintings from Cortona, but he was primarily a friend and intellectual mentor to the artist.
As a painter and architect, Cortona counted among his patrons three of the seventeenth century’s most important and influential popes: Urban VIII (r. 1623-44), Innocent X (r. 1644-55), and Alexander VII (r. 1655-67), as well as Urban VIII’s nephew, Cardinal Francesco Barberini, and such prominent Roman families as the Colonna, Sacchetti, and Mattei. Indeed, the artist’s first commission was for the Colonna family’s mausoleum in Paliano, for which he completed an altarpiece that featured portraits of family members in a scene of Christ’s resurrection. He was paid for his work on this project in 1623, which was the same year that Pietro was hired to fresco trompe l’oeil bronze medallions in a gallery at the Palazzo Mattei di Giove in Rome. Observing the young man’s talent, the family’s patriarch, Asdrubale Mattei, decided to expand the painter’s responsibilities to include four of six Solomon scenes slated to be painted on the gallery’s vaulted ceiling. Around this same period, artist biographer Giulio Mancini (1558-1630) described the young Cortona as a rising star.

After painting the Palazzo Mattei frescoes, the pace of Cortona’s career quickened. He became a favorite artist of the prominent Sacchetti family, who commissioned from him large canvases (1625-26) that are now in the Palazzo Sacchetti in Rome, and hired him not only to construct their villa at Castelfusano near Ostia, but also to decorate its chapel and galleries (1625-29). The family was closely aligned with Urban VIII, which allowed Cortona access to the pope’s inner circle. He subsequently obtained papal commissions and met Cardinal

---

545 Ibid., 909-10.  
546 Ibid., 906.  
Francesco Barberini, who became one of his primary patrons. The cardinal engaged Cortona as both an architect and painter, and financed his first big commission, a double monument for John Barclay and Bernardo Guglielmi at the church of S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura. Additionally, he recommended him to paint the Trinity altarpiece in the Sacrament Chapel at Saint Peter’s in Rome. Cortona’s work on the latter commission, which started on 4 February 1628, was contemporary with Bernini’s baldacchino (1623-34) and proved pivotal in solidifying his reputation. Six years later Cortona was elected principe, or president, of the Roman artists’ guild, the Accademia di S. Luca. In 1637, he travelled with the Sacchetti to Florence for the wedding of Ferdinand II, Grand Duke of Tuscany and Vittoria della Rovere. While in Florence, Cortona began to paint a program of frescoes for the grand duke at the Palazzo Pitti, which he completed between 1640 and 1647, when he later resided in Florence for a period. During periodic trips to Rome, he also worked on the Gran Salone at the Barberini family’s palazzo, where he painted the fresco entitled *Four Ages of Man*. After 1647 Cortona completed frescoes at the Chiesa Nuova and for the dome of S. Andrea della Valle and in the Palazzo Pamphilj in Piazza Navona (1651-54). In the last decade of his life, Pietro’s pictorial style incorporated expressive gestures and a more ethereal sense of light as seen in the altarpiece of 1667 that depicts *Saint Carlo Borromeo Carrying the Holy Nail in Procession during the Plague*
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552 Ibid.
553 Briganti, "Pietro da Cortona."
556 Ibid., 910.
at the church of S. Carlo ai Catinari in Rome. Among his important architectural projects are the façades of the churches of S. Maria della Pace (1656-67), S. Maria in Via Lata (c. 1660), and SS. Luca e Martina (1664). The latter, for which Cortona designed the crypt and financed the cost of its renovation, was affiliated with the Accademia di S. Luca. On 16 May 1669, Pietro da Cortona died at the age of seventy-two and was buried at the church of SS. Luca e Martina.

During his lifetime, Pietro da Cortona oversaw a large studio in Rome and his major paintings were engraved and disseminated across Europe. As we have seen above, early in Cortona’s career, contemporary audiences recognized his talent and he attracted an impressive list of patrons who sought him out for their commissions. Despite the high esteem in which Cortona was held during his lifetime, the following centuries saw a decline in the popularity of his work. As with other artists of the period, this fall from favor coincided with that of the baroque style.

The first exhibition dedicated to Pietro Berrettini of Cortona took place in 1896 in his hometown. From the 1960s on, a number of dissertations and other studies have focused on various aspects of his output, including his architectural projects, tapestry designs, anatomical drawings, and the frescoes that he painted at the Barberini, Mattei di Giove, Pamphilj, and Pitti palaces. Because of the painting that is the subject of this entry, it is important to note that
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557 Ibid., 910; Pamela M. Jones, “Serving the Poor Sick with Humility, from the Lazaretto of Milan to the Hospitals of Rome: Andrea Commodi’s S. Carlo Borromeo Venerating the Holy Nail (c. 1621-22) in the Church of S. Carlo ai Catinari,” in Altarpieces and Their Viewers in the Churches of Rome from Caravaggio to Guido Reni (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2008), 137-200.
558 Ibid., 911.
560 Ibid., 912.
561 Mancini, Considerazioni, 1: 262.
studies of Cortona’s paintings include monographs on the artist by Giorgio Briganti (1962, 1982) and Jörg Martin Merz (1991). These texts focus primarily on issues related to the attribution, dating, and style of Cortona’s oeuvre. From October 1997 to June 1998, Anna Lo Bianco curated an exhibition that Rome’s Soprintendenza per i beni Artistici e Storici (Superintendency for Artistic and Historical Heritage) sponsored in honor of the 400th anniversary of Pietro da Cortona’s birth that took place at the Palazzo Venezia in Rome from October 1997 to June 1998. That show and its accompanying exhibition catalog included The Birth of the Virgin that belongs to the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art. In her essay on the painting, Lo Bianco argued that Pietro da Cortona created this painting early in his career. Her brief catalog entry leaves a great deal of room for further discussion of this work. Therefore, the present study will further the arguments of Lo Bianco and that of Briganti, who also assigned this work to Cortona in his early years, by presenting additional comparisons with works firmly attributed to the artist that these two scholars did not take into consideration. It will also provide the first contextual analysis of Cortona’s painting by situating it within its probable original domestic setting.

4. Pietro Berrettini called Pietro da Cortona

*The Birth of the Virgin*

C. 1620-24

Oil on canvas

130 x 96 cm (51 x 37 ¾ in.)

A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family

---


*Description:* This scene of the Virgin Mary’s birth presents four female attendants in the foreground preparing a bath for the newborn. In the background, Mary’s mother, Saint Anne, recovers from labor with the help of two women, while her husband, Joachim, gazes at his wife from the end of her bed. The grey-haired Joachim, who is Anne’s husband and Mary’s father, has a beard and wears a dark cloak, the color of which is indiscernible. He stands in profile before a pastoral vista that extends into the distance in the upper left corner of the composition. The bed has crimson curtains that part in the center and wrap loosely around the thick, wooden poster, which forms the scene’s central axis. Saint Anne is cloaked in a camel-hued wrap and positioned in front of the dark partition of a red, curtained backdrop. Her dark-circled eyes and wan face emphasize her current delicate state. Two women turn toward the new mother, one faces away from the viewer, while the other appears frontally to offer a cream-colored ceramic bowl that is decorated with a simple blue, vegetal pattern. Mary’s mother is propped up in a well-appointed bed with ivory linens, and a gold coverlet with a matching bed skirt. A burgundy band of fabric with white, embroidered, intertwining grapes and leaves borders the top edge of the bulky, brown mattress upon which Saint Anne reclines. Joachim, Saint Anne, and the infant Mary are identified as a family in two ways. They are arranged in a unified, triangular composition and each has a thin gold halo, although the newborn’s is no longer visible.

The composition of the painting’s foreground complements that of the background. On the far left, the young attendant mirrors Joachim’s pose. She stands in profile and is stationed in front of the bucolic scenery as she observes the activity opposite. To the right, the newborn is aligned vertically with her mother and is positioned similarly, with two attendants flanking her as she rests upon a white sheet, surrounded with an abundance of rich, red fabric. Other unifying
elements include the repetition of decorative bands and use of a limited palette of red, gold, burgundy, white, and beige. The standing attendant wears the most elaborate clothing with gold embroidered trim that traces her rectangular neckline and that cuts diagonally across her deep mustard-colored overskirt. The artist coordinated the women’s clothing to work well compositionally. For instance, the three women tending to Mary wear fabric that has similar gold tones on a skirt, sleeve, shawl, ribbon, and turban. The horizontal repetition of color unifies the trio visually. The fourth woman on the far right, who peers over the shoulder of the woman in front of her, wears a dark bodice with a rectangular neckline whose color corresponds with that of the garments of the girl who stands opposite. The folds of the former attendant’s outer dress, or gonna, are rendered with a sense of heft. The camicia, a white linen shirt worn closest to the skin, escapes at varying lengths from underneath each woman’s bodice and is rolled up at the forearm to prevent its sleeves from getting damp during the child’s bath. The faces of the four attendants in the foreground are presented in profile with softly contoured eyebrows that arch over their rose-tinted eyelids, which are lowered over their darkened and recessed eyes. Their skin is ivory-toned and their cheeks pink. Some of the women have russet-colored ribbons threaded through their brown hair or their tresses are braided and coiled into buns at the back of their necks. Others wear a turban or have hair that is rolled into a loop at the back of the head that is covered in burgundy fabric with white stripes.

The assistants work as a team to prepare the bath for the infant Mary. The woman on the far right balances the nude baby along her left forearm as she tests the temperature of the water, swishing it with her right hand. The edge of her fringed shawl is carefully tucked into her bust, so as not to let it fall into the wide-brimmed, earthen-colored wash basin placed on the ground near the composition’s center foreground. Her ruby dress is the same color as the sumptuous bed
curtains behind her. To her right, another helper kneels and tilts a burgundy urn decorated with
gold detailing, pouring water into a low basin with a wide lip that may once have appeared
bronze in color, but now is tan. The young female standing on the left observes the bath’s
preparation as she waits for directions to hand over either the vessel hanging from its handle in
her right hand or the carefully folded towels with two neatly stitched rows of blue thread
balanced on her left arm.

In general, the foreground figures are rendered in more detail than those in the
background. Also, there are some inconsistencies in anatomical proportion for Saint Anne and
her two attendants. Some issues with proportion are evident in the right arms of two figures, the
attendant offering Saint Anne a bowl and the woman, who holds a kerchief and stands as she
leans over the Infant Mary. The right hands of both seem oddly placed and anatomically
incorrect. The upper left corner of the painting is so darkened that it is difficult to discern clearly
what is rendered. It appears that there is a pastoral vista visible through a window a tall cypress
that forms a central, vertical axis. On the left near the painting’s edge there is another tall
cypress, and on the right, near the window’s inner edge, a tree’s leafy bough. Behind the trees
and an area of bushes is what appears to be a large, rectangular, marble pedestal, or perhaps, a
sarcophagus. If it is the latter, it possibly could foreshadow the death of Mary’s son, Jesus
Christ. In the distance there are gently rolling hills beneath wispy gray clouds that part to reveal
a pink sky.

Condition Description: The varnish in the upper left quadrant of the painting has darkened with
age and appears noticeably murkier than in the rest of this work. Damage to the paint film has
resulted in the loss of figural modeling of the infant Mary and her attendant. Mary’s face is the
most abraded part of the canvas, with her nose and lips barely visible and her eyes appearing like
two dark holes and the basin in the foreground appears abraded, which may account for its relatively flat shape. There is a half-circle traced above Mary’s head that shows she once had a halo. The apparent surface damage is likely due to aggressive cleaning treatment. Ultraviolet light (UV light) indicates that the vertical stripes on the upper portion of the bed’s drapes have been repainted. UV light also exposes areas of in-painting on the outer edge of the left sleeve of the attendant standing on the far right, on the right hand of the attendant pouring water, and on the face, sternum, and right arm of the woman who holds Mary. Moreover, UV light shows areas that appear to have been scratched and where pigment has been applied to repair damage. Further in-painting appears in a small section of negative space to the right of the right shoulder of Mary’s attendant and in a horizontal band that measures approximately 2 cm (.787 in.) in height and 4 cm (1.57 in.) in width, that runs above and parallel to the bath. In-painting is also evident under UV light on the right arm of the girl standing on the composition’s left side, on the urn that she holds, and in the negative space to the right of her purple skirt, where there is a circular patch of paint loss, measuring approximately 2 cm (.787 in.) in diameter, that has been repaired. The face, clothing, and the linens of the attendant standing on the left, as well as the faces of the woman pouring the water and the one standing behind Mary, appear untouched.

_Attribution and Date:_ The first scholarly mention of the Greenlease Gallery’s _Birth of the Virgin_ appears in Briganti’s 1962 monograph on Pietro da Cortona, when he stated that “senza alcun dubbio,” or “without a doubt,” this painting is a very early work by Cortona, a position that he maintained when the monograph was re-published two decades later.\(^{566}\) When Anna Lo Bianco

\(^{566}\) Briganti, _Catalogo ragionato_, 164, fig. 24.
assessed it in 1998, she agreed with Briganti’s attribution of this painting to Cortona. Merz’s 1991 monograph on Cortona does not include this work, perhaps because he was unaware of its whereabouts. Those who have questioned Cortona’s authorship of this work include art critic Maurizio Fagiolo dell’Arco, who doubted the Tuscan painter executed it in his review of the 1998 exhibition in Rome, but did not provide any substantive evidence to support his claim, and conservator Henry Tully Moss (1988) and art historian Burton Dunbar (1996), who both associated the painting with Cortona’s atelier. The latter two considered that the disparity between the foreground figure on the left, which shows a high level of dexterity and detail in its rendering, and the remaining figures suggests that this painting was a product of Cortona’s workshop. Specifically, Dunbar pointed out that the infant Mary and the bowl show a lack of skilled brushwork, but he also acknowledged that over-cleaning in those areas may have rid the surface of much of its detail, which may account for the apparent discrepancy. There are a variety of reasons that support Briganti’s and Lo Bianco’s attributions of the small canvas to Cortona. A closer look at the comparisons that they made between this painting and others securely attributed to Cortona will affirm that Cortona created the Greenlease painting. In addition, other relevant works by Cortona that have not yet been connected to this image will be considered as further evidence of his authorship.

Briganti observed that The Birth of the Virgin was stylistically related to Cortona’s early output of 1620-24. In particular, he compared it to the frescoes that Cortona painted at the Palazzo Mattei di Giove in Rome, as well as some of the first commissions that the artist

567 For the painting’s exhibition entry, see Anna Lo Bianco, Pietro da Cortona, 1597-1669 (Milan: Electa, 1997), 301, fig. 14.
568 Merz, Pietro da Cortona: Der Aufstieg.
completed for the Sacchetti family, such as the *Aurora* (Campidoglio, Palazzo Senatorio, Rome), *The Oath of Semiramide* (Collection of Denis Mahon, London), and especially *The Sacrifice of Polissena* (Pinacoteca Capitolina, Rome).¹⁵⁷⁰ For the Mattei frescoes, Briganti did not specify in what way they compared with *The Birth of the Virgin*. Perhaps he noticed that the figure standing behind Saint Anne in the Greenlease painting is repeated as a turbaned woman who holds a knife and faces the main female protagonist in *The Oath of Semiramide* and as another female, who appears just to the left, and behind, King Solomon in *Solomon Adoring the Idols*.¹⁵⁷¹ All three figures share the same concentrated look and have closely set eyes and eyebrows, thickened noses, small mouths, and creased chins that accent oval faces. When Briganti noted that this painting was especially similar in style to the aforementioned *Sacrifice of Polissena*, he was probably referencing the young attendant standing on the left side of the painting sacrificial scene that finds her twin in the attendant who stands in a comparable spot in the Greenlease example.¹⁵⁷² Both figures have a nearly identical facial profiles and their clothing is similar, with bodices worn close to the torsos, voluminous, gauzy white sleeves, and overskirts with diagonal borders that drape over a longer, slim skirt underneath. Also, Joachim resembles the bearded figures that appear in the Mattei frescoes, particularly in the paintings of Solomon and Queen of Sheba, and in the Semiramide scene.¹⁵⁷³ For the figures that he renders from a back or side angle, the artist applied a prominent, peach-colored highlight that curves along the ear’s outer edge that suggests that these works share an author.

In her assessment of this work, Lo Bianco agreed with Briganti’s attribution and date for

---

¹⁵⁷³ Lo Bianco, *Pietro da Cortona*, 304, fig. 16.
the painting and noted that the female attendants depicted in the *Birth of the Virgin* closely mirror the women depicted in the Palazzo Mattei frescoes.\(^{574}\) She also observed that the frieze-like positioning of the foreground figures, which recalls antique sculptural reliefs, and the portrayals of Saint Anne and her attendant in the background, which mimic classical marble, busts, align with Cortona’s early compositions, which demonstrate his interest in antiquity. Lo Bianco also observed that the figures’ dark, concave eyes in this scene exemplify the period’s stylistic approach to facial physiognomy.\(^{575}\) Additionally, Lo Bianco likened the Greenlease painting to a similarly-titled work of 1643 that Cortona completed for the church of S. Filippo in Perugia, noting that, despite their differences in iconography and style, these works are compositionally similar.\(^{576}\) Both paintings portray a trio of women caring for the infant Mary in the foreground, with Saint Anne propped up in a sumptuous bed with curtains drawn open in the background and an architectural landscape in the distance. In the Perugia scene, the bath is over and the basin is pushed to the side as the attendants prepare to swaddle the infant Mary, Joachim is not included, and Anne’s bed is positioned on the opposite side of the canvas, which sets up a diagonal line between mother in the upper left corner and the daughter in the lower right that creates a deeper space. Otherwise the scenes are quite similar and Lo Bianco’s theory that the Greenlease work inspired the 1643 composition seems reasonable.\(^{577}\)

There are elements in the painting that correspond to other paintings by Pietro da Cortona

---

\(^{574}\) Ibid.

\(^{575}\) Ibid., 301.

\(^{576}\) Ibid., 301, 359, fig. 49. The painting belongs to the Galleria Nazionale in Perugia. A drawing in the Kunstmuseum of Düsseldorf depicts the same theme, but is more complex iconographically than the Van Ackeren painting, which led Lo Bianco to associate it with the Perugia example.

\(^{577}\) There is a study by Cortona for the *Birth of the Virgin* altarpiece of 1643 that he painted for the Chiesa Nuova in Perugia at the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York. See the library’s website for object with accession no. 1975.3. The pen and brown ink drawing consists of a rapid sketch of the attendants in the foreground on the right, Saint Anne in her bed with an attendant at her side in the composition’s upper left corner, and opposite, a window is traced with a maid holding a pitcher scurrying in front.
but that have not been previously taken into consideration. For instance, the dedication of approximately one-quarter of the composition to a pastoral scene that displays classical architecture in the distance is typical in Cortona’s oeuvre, as seen in the 1643 scene mentioned above.\textsuperscript{578} Also, there are similar fabric patterns and garment embellishments in this scene that are repeated in other of his works. For instance, the fringed shawl that the attendant holding the infant Mary wears in the Greenlease example is almost identical to one that is draped around the shoulders of a woman standing in the crowd in the aforementioned painting of Solomon and the bed canopy stripes are quite close to the striped pattern on a shawl that appears in \textit{Salome and the Queen of Sheba}.\textsuperscript{579} The tapestry-like band that cuts diagonally across the skirt of the girl standing on the left in the Van Ackeren painting reappears in a painting entitled \textit{S. Filippo Neri Cures the Gout of Clement VIII} (Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence).\textsuperscript{580} The band hangs as a vertical swath on the curtained wall behind the pope who is depicted in a setting, which mirrors that of the \textit{Birth of the Virgin}. The Uffizi painting shows the pope sitting at the edge of a luxuriously draped bed with red curtains opening theatrically and a haloed saint standing at the left near the bedposts, just as Joachim stands attentively near Saint Anne’s bed.\textsuperscript{581}

In addition to the recurrence of specific fabric, Cortona’s corpus shows a repetition of complex coiffeurs involving loose strands of hair around the face, braided hair piled in circles at the back of the head, and ribbons as headbands. For instance, the artist reprises in other works a hair accessory that the woman standing over Mary wears. It consists of a striped, burgundy and ivory-colored fabric that forms a donut-type loop on the back of the head. We see similarly

\textsuperscript{578} For illustrations of examples, see Lo Bianco, "Pietro da Cortona 1597-1669," 295, 303-04, 309, 313, 315, 317, 339; figs. 10, 16, 19, 21-23, 34, 37, 49.
\textsuperscript{579} Briganti, \textit{Catalogo ragionato}, 62, fig. 43.
\textsuperscript{580} Lo Bianco, \textit{Pietro da Cortona}, 355, fig. 46.
\textsuperscript{581} Ibid., 354-55.
coiffed figures in two paintings of *The Adultress* (Private collection, Paris; Castello, Schleissheim), as well as on the head of a woman carrying hay on her head in the fresco, *Age of Silver* (Palazzo Pitti, Florence). Similarly, in the lower right corner of the Solomon scene, a woman, who stands with her back to the viewer, has her hair bound up on in the same manner.582

While the infant Mary’s left forearm in the Van Ackeren painting appears distended and, thus, may seem inexpertly rendered, the same peculiarity appears in Cortona’s *Adoration of the Shepherds* of 1625 (Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica, Palazzo Barberini, Rome).583 That scene portrays a partially swaddled Christ child lying on a bed of hay with his left arm modeled identically to that of the Greenlease Mary, and, although Christ faces outwardly towards the viewer, his facial features, as well as the contours of his head and hairline, resemble those of his mother as an infant. Further validation of the Van Ackeren painting’s authorship that has not previously been identified, is evident in a comparison between the sleeves of the attendants depicted in the Van Ackeren painting and the four sleeves sketched in a preparatory drawing for a *Return of Hagar* (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna).584 In the sketch, Cortona traced white crayon to create highlights over black charcoal, forming a contrast along dark crevices with triangular and wishbone shapes, which are replicated in the fabric folds formed on the right sleeves at the elbows of the two attendants who are positioned in the foreground on the right. Additionally, the right sleeve of the girl standing with a pitcher and the elbow area of the woman pouring the water is the same as the sleeves sketched in the upper left and right corners, respectively, of the Louvre drawing. Cortona’s early drawings also show a particular interest in rendering embellished fabric, elaborate hairstyles, and classical profiles, all of which are

emphasized in Birth of the Virgin.

Considering the comparisons that Briganti and Lo Bianco made in determining this work’s authorship, as well as the additional evidence noted above, this painting exemplifies, in terms of composition, use of decorative elements, and figural rendering, the work of the artist at an early stage in his career, that is between 1620 and 1624, as Briganti first suggested. Therefore, Lo Bianco and Briganti were correct in proposing that Pietro da Cortona painted the Greenlease Birth of the Virgin between 1620 and 1624.

Provenance: Lo Bianco notes that a possible early reference to this painting appears in a 1737 inventory that records paintings in the cortile, or courtyard, of the church of S. Giovanni Decollato in Rome. The list identifies a Birth of the Virgin by Pietro da Cortona that shows many figures and measures “palmi 5 e 10 per alto,” or five hand lengths in width and ten in height, a description that approximates this work. However, no patron or previous history of this work is mentioned, so a link between the painting and that description cannot be confirmed. When Briganti assessed this painting in 1962, and again in 1982, it belonged to a private collection in England, and before that it was in private hands in Rome. By 23 June 1987 the painting had been acquired by the New York art dealer, French and Company, Inc., because at that time its representative, Robert Samuels, Jr. had begun to communicate with Father Maurice Van Ackeren regarding selling this picture to Rockhurst. In February of 1988 Virginia Greenlease provided the funds for Father Van Ackeren to purchase Cortona’s Birth of the Virgin, which she immediately donated to Rockhurst University.

586 Briganti, Catalogo ragionato, 164, fig. 24.
In 1996, Rockhurst honored a request from Rome’s Soprintendenza per i Beni Artistici e Storici, to include the Birth of the Virgin in the above-cited exhibition celebrating the 400th anniversary of Pietro da Cortona’s birth. The show took place at the Palazzo Venezia from October 1997 to June 1998.588

Iconography: The Virgin Mary’s birth was considered miraculous, because her parents, Anne and Joachim, were elderly when their daughter was conceived without sin.589 Indeed, Joachim and Anne are depicted in this scene with gray hair and Anne’s stooped posture also betrays her age. As patron saint of married couples, Anne was considered an effective intercessor, particularly for issues pertaining to pregnancy and child health.590 Also, the image of her as a new mother resting comfortably in a contemporary luxurious setting would have likely helped pregnant females prepare spiritually and mentally for the physical duress of labor, while also offering the women and their concerned families hope for a successful outcome.591

This scene is also related to the Immaculate Conception, the theological concept that Christ’s mother was conceived without sin, making her a worthy vessel to carry the Savior in her womb.592 According to tradition, Mary was born on a Tuesday in Jerusalem at the home of her

588 Claudio Strinati to Verna L. Rutz, 24 April 1996, Pietro da Cortona: Loans file, GGA; “Rockhurst College Loans Painting to Exhibition,” Rockhurst Newsletter, Van Ackeren file, box 209, GLA.
590 Brandenburg, "Saint Anne," 54-56; Nixon, Mary's Mother, 71.
592 The subject of the Immaculate Conception is explored further in cat. nos. 5, 9, 13. For quick reference, see also Nixon, Mary's Mother, 13-15.
parents, Anne and Joachim. Cortona portrays the newborn and her mother in a sumptuously appointed apartment displaying the décor of a seventeenth-century camera, or bedroom, in a Roman palazzo furnished with a rich assemblage of fabrics, furniture, and vessels. Mary is prominently placed in the foreground, her tiny, nude body ceremonially presented on a white cloth and the juxtaposition of that cloth and the voluminous crimson skirt of the attendant upon whose lap Mary rests creates a color contrast that draws the viewer’s eye toward the infant.

Context: Although it has been suggested that the painting was located at S. Giovanni Decollato, it is perhaps more likely that it once hung in a home. According to art historian Frances Gage, next to painted frescoes, piture amovibili, or portable paintings, such as this oil-on-canvas work, were the most popular form of decoration for palazzo walls in Seicento Rome. In the display of such works in a sala, those of religious subject, categorized as devote, were often interspersed with secular, or allegre, ones. While this painting might have appeared in a grand audience room, considering the intimate nature of its subject, it is more likely that it was displayed in a private chapel or in a camera, for which it would have been particularly well-suited.

Patricia Waddy and Stephanie Leone have contributed greatly to our understanding of the construction and interior décor of the Roman Seicento palazzo. As they describe, in most early modern Italian palaces, the camera (bedroom) would have been located on the piano nobile, or the first story above the ground floor, and situated farthest from the staircase, at the end of a

---

593 Warner, Alone of All Her Sex, 31; Brandenburg, "Saint Anne," 32-36; J. P. Asselin, "Anne and Joachim, SS.," in New Catholic Encyclopedia, ed. Berard L. Marthaler (Washington, DC: Thomson Gale in association with the Catholic University of America, 2003), 1: 469; Nixon, Mary’s Mother, 12-13. The site of Mary’s childhood home is thought to be located underneath the church of Saint Anne at Beaupré, built during the fifth century
595 Ibid., 206-07.
string of connected rooms.\textsuperscript{596} A palazzo’s walls typically had large windows for light and ventilation.\textsuperscript{597} In Cortona’s painting, there is a window situated on the left side and the view through that window shows a landscape with antique ruins, which firmly ties the setting to Rome. The most dominant feature of an Italian Baroque camera was an enormous letto, or bed, that typically measured approximately three meters in width.\textsuperscript{598} In this case, the type depicted is a letto a trabacca (four-poster bed), which, as the chamber’s major focus, was a stately piece of furniture was emblematic of marriage, death, and birth. While a bed represented a costly investment, the fabric used to decorate it was often even more expensive.\textsuperscript{599} Cloth of the type depicted in this room would have been particularly pricey, since the red dye used in its fabrication, which was obtained from pregnant kermes beetles, was expensive to produce.\textsuperscript{600} Because of its costliness, crimson fabric served as a status symbol and, for the purpose of impressing visitors, was often used to embellish a sala, or a large hall or reception room, in a Roman palazzo. For instance, at the Borghese and Pamphili palaces, red damask bedecked the


walls and furniture of the front sale, but green textiles were used for the camere. The curtains that are pulled back to reveal Saint Anne could also be closed for privacy, warmth, and protection from drafts. The wall behind the bed is covered in the same material as the drapes, which was typical for period decor. As Waddy explains, rooms were usually decorated in a single hue, which created an “ambience of color.” Saint Anne’s bed is outfitted with a coperta (coverlet) that has a magenta-colored border embellished with a white floral and vegetal pattern. Decorative bands of this type were often made of velvet and embellished with white or silver embroidered thread or with appliqués, and it is clear that Cortona recorded these typical, expensive fabrics in his painting.

The Greenlease Birth of the Virgin’s composition is formulaic in approach and has antecedents going back many centuries. Related examples include Pietro di Lorenzetti’s altarpiece of 1342 (Museo dell’Opera del Duomo, Siena) and Andrea del Sarto’s fresco of 1514 at the church of Santissima Annunziata in Florence. Like Cortona’s scene, these examples show well-appointed domestic interiors that were contemporary to the time of each painting’s creation. However, these compositions differ from the one that Cortona painted because he included Joachim in his scene, whereas in Del Sarto’s fresco Joachim is absent and in Lorenzetti’s painting, he is relegated to an adjacent hallway. In contrast, Cortona situates Joachim standing at the end of his wife’s bed. Since, typically, only females were depicted in this space, the

---


603 Waddy, "Life and the Arts," 27.

604 Monnas, Merchants, Princes and Painters, 40-65. Although Monnas’ study focuses on an earlier period, it is relevant to this painting. See also Welch, "The Domestic Setting," 292-96; Currie, "Textiles and Clothing," 348.
positioning here of a male figure in the birthing room is unusual. As Gage discusses, among the Roman aristocracy, it was the paterfamilias who normally selected paintings for the household.\textsuperscript{605} So, if a husband commissioned this work, it might explain why Joachim’s presence in this scene may have been warranted. More important than the material worth of a painting such as this was its value as a sacred work that was believed to provide protection for a family and its occupants, particularly in this case for a newborn and its mother.\textsuperscript{606} From at least the mid-fourteenth to the mid-seventeenth centuries, the iconography presented in this category of image remained consistent, which suggests the enduring nature of childbirth practices.\textsuperscript{607} These scenes separate the mother and child from one another. Female attendants bathe the newborn in a basin positioned in the foreground, as women tend to the recovering mother in the background and the scenes are decorated with architectural details, textiles, and clothing representative of the period from which the work originated.\textsuperscript{608} As such, this painting of a religious subject offers an opportunity to consider some aspects of aristocratic domestic interiors as a reflection of secular culture during the Roman Seicento.\textsuperscript{609}

A scholar who extensively explored this aspect of material culture is Jacqueline Marie Musacchio. Although Musacchio focuses primarily on the Quattrocento, her research is, nevertheless, applicable to the interpretation of this painting, since many of the objects that she

\textsuperscript{605} Gage, "Observing Order," 204-16.
\textsuperscript{606} Ibid., 206-07.
\textsuperscript{607} For a representative case study, see Marina d'Amelia, "Becoming a Mother in the Seventeenth Century: The Experience of a Roman Noblewoman," in Time, Space, and Women's Lives in Early Modern Europe ed. Anne Jacobson Schutte, Thomas Kuehn, and Silvana Seidel Menchi, Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2001), 223-44.
\textsuperscript{609} Musacchio, "Pregnancy and Poultry in Renaissance Italy," 8.
discusses appear in this scene. As was customary, the females tending to the new mother might have included relatives, friends, and hired help, such as the levatrice, who assisted in the actual birth, and the guardadonna, who watched over the recovering mother, or, as in the instance of a noblewoman, her household staff of camerieri (room attendants). Each participant focuses upon a particular task at hand. Following the birth, women were isolated for a period of time from the public, since they were considered impure. As such, new mothers were excluded from their children’s baptisms, which took place outside of the home during the period of confinement. Therefore, the interior scene, where the infant is submerged in a water-filled basin, provides a domestic counterpoint to the communal, ceremonial practice of baptism.

Musacchio has found that special linens and wares for the birthing chamber were designated specifically for periods of confinement. For instance, the embroidered towel that is draped over the arm of the attendant standing on the left is a type of cloth known as a sciugatoio da parto, which was specially used for confinement and baptism. For these objects, the term “da parto” (for childbirth) was attached, in order to identify their specific relation to objects associated with birth. The impagliata, or new mother, in this case Saint Anne, wore a special garment known as mantello da parto and her bed was made with a lenzuolo da parto, or a sheet or set of linen for the maternity bed. For the postpartum period, there was also a set of wares, typically made of ceramic, known as a credentino da parto, which was used to serve the new mother her meals. In this scene, the attendant behind the bed offers Saint Anne a white bowl, perhaps of ceramic, with

611 Randolph suggests that rituals surrounding the mother’s confinement acted as “domestic counterpoints” to the male-centric public rite of baptism. See Randolph, "Gendering the Period Eye," 551. For explanation of traditions relating to the idea of a new mother’s impurity also see Jacqueline Marie Musacchio, The Art and Ritual of Childbirth in Renaissance Italy (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), 46-48.
a blue leafy pattern encircling its rim. Since its contents are not visible, a contemporary observer might have surmised that the bowl was likely either filled with water for ritual hand washing or with chicken broth, as sustenance for the new mother’s recuperation. As Musacchio convincingly argues, painting scenes can provide visual records of aspects of material culture with which a contemporary audience would have identified.⁶¹³ Therefore, the inclusion in this scene of towels, bed linens and ceramic wares specifically associated with childbirth would have created a sense of familiarity for a contemporary audience and, without their incorporation, the painting would have lost much of its sense of immediacy and personal meaning.⁶¹⁴ As such, one could interpret that the Greenlease Gallery’s *Birth of the Virgin* reflects important aspects of the aristocratic female experience in early seventeenth-century Italy.

**Conclusion:** The painting’s composition and style confirm attribution to Pietro da Cortona and place it early in his career. The scene is situated in a noblewoman’s bedchamber of a seventeenth-century Roman *palazzo*. At a time of high mortality rates for infants and pregnant women, beholding an image of a successful birth, like the one presented in the Van Ackeren’s work, would have provided encouragement for expectant mothers and family members who were fully aware of the dangers involved in the birthing process, and for young girls, who hoped to survive the experience.⁶¹⁵ The domestic setting made it so that contemporary women could

---

⁶¹³ Ibid., 22-24 n. 33.
⁶¹⁴ Musacchio, *Art and Ritual*, 152.
⁶¹⁵ David Herlihy, “Did Women have a Renaissance?: A Reconsideration,” *Medievalia et humanistica* 13, no. 1985 (1985): 1-22; Klapisch-Zuber, *Women, Family and Ritual in Renaissance Italy*, 38, 33, 57, 104-06, 146-49, 151-54; Musacchio, "Pregnancy and Poultry in Renaissance Italy," 5; *Art and Ritual*, 13-15, 21-31, 153; "Weasels and Pregnancy in Renaissance Italy " *Renaissance Studies* 15 (2001): 172-87; Randolph, "Gendering the Period Eye," 545. Scholars David Herlihy and Christiane Klapsch-Zuber estimate through their archival research that twenty percent of deaths of married women during the early fifteenth century in Florence were attributed to childbirth. Musacchio theorizes that the mortality rate was even higher due to poor nutrition, unskilled practice of obstetrics, and lack of sanitation.
relate more closely to this sacred event.
Bartolomé Esteban Murillo was born in Seville, Spain and baptized there at the church of the Magdalene on 1 January 1618.\textsuperscript{616} He was the youngest of fourteen children born to Gaspar Esteban, an affluent, university-educated, barber-surgeon and his wife, María Pérez Murillo, who came from a family of silversmiths and painters.\textsuperscript{617} When Bartolomé was nine years old, his parents died within six months of each other and he became the ward of his sister, Ana, and her husband, Juan Agustín Lagares, who, like his wife’s father, was a barber-surgeon.\textsuperscript{618} Around the age of thirteen, the young Bartolomé was probably apprenticed to a workshop that belonged to his mother’s relative, the Spanish Baroque painter, Juan del Castillo (1590-1657).\textsuperscript{619} When he was fifteen years old, Murillo drew up his will and applied for permission to sail overseas, apparently to join relatives across the Atlantic ocean.\textsuperscript{620} However, there is no evidence that he ever made the voyage.\textsuperscript{621} The artist’s first Spanish biographer, Antonio Palomino (1653-1726),


\textsuperscript{619} Since no apprenticeship contract survives, the estimate of his age is based upon the period’s general workshop practice. See Cumberland, "Murillo;" Iñiguez, "Murillo," 11; Palomino, "Murillo, Painter," 280, 285 n. 2; Marqués, "Murillo," 342, 346; Stratton-Pruitt, "Murillo," 16.


described Murillo as “humble and modest” with a “good figure and an amiable disposition.” He came from a privileged family, whose status afforded him access to the city’s intellectuals, wealthy merchants, confraternities, and religious orders, many of whom became his patrons.

In 1645, the artist received his first major commission, for which he painted eleven scenes that depicted the miracles of Franciscan saints for the small church of the convent of S. Francisco el Grande in Seville. One biographer later noted that, when the work was complete, the convent was “thronged with artists and critics,” who realized that “[a] new star had arisen amongst them,” and thus his reputation as a fine artist was fully established. That same year, Murillo married a woman named Beatriz, who was five years his junior and, like his mother, came from a family of silversmiths. During the twenty years of their marriage, she bore the artist nine children, four of whom survived into adulthood. Enduring hardships in Seville, such as a peasant revolt (1652), an epidemic (1677), a famine (1678), and an earthquake (1680), Murillo, nevertheless, maintained a strong clientele base, for whom he completed large altarpieces and small devotional works. Finding commercial success as an artist, Murillo

---

purchased property from which he collected rents to supplement his income.\textsuperscript{629}

One of the most celebrated altarpieces that Murillo painted was a grand-scale *Vision of Saint Anthony of Padua* (1656) for the baptismal chapel in the cathedral of Seville. Other works that he completed for the cathedral and that remain *in situ* include a painting of the *Birth of the Virgin* (1660) for the chapel of the Immaculate Conception, eight roundels depicting saints for the chapter room, and an altarpiece of the *Virgin of the Immaculate Conception* (1666-68).\textsuperscript{630} Between the cathedral commissions, Murillo traveled to Madrid (1658), where he gained access to the royal collection to study its paintings, likely with the help of the court painter, Diego Velázquez (1599-1660).\textsuperscript{631} In January of 1660, the prominent artists of Seville elected Murillo and Francisco de Herrera the Younger (1622-1685) to serve as first co-presidents of the newly founded the Real Academia de Belles Artes de S. Isabel of Ungría (the Royal Academy of Fine Arts of Saint Isabel of Hungary) in Seville, which based its curriculum upon life-drawing.\textsuperscript{632} Although he had campaigned enthusiastically to establish an art academy in his city, within three years, Murillo distanced himself from the organization and began to teach sketching lessons privately in his own studio.\textsuperscript{633} Because of the work that will be discussed below, it is important

\textsuperscript{632} The Seville Academy, which was fashioned after the Accademia di S. Luca in Rome, promoted drawing, copying, and the study of live models. See Iñiguez, "Murillo," 11; Marqués, "Murillo," 345; Stratton-Pruitt, "Murillo," 25.
\textsuperscript{633} The reason that Murillo separated from the academy is unclear, although Palomino related that the “humble” Murillo did not much like the “arrogant” Juan de Valdés Leal (1622-1690), who had been instated as the academy’s new president in 1663. It could be that Murillo was simply too busy with his career to devote time elsewhere. See Calvert, *Murillo: A Biography*, 55-57; Marqués, "Murillo," 345.
to note how important the skill of draughtsmanship was to Murillo’s artistic production.\textsuperscript{634} He was a consummate technician who, before applying his brush to canvas, worked out all aspects of a composition on paper. Indeed, he is considered to have been the most prolific draughtsman in seventeenth-century Spain.\textsuperscript{635}

By the mid-1660s, Murillo had reached the height of his fame and was working on two of his most important commissions.\textsuperscript{636} For the church of S. Mariá la Blanca, he created three works for a temporary altar and, for the church’s crossing, four large-scale lunettes, one of which depicted a \textit{Virgin of the Immaculate Conception}.\textsuperscript{637} For the church of the Capuchins, a branch of the Conventual Franciscans, he completed ten paintings for the main altar, and eight for the side chapels (1665-66 and after 1668).\textsuperscript{638} During the Napoleonic invasion of 1808 the Franciscan friars sent these works to Gibraltar for safe-keeping, which demonstrates how highly Murillo’s sacred images were prized.\textsuperscript{639} While these works escaped the ravages of war, some of Murillo’s other paintings, such as a \textit{Virgin of the Immaculate Conception} (1675) at the Hospital de los Venerables Sacerdotes, were transported back to France when the French Marshal, Jean-de-Dieu Soult confiscated them as battle prizes.\textsuperscript{640}

While climbing a scaffolding to paint the \textit{Mystic Marriage of Saint Catherine} for the

\begin{footnotes}


\textsuperscript{636} Cumberland, "Murillo," 64.


\textsuperscript{639} "Murillo," 27.

\end{footnotes}
main altar of the Capuchin church in Cádiz, Murillo fell and suffered internal injuries that led to his death a few months later. With his youngest son, Gaspar at his side, the seventy-three-year-old artist died as he finalized his will on 3 April 1682. Murillo was buried in the church of Santa Cruz, but that building was demolished in the mid-nineteenth century and the painter’s tomb was lost. Murillo is remembered most for his pictures of beggar children and for his canonical images of the Virgin of the Immaculate Conception, which is the subject of a drawing in the Van Ackeren collection.

A year after Murillo’s death, Joachim von Sandrart (1606-1688) wrote the first biography of the artist, which appeared in Sandrart’s Academia nobilissimae artis pictoriae. The fact that Sandrart was German, and not Spanish, illustrates Murillo’s widespread fame at the time. From the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries, French and British collectors enthusiastically collected Murillo’s work. To the extent that, by 1779, collectors outside of Spain had acquired such a large part of the artist’s corpus that the Spanish government declared a moratorium against the further export of his work. In 1852, the popularity of Murillo as an artist reached a symbolic apex when, as mentioned earlier, the Soult Madonna commanded the
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643 Calvert, Murillo: A Biography, 2; Muñoz, Murillo, xi; Palomino, "Murillo, Painter," 284.
646 Ibid., 11.
647 Ibid., 11.
highest price ever paid for a painting. However, as Murillo’s tender interpretations of sacred subjects fell out of fashion, his critical reputation plummeted, in contrast to fellow Sevillian Diego Velázquez (1599-1660), who has garnered a great deal of scholarly attention. In 1942, Antonio Muñoz defended Murillo, arguing that the inability of modern audiences to comprehend fully the appeal of Murillo’s work should not negate the importance that it held for contemporary viewers.

Despite Murillo’s productive, forty-year career, there are fewer than one hundred extant drawings by him, which is not unusual for a Spanish artist of the period. The lack of surviving graphic works led early scholars to believe mistakenly that artists in Spain did not employ the discipline of drawing in their practice. Now, through the important scholarly contributions of Jonathan Brown, Manuela B. Mena Marqués, and Priscilla E. Muller, among others, it is generally accepted that seventeenth-century artists in Spain employed drawing as a method similar to that which their Northern European contemporaries practiced. However, in comparison to the north, far fewer Spanish examples survive, because, in Spain, drawings served

---


653 McDonald, *Prints and Drawings from Spain*, 15-44.

more of a utilitarian purpose and, since Spaniards had not cultivated much of an interest in collecting these works, there was less of a concern for their preservation.\footnote{For explanation of theories as to why so few Spanish Baroque drawings have survived, see \textit{Prints and Drawings from Spain}, 8-44, 147-58. See also Sánchez, \textit{Dessins espagnols}, 12.} The Van Ackeren \textit{Immaculate Conception} represents a well-preserved and relatively rare example of a seventeenth-century Spanish drawing, a subject in need of more study.

In the United States, Gridley McKim-Smith (1974) organized the first exhibition of Spanish Old Master drawings, including some by Murillo, at the University of Kansas Art Museum.\footnote{Gridley McKim Smith, \textit{Spanish Baroque Drawings in North American Collections} (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Museum of Art, 1974).} Two years later, American specialist of Spanish Baroque art Jonathan Brown gathered drawings by Murillo from various institutions and private collections for an exhibition at the Princeton University Art Museum.\footnote{Brown, \textit{Murillo Drawings}.} Both university shows were documented with catalogs that initiated a discussion of Murillo as a draughtsman, but that were primarily focused on issues of attribution. In 2012, Brown republished the Princeton catalog in a slightly different format and with some suggested changes in attributions.\footnote{Brown, \textit{Murillo Draftsman}.} The \textit{Immaculate Conception} that now belongs to Rockhurst University was mentioned in all three of the aforementioned texts and illustrated in the earlier Princeton edition.\footnote{Smith, \textit{Spanish Baroque Drawings}; Brown, \textit{Murillo Drawings}, cat. no. 38; \textit{Murillo Draftsman}, cat. R-2.} Other scholarly contributions that have broadened our understanding of Murillo’s draughtsmanship have appeared in catalogs published in conjunction with exhibitions at the Museo del Prado, Madrid and the Royal Academy of Arts in London (1982-1983); the Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth (2002); the Frick Collection in New York (2011); the Fondación Botín, Saintander, Spain (2012); the Princeton University Art
Museum (2012); and the Dulwich Picture Gallery, London (2013).\textsuperscript{660} The first compilation of the artist’s drawings appeared in the volume that Spanish scholar Diego Angulo Iñiguez published (1981).\textsuperscript{661} To date, Murillo expert Manuela B. Mena Marqués offers the most comprehensive study of the artist’s corpus of drawings in her catalogue raisonné (2015).\textsuperscript{662}

Of the objects belonging to the Van Ackeren collection, this drawing has received the most scholarly attention, primarily due to questions regarding its attribution. It is one of three similar drawings that have at various times been attributed to Murillo. The other two works belong to the Pierpont Morgan Library and the Hispanic Society of America, respectively. Each of the three images depicts Mary standing upon a crescent moon that is enveloped in a bank of clouds with five gamboling putti, two on the left and three on the right. Some of the winged figures hold attributes, such as a palm and/or olive branch and flowers. Scholars have struggled with the idea that three drawings that appear so much alike could have come from Murillo, who worked diligently to vary his compositions.\textsuperscript{663} Opinions regarding the Rockhurst example’s attribution have vacillated. In 1962, Iñiguez attributed this drawing to Bartolomé Esteban Murillo, but twelve years later, expressed some doubt.\textsuperscript{664} Brown has likewise wavered, first


\textsuperscript{662} Marqués, Catálogo Razonado, 648-49. For Marqués’ catalog, the present author provided an image of the Rockhurst Immaculate Conception, albeit not one of professional quality, and updated provenance information. However, her entry for this work mistakenly states that Rockhurst acquired it in 2001, rather than in 1977.

\textsuperscript{663} For additional attributes associated with images of the Immaculate Conception, see Diane Apostolos-Cappadonna, Dictionary of Christian Art (New York: Continuum, 1994), 167, 214, 243, 261, 265, 296. For the Hospital de los Venerables Sacerdotes Immaculate Conception, see Valdivieso, Murillo: Catálogo Razonado de Pinturas, 514-15, fig. 345.

rejecting this work’s authorship to Murillo (1973), then accepting it (1976), and then, ultimately, rejecting it (2012).665 Most recently, Marqués (2015) posited that the Greenlease *Immaculate Conception* is a copy drawn after Murillo’s death. However, she added the caveat that, clearly, an artist of talent executed this work, a point that means that the idea that Murillo drew this work cannot be dismissed.666 In 2006, Priscilla E. Muller argued persuasively for the attribution of this work to Murillo.667 In her essay, she noted the compositional similarities between the Hispanic Society and the “1664” drawings, as she refers to this work for the date inscribed on the lower left corner. She proposed that the Morgan example, which is a preparatory sketch, was likely a workshop copy, since it is so worn, but that this version, because of its well-preserved state and detailed appearance, was likely a presentation drawing, which was considered a finished work and often intended as a gift. Muller suggested that the Morgan library example, which is signed and came from an album that belonged to Murillo, represents a later variation of the theme represented in the other two drawings.668

Although the debate over this work’s authorship has simmered on, not one scholar to opine on it over the past forty years has viewed it in person. The reason for this is that, after 1977, William H. Schab Gallery sold the drawing to Virginia Greenlease, who immediately donated it to Rockhurst University, but the scholarly community lost track of its whereabouts.669
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666 Marqués, *Catálogo razonado*, 648-49, 119AC.
668 Muller and Matilla, *Dibujos españoles*, 166.
669 This fact is evident in the broad range of terms used to reference this work. Brown calls it the “ex-Schab” drawing and later states that it is in a private collection, but does not mention which one. Angulo Iñiguez refers to it as the Mentmore, Leighton Buzzard work belonging to the Countess Rosebery, and, as stated above, Muller calls it the “1664” drawing.
Therefore, those who have weighed in on this drawing’s authorship have had to rely upon poor quality images, such as the illustrations published in Iñiguez (1962) and Brown (1976), which, for instance, show a dark spot on the left side of the drawing, where none exists and does not reproduce accurately the fine gradations of brown wash. While it is not the purpose of the present study to argue either for or against the authorship of the Morgan Library and Hispanic Society versions, the discussion below will reference these works as they relate to the Rockhurst example and provide further evidence that supports Muller’s conclusion. In order to establish the attribution of this work to Barolomé Esteban Murillo, the discussion below will compare this work to drawings securely attributed to the artist, many of which have never been considered in terms of this work. In addition, the essay will update the drawing’s provenance and consider its iconography, format, function, and social context.

5. Bartolomé Esteban Murillo

*The Virgin of the Immaculate Conception*

1664

Pen and light brown ink with sepia ink wash and black chalk on laid paper

Paper size: 29.2 x 19.1 cm (11 ½ x 7 ½ in.)

Frame: 47 x 36.8 cm (18 ½ x 14 ½ in.)

A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family

Provenance: William Mayor (Lugt 2799); Lord Nathan Rothschild; to Baron Mayer Amschel de Rothschild; to Hannah Rothschild; to Albert Primrose, sixth Earl of Rosebery; to Eva Isabel Marion Primrose, Countess of Rosebery (Sotheby, November 21, 1974); William H. Schab Gallery, New York; Robert C. Greenlease family, Kansas City, 1977 to Rockhurst University.

*Description:* The Virgin of the Immaculate Conception stands on a crescent moon atop a swirl of billowing clouds and gamboling putti that fill the composition’s lower half. Traces of clouds fleck the scene to each side of Mary. The Virgin crosses her right hand over her left at her chest
and inclines her head to look down and to her right. The Madonna’s right knee presses against her gown’s weighty fabric, creating deep recesses of shadow along the folds that drape to each side of her leg and behind and over the curved sliver of moon. Mary’s ample garment sleeves fall back from her wrists and her voluminous cloak lays over her right hip and her left arm. The Virgin is crowned with a nimbus of twelve stars. The topmost star touches the upper edge of the picture plane. Mary’s hair is parted in the middle and pulled back from her oval face, framing her delicate facial features, which are defined with a few, deftly placed pen strokes and a light use of brown wash. The Virgin’s long, wavy tresses are delineated with interlocking S-, C-, and U-shapes [Cat. no. 5.1]. Her hair follows the contour of the left nape of her neck. On her right side, a breeze gently lifts her hair tendrils. The contour that the wind creates matches those below of the cloud bank and the edge of the Virgin’s mantle, also caught in a gust of wind.

Below the Virgin, five winged putti frolic in the churning clouds. Their cherubic figures are partially camouflaged, so that their downy heads and rounded bellies blend in with the cumulus cloud’s curves. The putti’s expressive faces and foreshortened limbs are rendered with a few masterful pen strokes. The two outermost putti gaze upward at the Virgin. The one on the right stretches its left arm upward, as the putto on the left reaches to the Madonna like a child beckoning its mother. The putti’s gestures and the direction of their gazes leads the viewer’s focus up to the Virgin. The two putti that appear on the left side of the composition, lie on their backs, with one covering the lower half of the other’s body. The topmost of the pair stretches its right leg out on a diagonal, as its other limbs disappear into the clouds. The putto adjacent to the Virgin’s left foot gathers flowers in its arms and rests on its belly, as it looks down at the putto sprawled below, holding a palm branch in its arms [Cat no. 5.2]. The left leg dangles over a cloud’s edge and the right one extends diagonally to align with the right stretched limb of the
putto positioned below and to the viewer’s left. A band of cloth stretches across its upper torso and then reappears between its limbs to cover its genitalia and drape down next to the bent left leg. The winged figures are so well camouflaged within the cloud’s nebulous form that one easily mistakes a putto’s pudgy limb, head, or wing for a cloud. The combined position of the lower four putti forms an inverted C-shape that complements the moon’s contour. A brown ink inscription, “Bartolomé Murillo, 1664,” appears in the lower left corner.

Condition Description: The drawing’s paper support is fragile and irregular foxing is visible throughout. There is a horizontal crease across the center of the paper support. In addition, there is a half-inch vertical tear on the bottom edge that is situated approximately four inches from the left edge. Beneath the Madonna’s hands, there is a small, almost invisible, hole. Areas of disintegration in the paper that were repaired in a previous intervention appear in the cloak of the Madonna near her right elbow, the right arm of the putto on the far left of the composition, and between the legs of the putto on the lower right. Small repaired losses also appear in the clouds at the lower right.

Attribution and Date: This sheet bears an ink signature that is similar to, but not exactly like, those that appear on nearly two-thirds of the artist’s known drawings. Scholars posit that, in many of these cases, and probably in this one as well, someone knowledgeable of the work’s origin, such as an executor of a will, estate evaluator, or contemporary collector, signed it as a

670 These observations come from Burton Dunbar, who, for insurance purposes, viewed this sheet out of its frame. See Condition Report, 5 October 2005, Murillo file, GGA.
form of documentation. Whether or not scholars agree that Murillo created this work, they do concur that it reflects the style and subject matter that the artist was producing during the mid-1660s, when he was working for his patron and close friend, Justino de Neve (1625-1685), who was a canon at Seville Cathedral. De Neve commissioned Murillo to complete a series of paintings, including an *Immaculate Conception*, for a small neighborhood church, S. Maria la Blanca (1662-65), and also owned a painting depicting the *Allegory of Spring* by Murillo, now at Dulwich Picture Gallery in London. That institution’s chief curator, Xavier Bray, has noted that a trio of putti that appears beneath the allegory of spring is related compositionally to the grouping of three cherubs that appear on the right side of this and the other two related drawings at the Hispanic Society and Morgan library. Iníquez noted a similar trio of putti in an *Immaculate Conception* painting that he initially attributed to a follower of Murillo, who may have copied the composition from a painting that is no longer extant. Now some believe it to have been painted by the master.

The pen and light brown ink and black chalk in which the Greenlease work was rendered are representative of a combination that Murillo used during the 1660s, when he probably made this work. Drawings in similar media that are securely attributed to Murillo include an *Assumption of the Virgin* (Hamburg, Kunsthalle), a *Virgin and Child* (Cleveland Art Museum), a *Penitent Saint Dominic* (Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna), and several sketches from a series that depicts angels with instruments of the Passion (Musée du Louvre). The pen strokes
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671 For more on variations in Murillo’s signature, see Brown, *Murillo Drawings*, 49-54; Marqués, *Catálogo razonado*, 680-91. In Marqués, the Greenlease drawing’s inscription is illustrated as fig. 138D.
673 For reproduction of the painting in question, see Iníquez, "Varios dibujos," 231-36, fig. 1.
675 For illustrations, see Brown, *Murillo Draftsman*, cat. nos. 33, 41-43, 50, 73.
display a spontaneity in execution that one would expect in an original work by Murillo.\textsuperscript{676} This becomes especially evident when viewing the marks under magnification. For example, the rendering of the Virgin’s eyes, nose, and mouth and the foreshortening of the putti appears masterful in its economical use of strokes and skillful applications of light brown wash. Sporadically placed loops that are characteristic of Murillo’s pen appear throughout the composition. They reflect a freedom of gesture that does not mirror the potentially stiff, studied markings of a copyist.

Although this drawing does not reflect the work of a copyist when compared to the Morgan and Hispanic Society versions, there are other works by Murillo that share affinities with this one, but that have not yet been considered in the literature in relation to the Greenlease drawing. For instance, the putto on the far left in the Greenlease drawing resembles a cherub positioned directly below Mary in Murillo’s most well-known drawing, an \textit{Assumption of the Virgin} of 1660-70 (Hamburger Kunsthalle).\textsuperscript{677} The foreshortened head, brow, and tiny button nose of the putto in each of these drawings is rendered with only a few deftly placed lines. Another area of comparison in this work is found in the loosely interlocking C-, S-, and U-shapes that form the tendrils of Mary’s hair, which also appear in a similar location in the composition of a rough sketch of an \textit{Immaculate Conception} by Murillo (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles).\textsuperscript{678} Both the Greenlease and Getty drawings display a specific configuration of shapes that consists of a ‘U’ mark that has tips, which flair out and almost touch two flanking, inverted ‘C’ shapes. In each image, located to the left of this formation is a three-sided, square mark that

\textsuperscript{676} I thank Mindy Nancarrow for providing me with guidance on how to navigate issues specific to determining the authenticity of Spanish Old Master Drawings. Nancarrow to Whittaker, 28 April 2014.

\textsuperscript{677} Brown, \textit{Murillo Draftsman}, 33; Marqués, \textit{Catálogo razonado}, cat. no. 44.

\textsuperscript{678} For illustrations, see \textit{Catálogo razonado}, cat. nos. 23, 51.
has the profile of an open box with a loop on one of its edges. Also, the navel of the Kansas City putto that lies on its back and holds a palm branch is similar to those of cherubs that appear in two drawings by Murillo, entitled *Putti Holding a Crown and Palm Branch* (British Museum, London) and *Infant Sleeping on the Cross with Two Putti Above* (Musée du Louvre). Each navel is shaped like a compressed and elongated ‘C’, with the open end facing to the viewer’s right. The Greenlease putti’s curly coiffures are rendered with a few looping pen strokes, as seen also in the depiction of an infant Jesus in the Cleveland drawing of a *Virgin and Child*. The Los Angeles, Hamburg, and Cleveland drawings by Murillo are all dated at 1665-68, which coincides with this work’s date.

When Brown rejected the attribution of this work to Murillo (2011, 2012), he described the cloud bank below the Virgin as “amorphous” and “opaque,” a description that applies to the poor quality, black-and-white illustrations of this work that have been published, but is not evident in the original work. In contrast, when he had access to this work during its display in the Princeton show, Brown admired the work’s “subtly differentiated” brown wash and complimented its “masterful” display of chiaroscuro in the Virgin’s drapery. This assessment presents a more appropriate description for this work, which shows clouds that are skillfully modulated with pen swirls and delicate gradations of brown wash, which exemplifies Murillo’s work.

In Brown’s last published opinion on the matter, he rejected this work and accepted only the Morgan sketch as an original by Murillo. In his argument against this drawing, Brown
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679 Brown, *Murillo Drawings*, 76, 149, cat. nos. 11, 65. See the verso image for cat. no. 11. The London drawing dates to the mid-1650s and the Louvre one to the early 1670s.

680 Ibid., 118.
pointed to the olive branches that the two outermost putti in the Morgan sketch hold aloft and posited that, since the attributes do not appear in this drawing, a copyist must have forgotten to include them. He suggested that, without their attributes, the putti lose their function, because their poses were rendered “ambiguous.” There are, however, reasons to question Brown’s observations. First, it is hard to imagine that someone intent on making an exact copy would omit such obvious elements. Second, by omitting the branches from both sides of the Greenlease scene, the artist maintained compositional balance, an alteration that demonstrates specific intent on the part of the artist. Without their attributes, the cherubs stretch their arms toward the Virgin and direct the viewer’s focus to Mary. Another change implemented in the Greenlease composition that Brown did not address is that the artist also tilted the head of the winged figure on the right back, so that both cherubs look up, thereby emphasizing, yet again, that the audience should gaze at the Virgin. These changes in composition also unify the scene’s upper and lower quadrants, in contrast to the Morgan composition, which appears disjointed in this regard, as the putto on the far right glances down at its frolicking friends below and seems oblivious of the Virgin’s presence.

Alterations applied to the pose of the putto that lies on its back and holds a palm branch in the Greenlease scene also contribute to the drawing’s cohesive composition. For instance, while in the Morgan example the palm-bearing cherub extends its left arm along the length of the branch’s leaves, the Greenlease putto bends its left arm at a ninety-degree angle to align vertically with the flower-bearing cherub’s arm above it. This alteration in pose visually links the two winged figures and directs the viewer’s gaze to Mary. Additionally, whereas the Morgan putto’s right arm is hidden in the clouds and its right leg is bent, the Greenlease putto twists its
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681 Brown, Murillo Draftsman, 151.
torso just enough to touch its right forearm to the left arm of the flower-bearing putto above and stretches its right leg diagonally to match the angle of the right limb of the putto positioned below and to the left. The changes in the central putto’s pose unify all four figures compositionally. This unification of forms creates an implied line that extends from the fingertips of the far left putto, along the two extended right legs of the winged pair in the middle, and up to the outermost putto’s stretched arm on the right. This formation creates an inverted curve that mirrors the crescent moon and, again, leads the eye up to the Virgin on both sides. These alterations do not reflect the work of a copyist, but rather an artist’s careful re-working of his own composition to create visual lines that more effectively promote the sacred subject depicted.

Of the three *Immaculate Conception* drawings associated with Murillo, the Greenlease and Hispanic Society examples are the most closely related compositionally and share the aforementioned features. Nevertheless, aside from their disparate conditions, with the Hispanic Society drawing being worn and probably a workshop copy and the well-preserved Greenlease example likely having served as a presentation drawing, they are not identical in configuration. A subtle difference between them that no one has yet mentioned is that, in the Hispanic Society version the right, outermost fold of the Virgin’s garment cuts diagonally behind the crescent moon, but in the Greenlease example that section of fabric separates into two pleats. The far right crease tapers vertically downward and the one to its left drapes over the innermost edge of the crescent moon. Another difference that sets the Kansas City drawing apart from the other two versions is that it is the only one in which Mary wears a corona of twelve stars, an apt addition for a presentation drawing and one that completes the display of Immaculate Conception iconography. Considering the high level of technical skill demonstrated in this
drawing and the similarity in aspects pertaining to composition and rendering that resemble works securely attributed to Murillo, this work should be attributed to Bartolomé Esteban Murillo and dated to 1664.

Provenance: In 1977, the William H. Schab Gallery of New York sold the drawing of an *Immaculate Conception* that is signed by Bartolomé Murillo, and dated 1664, to Virginia Greenlease, who immediately donated it to Rockhurst University. A year prior, Schab had loaned this work to the Princeton University Art Museum for Jonathan Brown’s exhibition of Murillo’s drawings. The earliest known person to own this work was William Mayor, a noted British art enthusiast of Old Master drawings, whose collector’s mark appears in the lower right hand corner of this drawing. A faded version of the same insignia appears on another drawing by Murillo that belonged to Mayor, a seated Virgin and Child of 1656-58. In 1830 Lord Nathan Rothschild (1777-1836), who was the founder of the English branch of the banking empire William Rothschild and Sons, acquired the drawing at an auction of Mayor’s collection.

After Lord Nathan died in 1836, his sixth child, Baron Mayer Amschel de Rothschild (1818-1874), who was an enthusiastic art collector, acquired this work. Whether he inherited it directly from his father or obtained it from one of his older siblings is unclear. However, when he died in 1874, his only daughter, Hannah Rothschild (1851-1890), who was his sole heiress inherited the work and then, in 1877, she lent it to a winter exhibition of old master drawings at
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682 Peter C. Bunnell to Mr. Frederick Schab, 10 Feb. 1977, Murillo: Acquisition file, GGA; Brown, *Murillo Drawings*, 119-20, fig. 38.
683 *Catálogo razonado*, 181, cat. no. 23.
Grosvenor Gallery in London. During his lifetime, Mayer constructed a massive estate (1852-54), called Mentmore, to house his extensive collection. Hannah inherited the palatial manor, which was located in Buckhamshire, England at Leighton Buzzard. It is likely that this drawing was displayed there, since Iñiguez used the estate’s name to reference this work in 1962, when Eva owned it. In 1878, Hannah married Archibald Primrose, the fifth Earl of Rosebery (1847-1929) and their eldest son, Albert Primrose, the sixth Earl of Rosebery (1882-1974), would have been the next to inherit the drawing. Albert’s second wife, Eva Isabel Marion Primrose, Countess of Rosebery (1892-1987) put the couple’s estate, including this work, up for auction at Sotheby’s in 1974. The Schab Gallery from whom Virginia Greenlease purchased the drawing, acquired it from Sotheby’s at an auction held on 21 November 1974.  

Iconography: This Virgin of the Immaculate Conception illustrates the theological concept that Mary was conceived without sin. The portrayal of the Virgin standing atop a bank of clouds with gamboling putti resembles images of the Assumption of the Virgin, which depict her
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685 “The Grosvenor Gallery illustrated catalogue: Winter exhibition (1877-78) of drawings by the old masters, and water-colour drawings by deceased artists of the British school,” (London: Grosvenor Gallery, 1877), 144, cat. no. 1143. The catalog entry for this work states that it was signed and dated 1664, but lists it incorrectly as an Assumption. This type of iconographical mistake is one that is commonly made. For further explanation, see discussion on iconography below.

686 Angulo Iñiguez referred to this work as the Mentmore, Leighton Buzzard drawing of Eva the Countess of Rosebery in 1962, when she owned it. In 1981, he used the same reference, even though the work belonged to Rockhurst. Iñiguez, ”Varios dibujos,” 232; Murillo: Cátalogo crítico, 378, cat. no. 812.


688 Warner, Alone of All Her Sex, 248; Jonathan Brown, The Golden Age of Painting in Spain (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1991), 270-76; M. Gnocchi, “Immacolata Concezione,” in Iconografia e arte cristiana, ed. Liana Castelfranchi and Maria Antonietta Crippa (Milan: San Paolo, 2004), 779. Mary’s conception was first discussed officially at the Council of Ephesus in 431. Sixtus IV’s decree prevented anyone from being convicted of heresy for promoting the concept. The moment of Mary’s conception is often represented as the kiss shared between Joachim and Anna at the Golden Gate, for instance in the fresco by Giotto at the Arena Chapel, and in Gil’s retable at Burgos Cathedral. For the concept of and history of the Immaculate Conception, see also cat. nos. 5, 13.
ascending to heaven. A case of mistaken identity in this regard occurred with this drawing, when it was displayed in 1877 at the Grosvenor Gallery in London and incorrectly listed in the catalog as an Assumption. What defines this scene instead as an Immaculate Conception is the inclusion of additional attributes, such as a crescent moon and a corona of twelve stars. The symbolism typically associated with this subject is adapted from a description of the Woman of the Apocalypse in Revelation 12:1-5, which describes her “...with the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars,” both of which are depicted in this drawing. In Marian imagery, the moon references the Madonna’s virginity and chastity. The crescent moon also signifies the triumph of Christianity over paganism. For Spanish devotees in particular, the symbol might have recalled the final expulsion in 1492 of non-Christians from Spain, when Isabel I, Queen of Castile and León (1451-1504), and Ferdinand II, King of Aragon (1452-1516), issued the Alhambra decree, which formally designated that Muslims and Jews would be allowed to remain on the Iberian peninsula but only if they converted to Christianity.

Spanish portrayals of the Immaculate Conception are often based upon the iconography that Francisco Pacheco set forth in his Arte de la pintura (Art of Painting). This book was published in 1649, fifteen years before Murillo rendered the Greenlease image. Pacheco recommended that the Immaculate Virgin should appear without the Christ Child, as she does not...
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689 Muller and Matilla, Dibujos españoles, 166; Valdivieso, Murillo: Catálogo razonado, 431, no. 240.
691 Muller and Matilla, Dibujos españoles, 166.
692 Gnocchi, "Immacolata Concezione," 778. For examples of Murillo’s paintings of this subject that depict the crescent moon, but not the corona of twelve stars, see Valdivieso, Murillo: Catálogo razonado, 407, 470, 513-15; cat. nos. 206, 296, 351-52, 354.
694 Ibid., 167; Marqués, "Murillo," 345; Gnocchi, "Immacolata Concezione," 778.
here, but he also stated that it is appropriate to portray her as a twelve- or thirteen-year-old girl “in the flower of her youth” and to point the crescent moon’s tips downward, for a naturalistic replication of the sun’s illumination. Instead, Mary appears here as a mature woman and the crescent moon’s tips point upwards. Perhaps the alterations signal Murillo’s attempt to vary the composition or maybe the changes were made at a patron’s behest.

The Greenlease drawing typifies Murillo’s representation of the subject, with Mary placed centrally within the composition upon a cloud and crescent moon and amid winged, sweet-faced cherubs with curly locks and bare, pudgy limbs. In his variations on the theme, Murillo included anywhere from a few to a plethora of putti. Sometimes he depicted a few of the winged figures holding attributes such as an olive branch, a stalk of lilies, a mirror, roses, and/or a palm frond. In this case, two of the five putti hold attributes, including a palm branch and flowers. The blossoms have a non-descript shape and no color to specify their species. However, a similar configuration of a putto gathering flowers that appears in paintings by Murillo, such as the El Escorial Immaculate Conception of 1660-65 and the Aranjuez Immaculate Conception of c. 1675, both at the Museo Prado, Madrid, show pink roses. This comparison suggests that the flowers in the Greenlease drawing were meant to signify Mary as the rose without thorns, and her role as the second Eve. The palm that the other putto holds is a Greco-Roman symbol of triumph that early Christians adopted as an attribute of martyrdom, or
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696 Muller makes this point in Muller and Matilla, Dibujos españoles, 163-66. For an illustration of a painting that depicts the crescent moon with its tips pointed downward and that has been attributed to Murillo or a follower, see Iñiguez, ”Varios dibujos,” 233, figs. 1-4; Marqués, Catálogo razonado, cat. no. 119AC.

697 Brown, Murillo Drawings, 37.


699 Ibid., 296.
as here, as a sign of immortality or victory over death.\textsuperscript{700}

In 1977, Virginia Greenlease purchased this drawing by Murillo in conjunction with a marble sculpture of the same subject by Peter Strudel (1660-1714), a court artist to the Holy Roman Emperor, Leopold I (1640-1705) in Vienna.\textsuperscript{701} The sketch and statue are dated 1664 and c. 1700, respectively. However, the iconography of the two is not identical, which presents an interesting comparison in terms of regional depictions of this theme. For instance, both show Mary standing on a crescent moon that is balanced atop a cloud filled with putti. However, only the Austrian version shows a globe underneath her feet with a slithering snake that wriggles across its surface and clamps its sharp teeth into an apple near Mary’s right foot. The absence of this serpentine symbol in the Spanish interpretation is explained in Pacheco’s \textit{Arte de la pintura}, which states that it is best not to “embarrass” a rendering of an Immaculate Conception with the inclusion of a “dragon, the common enemy, whose head the Virgin broke when she triumphed over original sin.”\textsuperscript{702} Certainly the incorporation of a serpent in the Austrian baroque sculpture added a dramatic and more menacing quality, in contrast to the Greenlease drawing, which exemplifies Murillo’s typically tender handling of the subject.\textsuperscript{703}

\textit{Format and Function:} The Greenlease \textit{Immaculate Conception} offers a well-preserved example

\textsuperscript{700} Warner, \textit{Alone of All Her Sex}: 248; Apostolos-Cappadonna, \textit{Dictionary of Christian Art}, 265; Jens Hoffman-Samland, \textit{The Spanish Gesture: Drawings from Murillo to Goya in the Hamburger Kunsthalle} (Dallas: Meadows Museum, Southern Methodist University, 2014), 84.


\textsuperscript{702} Pacheco’s passage is translated in Brown, "Painting in Seville," 6.

\textsuperscript{703} For an earlier form of Spanish iconography for the subject see cat. no. 9.
of a presentation drawing, which, of the types of sketches that seventeenth-century artists in Spain produced, was the most finished in its appearance.\textsuperscript{704} Other types of drawings from the period include preparatory sketches, which recorded preliminary designs, and more detailed studies, which might have served as a production prototypes for workshop employees, a representation of how the artist in question composed their works, or as teaching tools for students to learn a master’s style.\textsuperscript{705} The Greenlease example is a highly skilled rendering that employs a subtle application of ink washes to create fully volumetric figures. This technique gives the work an appearance of a monochromatic painting, as seen also in another drawing by Murillo, a \textit{Christ on the Cross} (Princeton University Art Museum).\textsuperscript{706} Sometimes given as a gift, the presentation drawing was a carefully sketched work that showcased the maker’s talent. Another purpose for this type of drawing was to inform a patron of an artist’s finished concept for a commission, such as two drawings by Murillo of 1655 that are of a similar medium as this one and which depict \textit{Saint Isidore of Seville} (British Museum). These are thought to have been sketched in preparation for painting the subject at Seville Cathedral.\textsuperscript{707} If the patron approved the idea, then the artist could proceed to realize the project. Occasionally, a patron and artist signed the sheet, in effect making the drawing a contractual agreement. The earliest extant example in Spain of such a contract drawing dates to 1494 and was signed for a project in Burgos by an artist represented in this collection, Gil de Siloé (c. 1450-1501).\textsuperscript{708}

\textsuperscript{704} Muller also identifies this work as a presentation drawing. See Muller and Matilla, \textit{Dibujos españoles}, 164. Since she was unaware of its location after Schab sold this work, Muller refers to it as “the drawing dated 1664.”
\textsuperscript{705} Ibid., 163-66.
\textsuperscript{706} Brown, \textit{Murillo Drawings}, 137, cat. 55.
\textsuperscript{707} McDonald, \textit{Prints and Drawings from Spain}, 150-51.
\textsuperscript{708} The contract drawing was for the main altarpiece for the church of S. Esteban in Burgos a project that he completed with his partner Diego de la Cruz. See Ronda Kasl, "The Making of Hispano-Flemish Style: Art, Commerce, and Politics in Fifteenth-Century Castile" (PhD diss., New York University, 2012), 121; McDonald, \textit{Prints and Drawings from Spain}, 30.
At the time that this work was drawn, Murillo’s most important patron was the aforementioned canon of Seville Cathedral, Justino de Neve. One of the canon’s commissions was a painting of an *Immaculate Conception* for a small neighborhood church, S. Mariá la Blanca. Stylistically this drawing compares to that painting’s depiction of the subject. Both portray the Virgin with delicate facial features, wearing a garment with voluminous sleeves, and with her mantle fabric artfully draped over the crescent moon. Each composition shows the effects of a breeze on Mary’s right side, swelling her cloak and lifting wisps of her hair into the air. However, the plethora of angels depicted in the painting do not compare to any of the groupings in the Kansas City drawing. Indeed, neither this nor any other painting is known to be associated with this drawing. Therefore, considering this point, as well as the drawing’s well-preserved state and detailed appearance, it is most likely that the Greenlease *Immaculate Conception* was intended as a finished work or presentation drawing, as Muller suggested.

*Context:* During Murillo’s lifetime, Seville was an urban center that served as an international port through which trade to and from the Spanish colonies was routed. The city had a large community of merchants, confraternities, parishes, and religious orders that commissioned Murillo to paint secular and sacred subjects, such as the Rockhurst *Immaculate Conception*. In Seville, devotion to the Immaculate Virgin permeated daily life. For instance, at the drawing academy that Murillo co-established there, a regulation stipulated that a student was allowed to draw and paint only after reciting the phrase, “Praised be the Holy Sacrament and the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady.” Spaniards had a long history of piety toward the

---

710 Brown, *Murillo Drawings*, 44.
Immaculate Virgin that stretched back at least to the last quarter of the fifteenth century during the reigns of Queen of Castille and Léon, Isabel I, and her husband, Ferdinand II, King of Aragon. The royal couple were staunch supporters of the theological concept who campaigned at the Vatican for its approval. In 1482, Pope Sixtus IV (r. 1471-1484), permitted a liturgical office for its celebration. The pope was a member of the Franciscans, whose members also promoted the theological concept. Murillo was closely affiliated both professionally and personally with the order. Indeed, as mid-nineteenth-century historian of Spanish art, William Stirling noted, Murillo achieved his “first flame” of fame in Seville at a Franciscan convent, S. Francesco el Grande, and was the order’s “chosen artist,” having completed numerous commissions for them, including paintings of the Immaculate Conception.\textsuperscript{711} Murillo was also a lay member of the Venerable Orden Tercera de S. Francisco, or Third Venerable Order of Saint Francis, and, thus, would have himself been devoted to the Immaculate Virgin. In 1661, Pope Alexander VII (r. 1655-1667) issued a papal bull that supported the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which effectively put an end to a centuries-old controversy over the concept.\textsuperscript{712} Consequently, the subject became an immensely popular one, as exemplified in this work that was created approximately three years after the papal bull was announced.\textsuperscript{713} In the context of Murillo’s career, Pope Alexander VII’s directive was important, because it was issued at the beginning of the decade that would be the artist’s most prolific, and provided and his patrons with the theme for which he would become most famous.\textsuperscript{714}

\textsuperscript{712} Muñoz, \textit{Murillo}, viii; O'Connor, "Immaculate Conception," 231-35. Sixtus IV’s decree prevented anyone from being convicted of heresy for promoting the concept. However, the Immaculate Conception did not become Roman Catholic dogma until 1854 under Pope Pius IX (1846-1878).
\textsuperscript{713} Brown, \textit{Murillo Drawings}, 46; Iñiguez, "Murillo," 16.
\textsuperscript{714} Muñoz, \textit{Murillo}, xiii; Marqués, "Murillo," 345; O'Connor, "Immaculate Conception," 335.
Conclusion: We have seen above that the Greenlease *Immaculate Conception* bears the inscription “Bartolomé Murillo, 1664.” Although it cannot be verified that the artist signed this work, the date corresponds to the subject matter and style that Murillo produced during the mid-1660s, when his primary patron was Justino de Neve, a canon at Seville Cathedral. The image, which visually represents the theological concept that Mary was conceived without sin, was particularly popular after Pope Alexander VII issued a papal bull that supported the religious doctrine.\(^7\) Of the works belonging to the Van Ackeren collection, this one has received the most scholarly attention, largely because of issues regarding its attribution. The Greenlease drawing has been linked to a quickly rendered *Immaculate Conception* at the Pierpont Morgan Library and a very worn drawing of the same subject at the Hispanic Society of America.\(^7\) Some scholars have argued that, since Murillo was careful not to duplicate compositions, he must not have authored all three of these works, which at first appear similar. However, as Priscilla E. Muller has argued and the present study supports, the sheets’ appearances suggest that they served different purposes, such as a preparatory sketch (Pierpont Morgan Library), workshop copy (Hispanic Society of America), and this one, which because it is more detailed and looks like a monochromatic painting, appears to have been a presentation drawing.\(^7\) The above discussion expanded upon this argument and demonstrated that the drawings are not compositionally identical. Instead, they show nuanced differences that reflect the work of an artist reconfiguring a composition, rather than a copyist making an inaccurate facsimile.

---


\(^7\) Muller and Matilla, *Dibujos españoles*, 163-66; Brown, *Murillo Draftsman*, 151. Muller and Brown have identified a fourth comparable drawing belonging to a private English collection, but neither published an image of this work for comparison.

\(^7\) Muller and Matilla, *Dibujos españoles*, 163-66.
To date, discussion of this drawing’s attribution has revolved around the two aforementioned drawings. The present study, however, considered it as it relates to those objects, as well as to other sketches that are securely attributed to Murillo. Comparison of those works shows that the curves, looping lines, and washes that produce softened effects of light and shadow in the Greenlease *Immaculate Conception* appear in other works by Murillo, and are representative of Murillo’s hand. During the seventeenth century in Spain, Murillo was the country’s most prolific draughtsman. As one of less than one hundred drawings by the artist to survive, the Greenlease *Immaculate Conception* of 1664 is a well-preserved example of the technical skill of one of Spain’s most prolific draughtsman and portrays the subject for which he was most renowned.

---

719 McDonald, *Prints and Drawings from Spain*, 147-55.
FRANCESCO TREVISANI
b. Capo d’Istria, 1656 - d. Rome, 1746

During the first half of the eighteenth century, Francesco Trevisani emerged as one of Rome’s most prominent artists. He was born on 9 April 1656 in Capo d’Istria, in present-day Slovenia, to Antonio Trevisani and his wife Dominga. Francesco’s architect father taught him to draw, and, at the age of twelve, the boy was sent to Venice, where he began an apprenticeship with Antonio Zanchi d’Este (1631-1722), who was a dominant painter in the city during the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Zanchi introduced his student to the city’s most current artistic trends and the rich pictorial heritage of the Venetian Cinquecento. The fledgling artist eventually left Zanchi to follow another teacher, Giuseppe Heintz the Younger (c. 1609-1678). The new instructor, who was originally from Augsburg, taught Francesco how to paint in the style of Hieronymus Bosch (1450-1516) and Pieter Breughel the Elder (1525-1569). With the introduction to drawing that he had received from his father, coupled with his studies with Heintz, Trevisani came to excel at executing minute details and earned a reputation as one of the

726 Pagura, Francesco Trevisani, 5, 85-86.
most skillful painters of portraits, cabinet paintings with mythological scenes, and small devotional images.\textsuperscript{727}

At the age of twenty-two, Trevisani left Venice for Rome.\textsuperscript{728} Each of the artist’s three contemporary biographers cites a different reason for his departure. Nicola Pio (1677-1733) explained that the student sought instruction outside of the city, because his potential outgrew his master’s ability to teach him.\textsuperscript{729} Lione Pascoli (1673-1744), on the other hand, suggested that Trevisani simply wanted to venture elsewhere and preferred to remain in Rome after visiting there.\textsuperscript{730} The most colorful of the three explanations of Trevisani’s relocation comes from Francesco Moücke (1700-1758), who relates that the artist caught the eye of a young Venetian noblewoman.\textsuperscript{731} At first Trevisani only feigned interest in her, but eventually his affections became genuine. To avoid the wrath of her aristocratic parents, the couple plotted an escape to Rome.\textsuperscript{732} According to Karin Wolfe, that woman was likely Girolama Riva, whom Trevisani married and with whom he had three children.\textsuperscript{733} The couple lived in an Istrian neighborhood in Rome adjacent to the Via del Corso, between the churches of S. Carlo al Corso and S. Girolamo degli Schiavoni. It was also in this neighborhood in Rome that, in September of 1679, Francesco set up a small bottega, in which his brother Pietro served as his primary assistant.\textsuperscript{734}

According to Pascoli, Trevisani continued his own training in Rome by studying and

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{728} Di Federico, “Trevisani: A Contribution,” 221.
\textsuperscript{729} Ibid., 206.
\textsuperscript{730} Ibid., 206-36; \textit{Francesco Trevisani}, 2, 5, 85-102.
\textsuperscript{732} Pagura, \textit{Francesco Trevisani}, 100. There might be some truth to this account, since Trevisani’s daughter was likely Moücke’s source for his 1762 biography of the artist.
\end{footnotes}
copying works by the Carracci brothers, Annibale (1560-1609) and Ludovico (1555-1619), in the Farnese Palace’s gallery, and by Antonio da Correggio (1489-1534) in the apartments of Queen Christina of Sweden. In addition, he studied the works of Guido Reni (1575-1642), Giovanni Lanfranco (1582-1647), and Pietro da Cortona (1596/7–1669), the latter of whom also has a work represented in the Van Ackeren collection. Francesco’s first powerful patron was Cardinal Flavio Chigi (1631-1693), who was the nephew of Pope Alexander VII (r. 1655-1667). Records in the Chigi archives indicate that the artist worked for the cardinal from ca. 1682 until Chigi’s death and completed altarpieces destined for locations outside of Rome. Only three of these works survive: a Holy Trinity (1684) in La Cetina and two works for Siena Cathedral, a Christ between Saints Philip and James (1687) and a Martyrdom of the Four Crowned Saints (1688). These initial examples of the artist’s professional work evince the dark palette and compositions filled with active, intertwining figures that are characteristic of his teacher Zanchi’s work. Early in his career, Trevisani likewise mirrored the baroque, tenebristic style of Carlo Maratta (1626-1713), the man whom he would one day succeed as Rome’s premier academic painter. Likely because of his earlier training with Heintz, he was also drawn to the miniature works on copper and canvas of Filippo Lauri (1623-1694).

Trevisani’s first monumental public commission, a project to paint the Crucifixion

736 Di Federico notes that Trevisani would also have been familiar with Caravaggio (1571-1610), as his early work shows traces of the artist’s use of tenebrism. See ibid., 1, 201-03; Ellis K. Waterhouse, “Painting in Rome in the Eighteenth Century,” Art Institute of Chicago Museum Studies 6 (1971): 8; Di Federico, Francesco Trevisani, 9, 11, 27.
737 Di Federico, Francesco Trevisani, 7.
Chapel in S. Silvestro in Capite with Passion scenes (1695-96), established his favorable critical reputation in Rome.\textsuperscript{741} Although Cardinal Galeazzo Marescotti had hired several artists to decorate six separate chapels at S. Silvestro, critics singled out only Trevisani’s work as exceptional.\textsuperscript{742} Those who have studied the artist’s oeuvre suggest that it was at this point that Trevisani reached a level of maturity by means of his synthesis of the Classical, Roman Baroque, and Venetian styles of the Cinquecento and Seicento.\textsuperscript{743} Trevisani scholar Francesco Di Federico posits that an encounter with the Venetian-inspired work at S. Silvestro of Roman painter Ludovico Gimigniani (1643-1697), who oversaw the entire project, inspired Francesco to revisit his own artistic heritage.\textsuperscript{744} Thereafter, Trevisani’s oeuvre demonstrated a stronger sense of the Venetian techniques of colorito, or incorporation of color as a basis of composition, and velatura, or veiling, which is the use of multiple layers of oil glazes.\textsuperscript{745}

In 1697 Francesco Trevisani became a member of the Accademia di S. Luca, Rome’s guild of painters, and he also joined the court of the most important patron of his career, Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni (1667-1740), who was the grandnephew of Pope Alexander VIII (r. 1689-1691).\textsuperscript{746} As the cardinal’s official “painter-in-residence,” Trevisani and his family lived at the


\textsuperscript{742} The critical review that singled Trevisani out for the excellence of his work was printed on 5 January 1697 in the \textit{Avviso di Roma al Card. G. Marescotti}. See Di Federico, "Trevisani: A Contribution," 149.

\textsuperscript{743} For the development of Trevisani’s style in Rome, see ibid., i, iv, 165, 200-01; "Decoration of the Crucifixion Chapel," 52-67.

\textsuperscript{744} "Decoration of the Crucifixion Chapel," 61-66.

\textsuperscript{745} Ludovico Gimigniani was inspired during a trip to Venice to adopt the Venetian style for his own artistic practice. See ibid., 62.

Palazzo della Cancelleria until Ottoboni’s death.\textsuperscript{747} The cardinal often featured Trevisani’s work in public exhibitions and generously allowed him to complete commissions for other patrons.\textsuperscript{748} For example, Trevisani painted some scenes from the life of the Blessed Lucy of Narni (early 1714-15) for Cardinal Sagripante in Umbria.\textsuperscript{749} Also, from 1708 to 1717, the artist completed sixteen paintings for Prince-Bishop Lothar Franz Von Schönborn (1655-1729), who resided at the Schloss Weissenstein in Pommersfelden, Germany.\textsuperscript{750} Other important patrons of the artist included Pope Benedict XIII, Cardinals Alberoni, Imperiali, Falconieri, and Coscia, Prince Borghese and his family, King Philip V of Spain, King James III of England and his queen, the Marquess di Priè, numerous English nobles, and the Elector Palatine, Johann Wilhelm II, (r. 1690-1716).\textsuperscript{751} In 1709 Cardinal Ottoboni was unsuccessful in petitioning King Louis XIV (1638-1715) to knight Trevisani. However, Pope Benedict XIII (r. 1724-1730) later awarded the artist with la croce dell’ordine di Cristo (“the cross of the order of Christ”).\textsuperscript{752} After 1720, Trevisani lessened his use of chiaroscuro, reduced the number of figures in his compositions, and began to employ a softer treatment of light.\textsuperscript{753} During his last decade of activity, the artist

\textsuperscript{747} For a complete inventory of Ottoboni’s collection at the time of his death, which includes numerous expensive works by Trevisani, see Edward J. Olszewski, \textit{The Inventory of Paintings of Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni (1667-1740)}, American University Studies (New York: Peter Lang, 2004). See also, Haskell, \textit{Patrons}, 6-7; Olszewski, "Enlightened Patronage," 148, 152, 157.

\textsuperscript{748} "A Rediscovered Holy Family." 31.


\textsuperscript{751} For Trevisani’s English patrons, see Herman Voss, \textit{Malerei des Barock in Rom} (Berlin: Propyläen-Verlag, 1924), 616-19; Haskell, \textit{Patrons and Painters}, 281-82; Wolfe, "Acquisitive Tourism," 83-101. Johann Wilhelm II was also a patron of Peter Strudel (1660-1714), whose work is also represented in the Van Ackeren collection. See cat. no. 13.


\textsuperscript{753} Ruggeri, "Francesco Trevisani," 312-15.
continued to paint altarpieces and completed what is considered to be his late masterpiece, the
cartoons for the baptismal Chapel mosaics in Saint Peter’s.754 When he died in Rome on 30 July
1746 at the age of ninety-one, Francesco was working on a painting of Saint Michael the
Archangel that was destined for Naples.755

During his lifetime, Trevisani moved within Rome’s elite, intellectual circles and was one
of the few artists invited to join the Accademia degli Arcadi, an organization that fourteen literati
associated with Queen Christina of Sweden established in 1690.756 The Arcadians, whose focus
was primarily literary in scope, promoted a nascent form of neo-Classicism that called for a
return to the ideals of classical antiquity. Some scholars point to Trevisani’s use of naturalistic
light and incorporation of classical architecture as proof that Arcadian philosophy inspired his
artistic output.757 However, his mature work is more closely connected to the Venetian-inspired
use of colorito and the brief interlude of Roman rococo, as exemplified in a small, oil-on-copper
painting, entitled *Madonna and Child with a Bishop Saint*, in the Van Ackeren Collection of
Religious Art that is attributed to the artist.758 As the neoclassical style replaced the rococo, the
artist and his work were forgotten and then essentially neglected for two centuries.759

The first art historians to consider Trevisani’s oeuvre seriously were Herman Voss

---

754 For more on his final commissions, see Di Federico, "Trevisani: A Contribution," I, 185-86, 194-99; Francesco Trevisani, 26-27; Pagura, Francesco Trevisani, 57-65; Spear, "Rome," 84.
755 Di Federico, Francesco Trevisani, 27.
758 Di Federico, Francesco Trevisani, 18.
(1924), who referred to him as an originator of the rococo style in Rome, and Heinrich Bodmer (1929), who recognized that his work never lost its Venetian expression. Francesco’s affiliation with Rome became a detriment to the artist’s critical fortunes, as early twentieth-century art historians focused their studies on Venice as the hub of eighteenth-century Italian art. While they acknowledged that Trevisani was an exemplary artist of his time, they nevertheless associated him with a period that they perceived as one of decline. However, the critical tide turned in the artist’s favor during the 1970s, when Frank Di Federico, who wrote his PhD dissertation (1971) on Trevisani and then compiled the artist’s catalogue raisonné (1977), and Roman Baroque specialist Ellis Waterhouse reexamined the importance of the artist. In 2010 scholar Karin Wolfe published a newly discovered self-portrait of the artist. Wolfe also researched inventories related to the contents of the estate on the Via della Lungara in Rome that Trevisani acquired after 1733. Di Federico aptly summarized Francesco Trevisani’s place in the history of art, by stating that, while he was an academician who may not have inspired revolutionary change, he nevertheless created some masterworks of Italian painting that fully embody the style of the Settecento in Rome.

Although it was executed by one of the period’s premier artists, the aforementioned Van
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761 Ellis K. Waterhouse, *Baroque Painting in Rome, the Seventeenth Century* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1937), 39; Di Federico, "Trevisani: A Contribution," iii; Francesco Trevisani, ix, 1-4. Di Federico insightfully pointed out that, had Trevisani remained in Venice, perhaps he would not have been so easily excluded from the historical canon.
764 Wolfe, *Francesco Trevisani: Autoritratto*.
765 "Acquisitive Tourism," 86 n.2.
Ackeren painting has not been the subject of substantive scholarly study. From 28 March to 6 June, 1999, this small devotional work was displayed at the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art in Kansas City, Missouri in the exhibition, *Copper as Canvas: Two Centuries of Masterpiece Paintings on Copper 1575-1775*, which originated at the Phoenix Art Museum.\(^6\) However, likely because the painting was displayed in only one of the show’s three venues, there was no entry for it in the exhibition’s catalog, nor does it appear anywhere else in the literature. As stated above, Trevisani was known for using copper as a support, even after that medium had gone out of style, and he excelled at painting small devotional works in minute detail. Since the Van Ackeren painting embodies all of these qualities and is in fine condition, the present study offers a special opportunity to examine a little-known work that exemplifies Francesco Trevisani’s technical virtuosity in his mature style and in the medium and genre for which he was particularly renowned.\(^7\) Additionally, to date, no one has been able to identify the holy figure kneeling before the Virgin and Christ child in this scene. We shall see below that the saint is Liborius, a fourth-century bishop in Le Mans, France (r. 348-97) and a primary intercessor for those suffering from gallstones and associated ailments. As such, the essay below will situate this painting within the context of Francesco Trevisani’s oeuvre and show that the appropriate title for this work is *Madonna and Child with Saint Liborius*.

6. Francesco Trevisani  
*Madonna and Child with Saint Liborius*  
c. 1725-29  
Oil on copper  
22.1 x 29.8 cm (8 5/8 x 11 5/8 in.)

A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family

---

\(^6\) Curatorial File: Roger Ward, Copper Exhibition: Installation, NAMAA.  

This small painting on copper features the Madonna and Child on the left and a saint who kneels before them on the right. There are three *putti* in the foreground, each of whom holds a book, crosier, and miter. The latter are a bishop’s staff and traditional headdress, respectively. Therefore, these attributes signify that the kneeling figure is a bishop. From the upper left corner, a billowy cloud descends from the heavens, envelops two-thirds of the composition’s left side, and serves as a vaporous throne for the Virgin Mary and the infant Christ. The cloud’s steely hue is suffused with a golden, celestial light that emanates from the upper left quadrant. Light beams down on a diagonal over the Virgin’s right shoulder to illuminate the bishop’s rapt face fully and to create subtle pockets of darkness throughout the scene. Gazing up at the heavenly vision, the bishop kneels down upon both knees on a stone step that runs parallel to the picture plane in the painting’s lower quadrant.

The Virgin’s pink gown and flowing, cerulean cloak comprise the largest area of a single color in the composition. Gradations in hue accentuate the ample folds of blue fabric that drape over Mary’s left shoulder and wrap around the front of her torso to cover her left leg. Under her golden veil, the Madonna’s chestnut-brown hair frames a sweet face. Mary has a creamy complexion, flushed cheeks, soft eyebrows, rounded jaw line, thin rose-colored lips, and gently sloping nose. To support her son, Mary clasps her hands around his belly and props him upon a light lavender pillow that is placed on her lap. The knot of the cushion’s gold tassel is punctuated with a circular dab of paint that lends a three-dimensional quality to the decoration. A white cloth that wraps underneath Christ’s body and spans his chest limits Mary’s contact with her son’s flesh. The infant’s pudgy lower torso is fully exposed, but his genitals are decorously
hidden between the folds of his legs. The child rests his right forearm upon his mother’s hand and stretches his left arm to bless the bishop-saint who kneels before him. In stark contrast to the doughy consistency of the Virgin’s and Christ child’s hands, the bishop’s hands are expressive and display fully articulated anatomy, including knuckles, veins, cuticles, and strained tendons. The cleric has a full white beard and moustache, but his hair is thinning at the crown of his head. His ruddy cheeks accentuate his sharply defined features, which add further contrast to the rounded contours of the scene’s other figures. The bishop is sumptuously attired in an opulent, gold-embroidered cope with a matching stole. His pink vestments complement the hue of the Virgin’s gown and balance the scene chromatically. Beneath the dark, rose-tinted lining of the cope, the cleric wears a white linen, ankle-length alb with long sleeves that end at his wrists in either a ruffle or lace embellishment.

In the foreground, there is a faint pink-and-white checkerboard-patterned floor, made of Rosso di Verona, a pink, mottled stone that is common in the Veneto region, where the artist was from. Visible over the bishop’s left shoulder in the background is an architectural landscape that features a colonnaded tholos, or temple with a circular plan. Either in front of or connected to the temple is a pediment with one, or possibly two, rounded arches cut into its facade. The structure recalls the contour of the Pantheon in Rome. The architecture is flanked on the left with clouds and two cypress trees, and on the right, with leafy tree branches, covered with dark ivy-green leaves that have a few amber highlights. Bushes and treetops partially obscure the façade from below. On the horizon, peach hues lighten the dusky blue sky.

Two of the three fair-haired putti are positioned near the composition’s lower left corner. The third one stands opposite near the painting’s right edge. Each putto tends to a component of the bishop-saint’s regalia. The one on the right turns its back to the audience and appears in
partial profile facing to the viewer’s left, as it supports a large tome at the bishop’s left side. In contrast, his two diminutive companions face outward. One stands on the far left and supports a silver crosier, or bishop’s staff, while the other, sits and holds a miter with cream-colored cloth and gold embellishment. Decorative bands, or lappets, extend length-wise from the back of the pointed miter and lay upon the stone step. In a form of contrapposto, the pair of putti on the left turns their torsos away from one another. All three cherubs have ample, dimpled, fleshy bodies and torsos that are too long for their squat legs. Each has curly, yellow locks, a button nose, and a narrow forehead with pink, pudgy cheeks. Their short wings are connected high on their backs. Along the top edges of the wings, feathery accents of blue and pink mirror the colors of the Virgin’s garments. The wings of the putti on the left are topped with light pink feathers and those of the putto on the right are blue.

The kneeling bishop in the Van Ackeren scene holds his elbows close to his sides and touches his sternum with his right hand, opening his left palm to the viewer. Trevisani used white highlights on the tips of the thumb, fore-, and middle fingers to emphasize the bishop’s gesture as he points his index finger downwards to a large book that a standing putto holds up. This emphasis in color and gesture draws the viewer’s attention to seven or eight minutely sized objects that are yellowish in color and scattered atop the salmon-colored tome that has a gold clasp. At first glance, the objects appear to be gold coins, but closer examination reveals that they are painted in varying shades of gray, taupe, yellow, and rose and display a gravelly surface texture with irregular outlines and shadowed depressions [Cat. no. 6.1]. These pebble-like objects are likely meant to represent gallstones, the attribute of Saint Liborius, a fourth-century bishop from Le Mans, France who had a reputation as an effective intercessor for preventing and
curing gallstones.\textsuperscript{769}

\textit{Condition Description: } In 1999, the painting was taken from its frame and adhesive tape was removed from the copper reverse.\textsuperscript{770} Under raking light the painted surface appears to be in fine condition, with only a few minute irregularities in coloration. Under ultraviolet (UV) light, evidence of in-painting appears as a few scattered dots. Two of these dots appear on the outside edge of the bishop’s cope, in the area just below his left shoulder, and have been in-painted with brown pigment. Four small dots, in-painted with a cream color, are located above the right arm of the putto that stands on the far left. Restoration of flesh tones is apparent in a vertically oriented, oval area just above the navel of the putto holding the crosier, as well as on the inside edge of the right thigh and on the right hand near the thumb and little finger of the putto holding the miter. A smattering of in-painted specks appears along the front edge of the step’s riser. Two tiny circles of restored paint also appear on the square-tiled floor. These are located in the crosier’s shadow to the right and to the left of its base, below the putto’s right foot. Near the garment’s hemline, where the fabric folds vertically between the Virgin’s shins, there is a jagged, diagonal scratch, measuring 1.27 cm (.5 in.), to which blue pigment has been applied. The bishop’s headdress shows signs of in-painting in the areas of the crevice on the left side, and on the outer right edge, below the initiation of the curve. Irregular foxing appears throughout the area of the Virgin’s pink gown, perhaps due to a reaction between that particular pigment and the copper support.

\textsuperscript{769} Joanne Baptista, "V. S. Liborius calculo laborantim patronus," in \textit{Acta Sanctorum}, ed. Joanne Carnandet (Paris and Rome: Victorem Palme, 1868), 401. Bishop Liborius is the only saint that the Acta Sanctorum identifies as an effective intercessor for \textit{calculi}, which is the Latin word for gallstones.

\textsuperscript{770} This intervention was performed in the conservation department at the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, in relation to this work’s display at the museum for the \textit{Copper as Canvas} exhibition mentioned above. See Trevisani: Loans, file, \textit{Copper as Canvas}, GGA.
Attribution and Date: In terms of its figural rendering, style, composition, palette, and use of copper medium, the Van Ackeren Madonna and Child with Saint Liborius fully exemplifies the mature work of Francesco Trevisani. Considered below for the first time in relation to the Kansas City painting are works securely attributed to the artist that confirm his authorship of the work in question. As demonstrated in a comparison between this painting and a Holy Family with Saints Anne, Joachim, and John the Baptist of 1729 (Cleveland Art Museum) by Trevisani, this scene’s portrayal of the Madonna and Child is highly characteristic of the artist’s oeuvre. The Cleveland example is a full-sized, oil-on-canvas presentation sketch (158 x 160.70 cm) that he created in preparation for an altarpiece in the oratory of S. Maria in Via Lata near Piazza Poli in Rome. These paintings depict gracefully posed, porcelain-like figures that are illuminated and pushed close to the picture plane. Each shows the Madonna supporting her son on her lap amid a celestial vision of clouds and light that descends from the upper left corner. Both examples incorporate a delicate pastel palette of pink, cream, pale blue, and lavender, which is characteristic of the Roman rococo style that Trevisani adopted during the 1720s. The two examples portray Mary with chestnut-brown hair that frames her oval face and ivory complexion with rose-colored cheeks. She wears a pink dress, blue cloak, and mustard-colored veil and has a sweet countenance. In the foreground of each scene is a white-and-rose-checkerboard-patterned pavement, or Rosso di Verona, that also appears in Trevisani’s Vision of Saint Anthony of Padua

---

772 Wolfe notes that Trevisani was famous for his depictions of the Virgin and posits that, since his images of the Madonna are so distinctive, Trevisani may have used his wife as the model for these paintings. See ibid., 85, 91.
774 For description of the Cleveland work, see ibid.
775 Di Federico, Francesco Trevisani, 26.
of c. 1721 to 1724 (Church of the Stimmate di S. Francesco, Rome). The modeling of the Virgin’s hands in the Kansas City and Cleveland images causes them to appear boneless and somewhat misshapen, with a disproportionate width that could accommodate additional fingers. This physical anomaly is also present in other paintings by Trevisani, including a *Madonna and Sleeping Christ Child* of c. 1710 (The Hoare Collection, Stourhead, England) and a *Holy Family* of 1710-15 (Bayerische Staatsgemäldeammlungen, Munich), and a *Pentitent Magdalene* (private collection, United States). Comparisons with other works by Trevisani reveal another motif present in this work that seems to be representative of Trevisani’s oeuvre. This is a small outward tuck at the center of the neckline of Mary’s garment, which is repeated in many of the painter’s depictions of the mother of Christ, such as the aforementioned Cleveland and Hoare Collection works, and in another *Madonna and Sleeping Christ Child* of 1710 (Marchese of Exeter, Burghley House, Stamford, Lincolnshire).

It has never been mentioned before that the portrayal of Saint Liborius is quite close to Trevisani’s depictions of Noah, Moses, and Saints Philip, Peter, and Sylvester in the cartoon designs that he completed for the fresco decoration of the baptismal chapel at Saint Peter’s in Rome. In the instance of the chapel frescoes, the recurrence of similar figures throughout the decorative program would have provided a sense of visual continuity. Additionally, the repetition of like forms between Tevisani’s frescoes at Saint Peter’s and this small, devotional work perhaps exemplifies a time-saving device common to workshop production. Indeed, Liborius appears like the aforementioned holy men whose images were intended for the chapel.

---

776 For illustration of the Saint Anthony painting, see ibid., fig. 66.
777 For illustrations, see ibid., fig. 51; Wolfe, *Francesco Trevisani: Autoritratto*, figs. 10, 22.
778 For drawings and paintings that display the tuck at the Virgin’s garment neckline, see *Francesco Trevisani: Autoritratto*, figs. 9-10; "Acquisitive Tourism," 83-101.
decoration, looking elderly, with sparse tufts of white hair that sprout from the top of a largely bald head. The bishop and each of these Old and New Testament figures has a thick rim of unruly hair that encircles the skull at its base, and a shock of white hair that goes over the top of the ears to connect with a full, white beard that follows the chin’s contour. In terms of pose, Bishop Liborius compares with Saint Sylvester, as depicted in *Saint Sylvester Baptizing Constantine* (Benediction Loggia, Saint Peter’s Vatican, Rome; Private Collection, Washington DC). Although the figures are angled differently, both bishop-saints gaze upward in a state of ecstasy and make the same expressive hand gesture, with the left palm open, thumb relaxed, index finger pointed, and with the other three fingers slightly curled and spaced evenly apart. In addition, like all popes, Saint Sylvester, also served as bishop of Rome (r. 314-335), and is, therefore, dressed comparably to Bishop Liborius, although with less embellishment on the cope, probably because the design was meant for a fresco, whereas in the case of the Kansas City example, the use of oil medium and considerably smaller scale allowed for more intricate detailing. The creation of exquisite embellishment on Liborius’ liturgical garments compares, in terms of technical skill, to Trevisani’s rendering of lace surplices as depicted in his portraits of *Abate Carlo Colonna (?)* of 1691 (formerly Sotheby’s, London) and *Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni* of 1700-05 (The Bowes Museum, Barnard Castle, Durham, England), and of tapestry fabric for vests, as seen in the paintings, *James Murray, Titular Earl of Dunbar* and *David Murray, Sixth Viscount Stormount*, both of c. 1725 (collection of Earl of Mansfield, Scone Palace, Perthshire, Scotland). An additional comparison between the Van Ackeren example and other works by

---

780 For illustrations, see ibid., figs. 88-89.  
781 For descriptions and illustrations, see ibid., 98, 100, 107-08; figs. 17-20, 28.
Trevisani that no one has noted is the rendering of putti with fleshy bodies, elongated torsos, and heads with narrow foreheads and full cheeks. For instance, the cherubic figures that appear in a Dead Christ Supported by Angels (Kunsthistorisches Institut, Vienna) of 1720 are akin to the Van Ackeren putti, not only in terms of their shared physiognomy, but also because those depicted on the composition’s left side have wings that are tinged pink along the top edge, while those on the right have wings that are tinted blue. Additionally, the trope of putti holding saintly attributes that occurs in this scene is repeated in Trevisani’s Putti Displaying Instruments of the Passion of 1695-96, which he painted for the pendentives of the Crucifixion Chapel at S. Silvestro in Capite. Specifically, the Greenlease putto with the mitre is posed identically to the S. Silvestro cherub holding the column used in Christ’s flagellation.

Another point of consideration for this painting is its format, which compares to a Noli Me Tangere of circa 1700 (Burghley Collection, Stamford, Lincolnshire, England) by Trevisani. The fifth Earl of Exeter purchased this work directly from the artist during the British aristocrat’s trip to Rome. The Mary Magdalene scene shows the saint on the composition’s right side kneeling before a risen Christ, just as Saint Liborius kneels before the Madonna and Child. Over the left shoulder of each saint and in the distance is a colonnaded structure that is framed on the right with a grove of leafy trees and, on the left, with two cypresses that pierce the horizon. Again, for the artist to have adapted a similar format for these two paintings would have increased workshop output by saving time in the creative process. As shown above, in terms of

782 For more on Trevisani’s commission at S. Silvestro in Capite and images of the putti holding attributes, see Voss, Malerei des Barock in Rom, 616; Di Federico, ”Trevisani: A Contribution,” II, figs. 170-73; ”Decoration of the Crucifixion Chapel,” 52-67, figs. 22-25; Francesco Trevisani, 42-44, figs.16-19; Ruggeri, ”Francesco Trevisani,” 313.
783 For illustrations of the putto in the S. Silvestro fresco that supports the column from Christ’s flagellation, see Di Federico, ”Trevisani: A Contribution,” II, fig. 170; ”Decoration of the Crucifixion Chapel,” fig. 25; Francesco Trevisani, fig. 17.
784 Wolfe, ”Acquisitive Tourism,” 91.
its figural rendering, composition, medium, and mastery of brushwork, the Van Ackeren painting compares closely, with other works securely attributed to Francesco Trevisani, and, therefore, it appears quite certain that the attribution of the *Madonna and Child with Saint Liborius* to that master of the Roman Settecento is correct.

The first time that a specific date was assigned to this work was in a loan agreement for its display in the *Copper as Canvas* exhibition mentioned above. The date given was c. 1725, although it is not clear who made this assessment or how that person arrived at that conclusion. Nevertheless, their estimate seems accurate, because, during the 1720s, Trevisani included fewer figures in his compositions, suffused his scenes with golden light, and adopted a pastel palette. The Greenlease painting embodies all of these qualities and, therefore, should be included in his corpus of works from that period. Moreover, the intricate detailing of the cope aligns with the rendering of attire for Trevisani’s portraits of his British patrons that he painted c. 1725 and the rendering of the Madonna and Child aligns with the Cleveland work mentioned above, which art historian Edward Olszewski dates from 1729. Without documentation, there is no proof for this work’s date, but, based upon stylistic considerations, a date of c. 1725 to 1729 seems plausible for the Greenlease *Madonna and Child with Saint Liborius*.

*Provenance:* In 1980 the New York art dealer Martin Zimet of French and Company shipped the *Madonna and Child with Bishop Saint* by Francesco Trevisani to The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art in Kansas City, Missouri, where Edgar Peters Bowron, who was Curator of Renaissance and Baroque Art there from 1978 to 1981, examined the painting for Mrs. Virginia Greenlease.


786 E-mail Edgar Peters Bowron to Loren Whittaker, 3 December 2014.
After noting the painting’s high quality, Peters Bowron suggested that Mrs. Greenlease purchase the small copper work from the New York company. Following the curator’s advice, Mrs. Greenlease acquired the painting and immediately donated it to Rockhurst University. There is no earlier provenance known for this work.

In June of 1998, Roger Ward, who at the time was curator of European art at the Nelson-Atkins, sent a letter to Rockhurst University requesting the loan of this painting. Ward made this request with the intention of including the work in the Copper as Canvas exhibition, which, as stated above, originated at the Phoenix Art Museum, and was later on display at the Nelson-Atkins from 28 March to 6 June 1999. In his correspondence, the curator remarked, “I do hope this loan can be arranged, not just because of the intrinsic beauty of the painting itself, but also because there is not a single European painting on copper in the [Nelson-Atkins] Museum’s collection. The Rockhurst Madonna would be the only local representative!”

Iconography: The crosier and miter depicted in this scene indicate that the kneeling figure is a bishop. The crosier that the putto on the far left stabilizes is officially known as a baculus pastoralis, which is bestowed upon a bishop at the time of his consecration as a symbol of episcopal authority. The pastoral staff has a straight shaft that symbolizes virtuous rule, a

---

787 For Peters Bowron’s comments regarding the fine quality of the Trevisani painting, see Letter, Edgar Peters Bowron to Martin Zimet of French and Company, 1 October 1979, Francesco Trevisani: Acquisition file, GGA: Donald Hoffman, “Rockhurst Art Gallery Given Italian Work,” Kansas City Star, 6 July 1980, 6D.


789 Exhibition label, Curatorial File: Roger Ward, Copper Exhibition: Installation, NAMAA.

790 The year following the exhibition, Roger Ward, on behalf of the Nelson-Atkins, acquired a copper painting for the museum’s collection.


792 Noonan Jr., The Church Visible, 355.
pointed end meant to prod the spiritually idle, and a curved top to gather those who wander from the Christian fold, thus equating the bishop to a shepherd herding his flock.\(^7\) The seated *putto* holds a miter, or traditional bishop’s hat, which has two peaked sections that are sewn together on the sides. The type of miter represented in this scene is an *auriphyrgiata*, which is traditionally worn for the celebration of the sacraments.\(^8\) Typically, as seen here, it is covered in white or gold silk and embellished with gold and/or silver embroidery. Since the color of a bishop’s cope, or cloak, correlates with the celebration of specific liturgical feasts, the pink cope that Liborius wears in this image may reference the third Sunday of Advent, known as *Gaudete* Sunday, and/or the fourth Sunday of Lent, called *Laetare* Sunday.\(^9\) These two celebrations are related to the birth and resurrection of Christ, respectively. However, the artist’s choice of color may simply reflect his adherence to the pastel hues of the rococo palette. Trevisani’s representation of eighteenth-century clerical garments is faithful to the period’s style, as during the rococo, copes were produced in pastel shades, decorated with arabesque embroidery patterns, and, as was common earlier, were often sewn with an interior lining of a different color than the exterior.\(^10\) Rome was the leading center for the production of the type of cope that Trevisani depicted, which has a background fabric that is shot at intervals with glistening silver thread and heavily laden with gold embroidery.\(^11\) The third attribute, a book that the *putto* on the right

---


\(^8\) Noonan Jr., *The Church Visible*, 365-69.


balances horizontally in his arms, is the same color as the cope and may represent the Holy Bible and also symbolize the cleric’s faith and, perhaps, erudition. The classical architecture in the landscape on the right may symbolize Christianity’s conquest of Roman paganism or, as with the Birth of the Virgin by Cortona discussed in the previous entry, ties the painting to Rome.798

Because over time the identity of the kneeling bishop has been lost, the painting has retained the ambiguous title, Madonna and Child with Bishop Saint. Although Ward and Peters Bowron both recognized that the objects scattered on top of the book were integral to this devotional work’s symbolism, they were unable to determine which holy figure was depicted. The painting’s present gallery label suggests that the seven or eight yellow objects dispersed upon the book cover are coins. At a quick glance, this appears possible, but under magnification, these miniscule objects are neither gold nor silver in color, nor are their contours circular like coins. Rather, they are painted in varying shades of gray, taupe, yellow, and rose and display a gravelly surface texture with irregular outlines and shadowed depressions. A comparison of these pebble-like objects with medical photographs of gallstones extracted from the human body reveals that Trevisani painted gallstones, not coins.799 Moreover, he did so quite accurately which further exemplifies his technical skill in the petit manière, which, as we have seen above, he learned during his apprenticeship with Heintz. The saint whose attribute is gallstones is the fourth-century French bishop, Liborius.800

During the seventeenth century, the cult of Saint Liborius was particularly popular in

798 Schiller, Iconography of Christian Art, 1: 305.
Italy, Germany, Spain, and Western Croatia, in areas where water came into contact with limestone and, therefore, contained high mineral levels of calcium and magnesium, the ingestion of which could cause gallstones. Liborius came from Gaul, which, during his life, had borders extending from the coast of France to west of the Rhine River in present-day Germany. At the beginning of the bishop’s tenure as bishop of Le Mans, Christianity had been legalized for only a few decades under Emperor Constantine’s Edict of Milan of 313 and pagans remained numerous in the diocese. In order to facilitate their conversion to Christianity, the bishop ordained many clerics and constructed several churches. In 397 Liborius died in the arms of his close friend, Saint Martin of Tours (316-397), and he was buried in the Apostles’ Basilica in Le Mans. In 799, Charlemagne (742-814) and Pope Leo III (795-816) established a diocese in Paderborn, Germany, where the saint’s relics were translated during the ninth century and where they remain housed in the cathedral’s crypt. The first recorded instance of a miraculous cure from gallstones resulting from invoking the saint’s help occurred in 1267, when Archbishop Werner von Eppstein visited the saint’s shrine in Paderborn and was relieved of his suffering.

According to Saint Liborius’s vita in the Acta Sanctorum, those suffering from symptoms associated with gallstone and kidney ailments should seek his intercession by reciting the Oratio contra caclulum, which reads as follows:

---

Christi Praesul egregious
Pro nobis hic LIBORIVS, oret deum altissimum;
Ne pro culpâ peccaminum, morbo vexemur calculii.
Succurrant nobis Angeli, et post vitae certamina, ducant ad ver gaudia. \(^{807}\)

(Christ Egregious (or remarkably good) Overseer,
For us here, Liborius, pray to God above.
Do not fault us our sins with this vexing gallstone disease.
Present to us the angels that, after the battle, will lead us to the joys of spring.)

Accompanying the prayer is an illustration of Saint Liborius in a three-quarter pose. He wears a miter and holds a crosier in his left hand, as he braces a book against his chest with his right arm. \(^{808}\) As with the Greenlease image, the crosier, miter, and book signify that the cleric depicted is a bishop and confessor. What identifies him specifically as Saint Liborius are the five, medium-sized stones that are set atop the closed tome that he holds and the smaller pebbles that have seemingly spilled out of the picture’s laurel frame onto an expanse of white fabric stretched below. \(^{809}\) In the Westsalenkappelle (chapel at the west end) at Paderborn Cathedral there is a sculpture of 1517 that depicts iconography similar to that which appears in the Greenlease painting, including the saint wearing a miter and holding a crosier and an open book upon which three walnut-sized gallstones rest. \(^{810}\) While the number of stones included in various examples may or may not bear some religious significance, since there seems to be no consistency in how many pebbles are displayed as attributes for Saint Liborius, it could be that their number and placement often serves only compositional considerations. Nevertheless, the iconography of the Greenlease example relates to that of the *Acta Sanctorum* image and

\(^{807}\) Baptista, "V.S. Liborius," 401.
\(^{808}\) For illustration of Saint Liborius, see ibid.
\(^{809}\) In an individual’s gallbladder, gallstones typically consist of one or more pebbles that vary in size from as small as a grain of sand to as large as a golf ball. See Stella Fatovic-Ferencic, “Two Unconventional Testimonies,” 245-49; Services, “Gallstones”.
\(^{810}\) For other images of the saint in Paderborn, see de Vry, *Liborius*, 10, 22, 29. Braun states that German representations of the saint typically show three or four small stones. See Braun, *Tracht und Attributen*, 464-65.
Paderborn cathedral sculpture and confirms that the unknown bishop-saint depicted is Liborius.

*Format and Function:* As this painting exemplifies, during the early to mid-eighteenth century in Rome, copper remained popular as a medium for artists like Trevisani, even though its use had waned in most other places in Italy.\(^{811}\) Copper was prevalent in Europe as a support from the mid-sixteenth to mid-seventeenth centuries, which coincided with the development of a humanist interest in precious objects that were collectable.\(^{812}\) Other contributing factors to the medium’s popularity included advances in the mining and manufacturing of the metal, and a continued and increased practice by artists for etching and engraving.\(^{813}\) The early modern artist and biographer Giorgio Vasari (1511-1574) mentions in his *Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects* that the painter Sebastiano del Piombo (1485-1547) painted on various types of stone, describing them as “materials on which paintings can last a very long time…not to mention that this has shown how one may paint on silver, copper, tin, and other metals.”\(^{814}\)

Sometimes an engraved or etched plate was repurposed for a painting. In these instances, the previously etched scene is visible through the paint film, which does not appear to be the case

---


\(^{812}\) Van der Graaf, "Development of Oil Paint," 43.

\(^{813}\) Bowron, "A Brief History," 10.

with the Van Ackeren painting. Those, like Trevisani, who were skilled in the *petit maniéré*, appreciated the medium’s evenness and ability to support delicate brushwork, making it appear smooth and enamel-like, as it does in the Van Ackeren painting. Because the artist could paint minute details, copper was particularly useful in creating an exact copy of an original work.

While copper was too expensive to use for a *modello*, artists did sometimes use the metal support to create a personal record of a work, or to replicate an altarpiece or easel painting in miniature for a patron. However, in the instance of the Greenlease work, this is probably not the case, since it is not related to any known altarpiece.

Additionally, there were practical considerations in the medium’s use. For a copper support, issues of corrosion and flimsiness were not a concern because paint creates a barrier that insulates the metal from contact with air and, thus, prevents corrosion. Also, a thinner plate that is more highly worked becomes sturdier. Moreover, copper does not crack or tear and its smooth surface is non-absorbent so that less paint is needed. Also, copper requires far less preparation. Instead of applying layers of glue sizing and gesso as with the panel and canvas, the surface only needs plannishing, or flattening to a smooth finish, and then roughening to create a ‘tooth’, or jagged surface, for the paint to adhere. To improve paint adherence, Trevisani may have followed the methods that period artists suggested, such as wiping the

---

819 Horovitz, "Materials and Techniques," 64-69, 76, 84-85.
821 Either the artist or someone else had to plannish the sheet until it was completely flat and free of hammer or roll marks that may have been incurred during manufacture. See Horovitz, "Materials and Techniques," 64.
copper plate with a flux of borax, alum, or salts, or with garlic to create a sticky surface.\textsuperscript{822} Some copper sheets were covered with a thin layer of white lead and umber in oil or with tin, lead, or silver leaf, which lent luminosity to the enamel-like surface.\textsuperscript{823}

\textit{Context}: The difficulty experienced in identifying the bishop that Trevisani depicted in the Greenlease painting is not surprising because the saint is obscure and very little is known about his life.\textsuperscript{824} His name is not included in the Tridentine calendar and it was only added to the Roman calendar in 1702, when Clement XI (r. 1700-1721) assigned 23 July as a day of commemoration for the saint whose name he had invoked in search of a cure for his gallstones.\textsuperscript{825} Another early eighteenth-century figure who sought the saint’s help to rid him of his gallstone pain was Lombard artist Paolo Pagani (1655-1716), who, in 1712, painted an altarpiece, entitled \textit{S. Liborio}, which he donated to the Augustinian church of S. Marco in Milan as a votive to the saint for restoring the painter’s health.\textsuperscript{826} The artist signed and dated the work in an inscription written on a scroll that an older man in contemporary clothes on the right side of the composition unfurls. It states “D. LIBORIO/ Restitute saluti / VOTUM SOLVENS/ Paulus

\textsuperscript{822} Ibid., 67, 70.
\textsuperscript{823} Peters Bowron, "A Brief History," 9-11; Horovitz, "Materials and Techniques,” 67-70. To determine Trevisani’s method of preparation, a cross-section of the painting’s surface would need to be extracted and analyzed in a laboratory, which is an examination that is beyond the scope of the present study.
\textsuperscript{824} For instance, no entry is dedicated to Liborius in the Catholic Encyclopedia and he is only mentioned in the online version under three subtitles: “LeMans,” “Latin Literature in Christianity (Sixth to Twentieth Century),” and “Patron Saints.” His biography is also not included in most dictionaries and books on the lives of the saints. However, the Acta Sanctorum dedicates several pages to Saint Liborius. See Baptista, "V.S. Liborius,” 400-07. Brief entries for the bishop-saint also appear in: Attwater and Thurston, "Saint Liborius,” 329-30; Parsch, The Church's Year of Grace, 4: 265; Braun, Tracht und Attributen, 463.
"Paganus / Pingebat / Ano MDCCXII." Near the composition’s bottom edge Pagani portrayed a prostrate male in a loin-cloth, who presses his hands against the sides of his ribcage, presumably reacting to the gallstone pain, which typically radiates through the chest.\textsuperscript{827} The Kansas City and Milan scenes display typical iconography for Saint Liborius, including a bishop’s crosier and miter, as well as a book. However, they are dissimilar in composition and size, and would have been viewed in different settings. While Pagani’s large altarpiece was appropriate for public display, the much smaller Greenlease \textit{Madonna and Child with Saint Liborius} was more suitable for a more intimate setting, such as a camera in a Roman palace. For instance, as Stephanie Leone describes, one of three religious works that Prince Giovanni Battista Pamphilj (1648-1709) kept in his bed chamber at the Pamphilj palace was a “Saint Liborius before a Madonna and Child on red taffeta in a frame of white wood.”\textsuperscript{828} Whether or not the Greenlease painting was originally framed in the same manner as the Pamphilj example is unknown, but it is likely that it was displayed under similar circumstances, in the private chamber of a wealthy patron in Rome, who sought the intercession of Bishop Liborius, patron saint of gallstones.

The inclusion of Saint Liborius made the painting particularly efficacious for prayers offered in relation to healing gallbladder and kidney ailments. Considering the approximate date of c. 1729 for this work’s creation, it could be that the original patron may have wished to commemorate Pope Clement XI’s recent inclusion of the saint in the Roman calendar, or, since Trevisani was known to keep works on hand to sell in his workshop, perhaps, he painted this subject as a work to keep in stock in anticipation of a sale.\textsuperscript{829} During the time that Trevisani was

\textsuperscript{827} Symptoms for the ailment, which were well documented in Hippocratic manuscripts, included acute pain that might radiate to the chest. See Stella Fatovic-Ferencic, “Two Unconventional Testimonies,” 245-49; Services, "Gallstones”.

\textsuperscript{828} Leone, “Prince Giovanni Battista Pamphilj,” 203.

\textsuperscript{829} Stella Fatovic-Ferencic, “Two Unconventional Testimonies,” 247.
active in Rome, there was a market for small paintings that included a Roman-inspired vista, as appears here in the composition’s upper right corner. Such works appealed to tourists, for example, the fifth Earl of Exeter, Captain Urguhart, the British aristocrat mentioned above, who purchased a Noli me tangere by Trevisani for his wife, Lady Anne. While the Roman-inspired architectural landscape that appears in this painting might symbolize Christianity’s conquest of paganism, its inclusion in the Earl of Exeter’s scene also served as a visual reminder of the duke’s own visit to the Eternal City during his Grand Tour of Europe. Nobles were not the only ones who purchased devotional works such as this. As Peters Bowron notes, these small pictures were also particularly well suited to smaller bourgeois residences.

**Conclusion:** This painting demonstrates qualities that are fundamental to Trevisani’s mature oeuvre during the 1720s, including his uncluttered compositions and Venetian-inspired effects of light and color, which he blended into the contemporary form of the Roman rococo. As a carefully wrought, small-scale devotional work, the Van Ackeren painting exemplifies the genre for which the artist was particularly noted. Because of its medium of oil and copper, the painting has retained much of its original freshness and showcases the artist’s technical virtuosity in the petit maniére. In creating this painting, Trevisani worked within stylistic norms, crafting a picture that included a religious figure who held particular relevance for Rome after 1702, when
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830 For instance, Trevisani painted portraits of visiting British aristocrats, that, similar to the Greenlease composition, incorporated classically inspired architecture in the composition’s upper right corner. See Di Federico, *Francesco Trevisani*, 48, 74-75, figs. 17-20, plate 103. For British patronage of Trevisani see Wolfe, "Acquisitive Tourism," 83-101.

831 Bowron, "A Brief History," 8 n. 5. Another oil-on-copper painting with which this work compares is a Pietà (Los Angeles County Museum of Art) that Trevisani painted c. 1720. The work measures 22.54 × 17.46 cm (8 7/8 × 6 7/8 in.) and is somewhat smaller than the Van Ackeren example.


833 Because copper paintings are made of a durable medium, colors tend to remain stable. See Bowron, "A Brief History," 11, 25.
Clement XI gave personal thanks to Saint Liborius for his intercession. As such, Francesco Trevisani’s painting, the *Madonna and Child with Saint Liborius*, offers an exemplary visual record of the art of the Roman Settecento by one of the period’s most famous artists and important academicians.

GIUSEPPE MARIA CRESPI, called LO SPAGNOLO
Bologna, 1665-1747

Giuseppe Maria Crespi, called Lo Spagnuolo, was one of Bologna’s finest artists and the last of its famous Baroque painters. Born on 14 March 1665, Giuseppe Maria was the youngest of the four children of a miller, Girolamo Teodosio Crespi, and his wife, Ippolita Cospi. The family resided in a modest, comfortable home in the parish of S. Martino Maggiore. At the age of twelve, Giuseppe Maria began his training with a little-known painter, Agnolo Michele Toni (1640-1708). Later he studied with Domenico Maria Canuti (1620-1684) and, after Canuti’s death, trained for two years with Carlo Cignani (1628-1719). Both instructors painted in the predominant style of the Bolognese school, which the Carracci, brothers Agostino (1557-1602) and Annibale (1560-1609) and their cousin, Ludovico (1551-

---

836 Crespi, *Felsina pittrice*, 201.
1619), had established in 1582.\textsuperscript{838} As part of his training, Crespi copied altarpieces by Guercino (1591-1666) and fresco cycles that the Carracci, and their students completed at the Palazzo Fava (1583/84) and Palazzo Magnani (1590) and at the cloister of S. Michele in Bosco (1592).\textsuperscript{839}

During the 1680s, he attended the academy at Palazzo Ghislieri, where his colleagues playfully nicknamed him “Lo Spagnuolo,” or the Spaniard, for his outmoded wardrobe, comprised of a short, tight, little jacket and narrow trousers.\textsuperscript{840} Crespi was a talented draughtsman, who often placed first in life drawing classes.\textsuperscript{841} However, when the tall, blue-eyed artist put that talent toward sketching a caricature of the instructor, Count Carlo Cesare Malvasia (1616-1693), as a dead chicken and passing it around the classroom, he was expelled from the academy.\textsuperscript{842} After his dismissal from the academy, he underwent a self-imposed exile and traveled for the first time to Venice.

By 1686 he had returned to Bologna and opened a studio with fellow artist Gian Antonio Burrini (1656-1727) and some students of painter Lorenzo Pasinelli (1629-1700).\textsuperscript{843} On 24 May 1690 Crespi received a unanimous vote to join the local guild of painters, the Compagnia de Signori Pitori (company of gentlemen painters).\textsuperscript{844} Fourteen years later, he instituted his own academy, which met with immediate success, attracting over thirty students from Siena, Ferrara,


\textsuperscript{839} For more on Crespi and the accurate copies that he made of paintings by Annibale Carracci and Guercino, see Zanotti, "Lo Spagnuolo," 32-33; Crespi, \textit{Felsina pittrice}, 202-03; Merriman, "Paintings," 16-17.

\textsuperscript{840} Zanotti, "Lo Spagnuolo," 32-33; Crespi, \textit{Felsina pittrice}, 201, 225; Puglisi, "Giuseppe Maria Crespi," 140.

\textsuperscript{841} For Crespi’s skill as a draughtsman, see Spike, "Drawings by Crespi in the Uffizi," 105-11.

\textsuperscript{842} Crespi, \textit{Felsina pittrice}, 206; Merriman, "Paintings," 2, 23-24, 82; Puglisi, "Giuseppe Maria Crespi," 141.

\textsuperscript{843} Zanotti, "Lo Spagnuolo," 35; Crespi, \textit{Felsina pittrice}, 205; Michael Liebman, \textit{Giuseppe Maria Crespi} (Dresden: VEB Verlag der Kunst, 1976), 11; Merriman, "Paintings," 17, 20; Puglisi, "Giuseppe Maria Crespi," 140.

\textsuperscript{844} Merriman, \textit{Giuseppe Maria Crespi}, 25.
Pistoia, Imola, Turin, and Venice. On 17 May 1707, the painter married Gioanna Cuppini Spisi, an eighteen-year-old widow and butcher’s daughter, with whom he had four children, including Crespi’s future biographer, Luigi. The following year, he helped found Bologna’s first official public arts school, the Accademia Clementina, which was named after the reigning pope, Clement XI (r. 1700-1721). Crespi was one of the academy’s forty original members and served two terms as one of the academy’s first elected presidents. However, shortly after serving those terms he cut his ties to the institution, because he felt the organization’s membership policy was lax and, thus, compromised the honor of his profession.

Direct in his dealings, Crespi once forcefully confiscated a painting of the Massacre of the Innocents (1708) from a Florentine priest who commissioned the work as a gift for the grand prince of Tuscany, Ferdinando de’ Medici (1663-1713), but decided instead to keep it himself. Against the mores of courtly etiquette, Crespi personally delivered the commission to the Medici prince, who was impressed enough to invite the artist to reside for a period at his villa at Pratolino and serve as Ferdinando’s “pittore attuale,” or “current painter.” During Crespi’s eight-month residency there, his wife gave birth to their third son, who was named after the Medici prince, who was also the boy’s godfather. After Ferdinando de’ Medici’s death in 1713, his younger brother, Gian Gastone, continued as late as 1736 to commission works from the Bolognese master.
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845 Crespi, Felsina pittrice, 231-32; Merriman, "Paintings," 66-67 n. 5.
846 For more on Crespi’s wife and children, see Merriman, "Paintings," 65 n. 1, 133-34; Giuseppe Maria Crespi, 27-28.
847 Zanotti, "Lo Spagnuolo," 15; Merriman, Giuseppe Maria Crespi, 30-31.
848 Crespi, Felsina pittrice, 227; Merriman, "Paintings," 79-84; Puglisi, "Giuseppe Maria Crespi," 141.
849 For more on this and other Crespi commissions for the Medici, see Merriman, "Paintings," 90; Spike, "The Vita of Giuseppe Maria Crespi"; Puglisi, "Giuseppe Maria Crespi," 142.
850 Merriman, "Paintings," 65 n. 1, 133-34.
851 Ibid.
After his wife died of a stroke on 24 May 1722, Crespi became more and more reclusive. He abandoned teaching, preferring instead to paint in his workshop solely with his sons, Luigi and Antonio. The archbishop of Bologna, Cardinal Prospero Lorenzo Lambertini (1675-1758) was Crespi’s good friend and an ardent admirer of his work. In 1741, when Lambertini was reigning as Pope Benedict XIV (r. 1740-1758), he honored the artist by giving him the title of Cavaliere, or knight. For the final two years of his life, the artist was blind. With his four sons at his bedside, Crespi died on 16 July 1747 and then was buried at the Confraternità della S. Maria Maddalena, his parish church in Bologna. In praise of his father, Luigi later commented that he left behind no debt, but only the wealth of his work.

During Crespi’s career, Rome and Venice were declining in prestige as art centers. Consequently, art collectors were drawn to Bologna, where artists like Crespi benefitted from the influx of new commissions. For instance, even though the painter never travelled to the Vatican a Roman cardinal, Pietro Ottoboni (1667-1740), owned his most famous series of paintings, *The Seven Sacraments* (1712), which were acclaimed for their genre-like treatment of liturgical themes. Other illustrious individuals whom Crespi counted among his patrons included

---

852 Merriman, *Giuseppe Maria Crespi*, 35; Puglisi, "Giuseppe Maria Crespi," 144.
854 Merriman, *Giuseppe Maria Crespi*, 36-37.
855 Ibid.
856 Crespi, *Felsina pittrice*, 222; Merriman, "Paintings," 140-41.
Ferdinando de’ Medici’s younger brother, Gian Gastone, the last Medici duke of Tuscany (1671-1737); the Prince of Liechtenstein, Karl Eusebius (1611-1684); King James III of England (1688-1766); and Prince Eugene of Savoy (1663-1736), who scholar Frances Haskell considers to have been the period’s premier European patron.\textsuperscript{860} Lo Spagnuolo also painted for important clerics and for several religious orders, including the Jesuits, Benedictines, Barnabites, and the Servites.\textsuperscript{861} Crespi’s patrons in Bologna included the prominent Ghisilieri and Pepoli families, as well as wealthy merchants, such as Giovanni Ricci, who sponsored the artist’s trips to study in Venice, Modena, Pesaro, Urbino, and Parma.\textsuperscript{862}

Even though Crespi was fully schooled in Bologna’s academic style, his art contrasted markedly with that of his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{863} Instead of smoothly blending his brushwork, Crespi painted with a vigorous stroke and preferred secular and religious subjects to the classical themes that were popular among Bologna’s aristocrats.\textsuperscript{864} Scholars suggest that Crespi’s style diverged from classicism because of the influence of his studies outside of the city, particularly in Venice where he observed the color and brushwork of Titian’s (1488-1576) late paintings and the rustic nature of Jacopo Bassano’s (1510-1592) compositional and subjects, and in Parma, where he admired the color palettes of Antonio da Correggio (1489-1534) and Parmigianino (1503-1540).\textsuperscript{865} Another major source of inspiration for the artist was the Medici’s collection of

\textsuperscript{860} Haskell, \textit{Patrons and Painters}, 199, 384.
\textsuperscript{861} For more on Crespi’s numerous, illustrious patrons, see ibid., 166, 169-70, 201, 221, 225-26; Crespi, \textit{Felsina pittrice}: 205, 207-08, 214; Merriman, "Paintings," 75, 104-08, 116; Spike, "The Vita of Giuseppe Maria Crespi by F.M.N. Gaburri: Notes on the Artist’s Visit to Florence in 1736," 22; Puglisi, "Giuseppe Maria Crespi," 141-42.
\textsuperscript{862} Haskell, \textit{Patrons and Painters}: 203-04; Puglisi, "Giuseppe Maria Crespi," 140.
\textsuperscript{863} John T. Spike, "Giuseppe Maria Crespi and the Emergence of Genre Painting in Italy," (Fort Worth: Kimbell Art Museum, 1986), 21.
\textsuperscript{864} Merriman, "Paintings," 41-48, 51-54.
\textsuperscript{865} From Umbrian and other Venetian artistic influences for the painter, see Matteo Marangoni, "Giuseppe Maria Crespi detto Lo Spagnuolo," \textit{Dedalo} I (1920-1921): 575-91, 647-68; Crespi, \textit{Felsina pittrice}, 205; Merriman, "Paintings," 21-22, 27, 32-38, 45.
Flemish and Baroque paintings, to which he had access during his 1709 stay at the family’s villa at Pratolino. Crespi was drawn to the northern, “low-life” genre scenes of peasants and admired Rembrandt’s (1606-1669) use of chiaroscuro, or contrast of dark and light. He experimented in his home with the camera obscura and translated to his paintings the effects of light that he observed, by creating luminescent figures that emerged from an obscured background. Only one of Crespi’s followers, Venetian artist Giovanni Battista Piazzetta (1682-1752/4), became well known. Piazzetta’s paintings, which display the energetic brushwork that he had adopted from Crespi, later inspired Venetian artist Giovanni Battista Tiepolo (1696-1770), whose work is also represented in the Van Ackeren collection, later drew from.

Crespi’s first biographers were his son, Luigi (1708-99), and Giampietro Zanotti (1674-1765), who served as secretary at the Accademia Clementina. Lo Spagnuolo and his work were highly regarded by Venetian critics and art connoisseurs Francesco Algarotti (1712-1764) and Zaccaria Sagredo (1653-1729) and engraver and draftsman Antonio Maria Zanetti (1679-1767). However, while the Accademia director Zanotti acknowledged that Crespi was a famous and celebrated artist, he described him as “aparto e strano,” or reclusive and strange, and pettily criticized the painter for his simple manner of speaking and dressing, finding both to be

866 Merriman, “Paintings,” 97-103.
867 Ibid., 110; Wittkower, Art and Architecture in Italy, 1600-1750, 3: 491-96.
868 Crespi, Felsina pittrice, 223; Merriman, “Paintings,” 75-76; Giuseppe Maria Crespi, 52; Puglisi, “Giuseppe Maria Crespi,” 144.
872 Haskell, Patrons and Painters, 341-51; Puglisi, “Giuseppe Maria Crespi,” 140-46; Francesco Algarotti, Saggio sopra la pittura (Glasgow: Printed for Robert Urie, 1764), 3: 25.
inappropriate in the company of important clerics and patrons.\textsuperscript{873} This derogatory
characterization influenced later critics, who judged Crespi and his art based on accounts of his
personality.\textsuperscript{874} Consequently, what sparse nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholarship
pertaining to the artist exists proves disparaging and sometimes incorrect.\textsuperscript{875} More recently,
researchers have shown that an understanding of the artist’s work oftentimes falls short. For
example, scholars Mira Pajes Merriman and John T. Spike praise Crespi’s sensitive and dignified
treatment of humble themes.\textsuperscript{876} Spike also credits Crespi for playing an instrumental role in
increasing the popularity of genre themes in Italy during the eighteenth century. However, like
so many of the period’s artists, Crespi faded into critical obscurity as the baroque style fell out of
fashion.\textsuperscript{877}

After 1913, when art historian Herman Voss listed eighty of Crespi’s paintings in the
Allgemeines Künstler-Lexicon, the artist’s work began to attract critical attention for its
innovative departure from the classical Bolognese tradition.\textsuperscript{878} His paintings entered into a brisk
post-war market and fared well.\textsuperscript{879} In 1935, sixty-four of Crespi’s paintings were prominently
featured in an exhibition of settecento, or eighteenth-century, artists in Bologna.\textsuperscript{880} The first
show dedicated solely to Crespi occurred in 1948 at the Salone del Podestà in Bologna, under the

\textsuperscript{874} For critique of Crespi’s personality, see “\textit{Un umore strano, un uomo bizzarro}” in Zanotti, "Lo Spagnuolo," 70; Roberto Longhi and Guido Zucchini, \textit{Mostra del settecento bolognese: Catologo} (Bologna: Comune di Bologna, 1935), 7-8; Merriman, "Paintings," 49, 83-84; Emiliani, "Sentimento dell’essere e Tempo Ritrovato " xxi-xxii.
\textsuperscript{875} For more on Crespi’s critical acclaim, see Tietze, \textit{Three Baroque Masters}, 11; Merriman, "Paintings," v;
\textit{Giuseppe Maria Crespi}, 39-60.
\textsuperscript{876} "Paintings," 41-48; Spike, "Crespi," 13.
\textsuperscript{877} Tietze, \textit{Three Baroque Masters}, 11.
\textsuperscript{878} Herman Voss, "Crespi, Giuseppe Maria," in \textit{Allgemeines Lexicon der Bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur}
\textsuperscript{879} Merriman, "Paintings," ii. v.
\textsuperscript{880} Zucchini, \textit{Mostra del settecento bolognese}, cat. no. 8.
co-curation of Roberto Longhi, Cesare Gnudi, and Francesco Arcangeli. During the 1980s and 1990s, three major exhibitions dedicated to the artist took place in fairly quick succession at the Kimbell Museum, Fort Worth (1986); the Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna, Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart, Pushkin Museum, Moscow (1990); and the Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence (1993).

To date, the most comprehensive study of the artist’s paintings is Mira Pajes Merriman’s 1969 PhD dissertation, which establishes a chronological order for Crespi’s oeuvre and identifies 310 of his paintings. In 2014 Marco Riccòmini published a catalogue raisonné of Crespi’s drawings and prints, which brought much needed attention to the artist’s skilled production of drawings.

Merriman’s research was very thorough, but not exhaustive, as she herself noted, when she pointed out that the artist’s iconography deserves further attention. This is an issue that remains unresolved, but one that the present study will help to address. One painting that has been attributed to Giuseppe Maria Crespi but that Merriman did not include in her list is the Holy Family that belongs to the Van Ackeren collection of Religious Art in Kansas City, Missouri. As we shall see below, at the time of Merriman’s study, the painting was part of a private collection in France. Since then, the only published reference to this painting appears in a catalog entry for an almost identical work by Crespi (Colnaghi Collection, New York) that was

---

886 Merriman likely did not know about this painting because, at the time of her study it belonged to a private French collector. See discussion below.
featured in the aforementioned 1990 exhibition in Bologna. The essay’s author, art historian Giordano Viroli, noted the similarities between the Colnaghi and Rockhurst works, but left much room for discussion regarding the topic. Therefore, the discussion below will address aspects of the Greenlease Holy Family, such as its subject, iconography, and context that have not yet received scholarly consideration.887

7. Giuseppe Maria Crespi (called Lo Spagnuolo)  
*The Holy Family*  
c. 1730  
Oil on canvas  
63.82 x 52.71 cm (25 1/8 x 20 3/4 in.)  
A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family  

Provenance: Private collection, Saint-Jean-Cap-Ferrat, France; Frederick Mont for Frederick Mont, Inc., New York; Virginia Greenlease, Kansas City, Missouri, 1976 to Rockhurst University.

*Description:* This painting depicts the Holy Family in a domestic setting that also serves as a carpenter’s workshop. The room is partially lit with a muted, natural light that emanates from a window with diamond-shaped, leaded-glass panes located in the upper left corner. However, the source of illumination for Mary, her husband Joseph, and the infant Jesus is unseen and, therefore, likely divine in origin. The infant Christ is placed centrally in the composition in a woven basket lined with a white sheet. Mary and Joseph kneel on the left and right, respectively, gazing at and leaning towards the infant, who slumbers peacefully with his head tilting slightly to his right side and resting upon a plump, cream-colored pillow. Jesus is swaddled tightly in white

linen strips that cover him from his feet to just below the shoulders and with three bands of red cloth that run horizontally across his body.

The Virgin wears an unadorned, long-sleeved, red dress with a round collar. From beneath her garment the narrow border of a white linen shirt, or camicia, is revealed at her wrists and neck-line. The Virgin’s dark auburn tresses are pulled back away from her face, just above the ear lobes. At the nape of her neck, Mary’s hair is tucked under her blue veil, which falls midway down her back and is fixed into place on top of her head. The Virgin’s face is delineated with softly curved eyebrows, a delicately modeled chin, and slightly parted lips that are tinted rose. She subtly inclines her head as she observes her son. Her fingertips barely touch, as she holds her hands in prayer. Placed prominently in the lower left corner is a shallow, woven, oval sewing basket filled with a small tan pin cushion, upon which a pair of scissors rests. A threaded needle is stuck into the pillow and an attached spool has tumbled over the wicker basket’s side, leaving behind a trail of white thread. Hanging on the edge of the sleeve of a white linen shirt, with a finished cuff.

Behind the basket there is a wooden chair with two back slats and a woven, cane-bottomed seat upon which an open book rests. The placement of the text complements the open codex that Mary’s husband, Joseph, supports in both of his hands, as he kneels opposite her. He uses the middle and little fingers of his left hand to prop his attribute, a blooming staff, at an angle against his chest. Three faint, white flowers with four petals each are barely visible at the top of the dark brown, wooden stick. In terms of his position opposite her and his appearance, Joseph presents a visual counterpoint to the Virgin. While Mary’s back is straight, Joseph’s is curved. His stoop shows his advanced age and places him close to the infant Christ. The Virgin’s complexion is smooth and creamy, with a few pink hints in her cheeks, but the much
older Joseph’s skin appears ruddy and his brow is wrinkled. And, while her hair is neatly swept back, his straggly beard barely covers his chin and his white hair wafts back in unruly wisps. The mother and foster father of Christ wear the same gold and robin’s-egg-blue clothing, only in reverse. Joseph has a dark yellow cloak that drapes over an ample-sleeved, blue, collared shirt that laces at the sternum. Conversely Mary’s veil is blue with a gold lining.

To the right of the window in the background there is a shelf with carpentry tools that hang vertically from the shelf. Next to the shelf is a roughly hewn, hanging cupboard with closed doors. The painting’s varnish has darkened so that details of the back wall are barely visible. However, upon close inspection, one can decipher the horizontal and vertical outlines of a few scattered bricks and a square dark patch on the wall below the fireplace hood, which appears as a triangular section in the painting’s upper right quadrant. An iron hook hangs from the hood’s edge, possibly intended for a pot.

The artist accurately rendered the carpenter’s bench, which dominates the middle ground. Its form emerges from the room’s obscure recesses, through the use of carefully placed highlights that define the edges of the broad and hefty chop block, the handle, and the vise, which is comprised of a thick, wooden plank that runs horizontally to the bench. An enormous wooden screw extends perpendicularly from the bench’s side and threads through the handle of the vise. This allows for the handle to travel back and forth in order to adjust the vise’s width and thus accommodate varying thicknesses of lumber. A rectangular board is wedged at an angle into the vise’s firm grip. A bow saw is lodged where it ceased cutting into the wood

---

889 For a depiction of a bow saw, see Ancient Carpenters' Tools, 70, 150; figs. 70, 140
at a position of one-sixth of the board’s length. The saw’s curved brackets form a lyre shape that frames three horizontal elements: a thick piece of twine at the top that is attached to a vertical toggle to control the rope’s tension, a stabilizing bar in the middle, and, at the lowest level, a riveted blade, which the artist accented with a silvery blue tint. A peg passes through each side of the bow’s frame and attaches to the blade’s edge, to allow for the adjustment of the cutting angle. The intersection of the bow saw and wood plank forms a cross. The interconnecting surfaces are painted light brown, which emphasizes its shape against the dark background. The cross hovers at an angle over the sleeping, swaddled Christ child, presaging his Crucifixion and his subsequent entombment, while the white winding cloth in the basket nearby may symbolize his Resurrection.

**Condition Description:** The painting is in good and stable condition. Areas of retouching are evident under ultraviolet light. These include a few, tiny specks randomly scattered across the back wall and a vertical string of five dots that are located in the composition’s upper right quadrant, approximately 17.145 cm (6 ¾ in.) below the canvas’ upper edge and 12.7 cm (5 in.) to the left of its right border. Other small areas of retouching evident under ultraviolet light are located on the upper part of Mary’s right sleeve and near the hem of Joseph’s cloak, in the dark recesses of a cloth fold. Also, along the upper and lower edges of the canvas there are small, semi-circular marks that appear every 8.9 cm (3 ½ in.) that have been retouched. An old frame may have created these regularly placed markings.

**Attribution and Date:** As mentioned above, Viroli attributed the Greenlease and Colnaghi paintings to Giuseppe Maria Crespi and observed that they are nearly identical.\(^\text{890}\) Although he

\(^{890}\) Rave, "Crespi," 228.
did not mention them, the differences between these two works are subtle and are comprised of slight variations in the configuration of the fabric folds of the cloth in the sewing basket, the Virgin’s dress, and Joseph’s cloak. Also, slightly dissimilar are the unspooled thread, the books’ crumpled pages, and the number of screw threads that are highlighted on the carpenter’s vise. The most notable difference between the two paintings is that the first depicts Saint Joseph wearing a brown, laced vest over a blue shirt, but the latter shows only a blue-laced shirt. In all other respects, such as size, composition, style, and palette these two works are the same.

Aspects of the Rockhurst painting that are consistent with Crespi’s oeuvre that include the rendering of Mary’s facial features and her garments, which include a red dress and a blue veil with a mustard-hued lining. Also, the juxtaposition of her kneeling near a cane-bottomed chair that has an open book placed upon the seat, but is replicated as a mirror image on the opposite side of the composition, in an Annunciate Virgin (Oratorio di S. Maria Maddalena, Bologna), of c. 1741 by Crespi. The cane-bottomed, wooden chair with back slats seems to have been a stock item in Crespi’s compositions. It appears repeatedly in a number of his paintings, including an Extreme Unction of c. 1712 (Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden), a Death of Saint Joseph of c. 1715-20 (Borgo Agricola, chiesa parrocchiale, Stufione-Modena), a Dream of Saint Joseph of 1727-32 (Conservatorio del Baraccano, Bologna), and in The Flea Hunt of the late 1730s (The Barber Institute of Fine Arts,...

891 Under UV light no sign of retouching shows up in this area, but the blue and brown paint colors are mixed in this section. So, it is not clear whether the paint is original, or if the pigment was applied during a later intervention.
892 Frederick Mont to Ralph Coe, Ralph Coe Personal Correspondence, file, RG99-3, NAMAA. Mont noted a resemblance between the rendering of the Madonna in this painting with that of an altarpiece by Crespi at the church of S. Bartolomeo in Modena.
893 For illustrations, see Merriman, "Paintings," 156-57; Rave, "Crespi," 241-42, cat. no. 122. The back of the chair in the Annunciation scene is nearest to the viewer, whereas in the Greenlease example, the chair faces the other direction, so that its seat is closer to the picture plane.
The chair also appears in miniature and with a cat curled up on the seat in the lower left corner of a self-portrait of Crespi in his studio (Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford).

The positioning of the chair in the lower left corner of this composition creates an angled entry into the scene, which is a format that Crespi repeated often in his paintings of both religious and secular subjects. For instance, the combination here of a chair in the foreground on the left and a fireplace hood in the background on the right also appears in a Woman Washing Dishes of c. 1710 (Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence) and in three of the four extant paintings of The Flea Hunt of c. 1727-29 (Museo di Capodimonte, Naples; Musée du Louvre, Paris; Museo Nazionale e Civico di San Matteo, Pisa). Each of the flea hunt scenes incorporates a wooden cupboard of like-proportion and construction as this which appears in the Greenlease composition and affixed to the wall in a similar position. Also, the sewing basket, carpenter’s bench, and blooming staff displayed in the Kansas City painting recur in the aforementioned Dream of Saint Joseph. The latter, which has sparse, faintly traced white blossoms at the tip, appears in every one of Crespi’s portrayals of Saint Joseph.

Another aspect of this work that typifies Crespi’s work is the thick application of paint, which is especially evident in the rendering of Saint Joseph’s face. The illumination of foreground figures against a darkened background shows up in his corpus after 1712, when he adopted this approach after a trip to Venice. This fact suggests that the Greenlease work post-dates Crespi’s travels to the Veneto. Other relevant points to consider regarding the dating of this work are that, from the early 1720s on, Crespi increasingly dedicated himself to religious
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894 For illustrations, see "Crespi," 77, 91, 111, 157, 159, 175; figs. 40, 45, 55, 78-79, 87.
897 For illustrations of Crespi’s paintings that depict Saint Joseph with his flowering staff, see Merriman, "Paintings," 201-02; Rave, "Crespi," 130-31, 136-37, 156-59, 162-63, 258-59; cat. nos. 65, 68, 78-79, 81, 130.
898 For the development of Crespi’s style see Merriman, "Paintings," 67-77.
subject matters and, more specifically, from c. 1715 to 1732, he often depicted Saint Joseph. By the early 1740s his brushstroke was no longer firm and, as Merriman observed, his skills had lessened considerably. Therefore, considering that the painting’s figures are illuminated in a style that he adopted during the mid-1710s and used thereafter and that the painting exemplifies his mature brushwork, a date of c. 1730 for the Greenlease Holy Family by Guiseppe Maria Crespi seems appropriate.

**Provenance:** During the waning months of 1974, while residing in Saint-Jean-Cap-Ferrat, France, New York art dealer Frederick Mont acquired this painting from an unidentified, private French collection. Art broker Roland Robert of Nice facilitated the purchase, which Mont pursued under the advisement of Italian art historian and connoisseur Federico Zeri (1921-1998) of Rome. By January of 1975, Mont had transported his new acquisition back to his New York gallery, where Rockhurst’s president, Father Maurice Van Ackeren, viewed the painting. Although he initially expressed interest in obtaining the work, the following month he informed Mr. Mont’s wife Betty that his donor resources were depleted due to ongoing campus renovations. In September of 1976, he contacted Mrs. Mont to inquire about the painting’s availability. Arrangements were soon made for Virginia Greenlease to purchase and bequeath Crespi’s Holy Family to Rockhurst.

The circumstances of this painting’s commission and its provenance prior to 1974 are unknown. However, Crespi’s biographer, Zanotti, did mention a work that was similar in

---

899 Merriman notes that the brushwork in the Annunciate Virgin of 1642 appears less vigorous when compared to the artist’s work from the prior decade, which suggests that the Annunciation scene post-dates the Greenlease painting. See ibid., 156-67; Rave, "Crespi," 241-42, cat. no. 122.

900 Betty Mont to Ted Coe, 11 January and 10 February, 1975. Ralph T. Coe, Personal Correspondence, file RG99-3, NAMAA.
composition to this one. That painting belonged to a Monsignor Millo, who was *vicario dell’insegne* (vicar of the insignia) for Cardinal Lambertini, the aforementioned archbishop of Bologna and future pope Benedict XIV. Viroli posited that Zanotti’s reference could pertain to either the Colnaghi or Rockhurst *Holy Family* paintings, but he also noted that Crespi often replicated works, which made it difficult to link any inventory or contemporary description to a particular painting. Therefore, tracing the provenance of the Greenlease *Holy Family* is nearly impossible.

**Iconography:** We have seen above that the scene’s primary focus is the swaddled infant Christ, who is placed centrally in the foreground. This portrayal of Jesus signifies both the beginning and end of his life on earth, as the slumbering infant equates a state of death and the swaddling evokes how Joseph of Arimathea wrapped the adult Christ’s body in linen bandages for his entombment. Indeed, the recorded practice of bathing a newborn and then soothing its skin with salt and honey before swaddling mirrors the care that was taken in the ritual of perfuming, and wrapping Christ’s body before his entombment. According to scholar Michael E. Goodich, a bound baby was also symbolic of mankind’s inherent weakness and dependency. Goodich quotes a sixteenth-century writer, John of S. Gimignano, who compared a newborn’s

---

902 For the entry, see "Sacra Famiglia," 228-29, fig. 115.
care to a devotee’s path to salvation, explaining that, just as binding straightened limbs, so too did faith provide structure for youths and converts.\[906\] The shirt in the sewing basket to the left of Christ’s basinet could reference Christ’s tunic, which Roman soldiers gambled over and then divided among themselves after they had crucified him, symbolize the white garment he wears in Resurrection scenes, or simply just be Mary’s sewing project.\[907\]

The workbench in the background serves as an attribute for Joseph, who was a carpenter by trade. The wooden plank that is angled in its vise coupled with the bow saw lodged into the board near the top creates the shape of a cross that hovers over Jesus. In this composition, three Passion symbols, including the cross, swaddled infant, and white tunic, align diagonally and, if interpreted in order from the back to the front, present a chronology of Jesus’ Passion. The first symbol is the cross in the background, which portends his Crucifixion. Next, the infant swaddled in white linen signifies his entombment. The stripes’ red color may reference his bloody sacrifice and their number may signify the three days of burial before his Resurrection. Thus, the painting may be intended to convey a message of hope and salvation through Christ’s death and Resurrection.

Besides the workbench and carpentry tools, another traditional symbol for Saint Joseph that is depicted in this scene is the blooming rod. As mentioned above, Crespi regularly portrayed the saint, whose name he shared, with this attribute. Traditionally, the blooming rod identifies Joseph as the miraculously chosen guardian for the Virgin and Child and relates to a story that is retold in a number of medieval textual sources.\[908\] According to one of these, the *Golden Legend*, Joseph was a widower with six children, who was summoned to the temple with

\[906\] Ibid., 87.
a group of men from the house of David, when Mary was fourteen and ready to wed. She had resided in the temple since the age of three, when her parents, Joachim and Anna, had brought her there to live.\textsuperscript{909} As was customary, each suitor carried with him a branch. Before the group of potential husbands arrived, the priests heard a voice that proclaimed, “One of these branches will bloom and the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove will perch upon its tip, according to the prophecy of Isaiah. The man to whom this branch belongs is, beyond all doubt, the one who is to be the Virgin’s spouse.”\textsuperscript{910} Because he was elderly, Joseph felt that he was not a suitable choice for Mary. Therefore, he did not initially place his branch on the altar with the other men. When the priests perceived of no signal, a voice spoke and informed them that the, “only man who had not brought the branch was the one.”\textsuperscript{911} Hence, Joseph, who had not set his branch down, was called forth. His staff then bloomed and a dove perched on its end. Immediately, it became clear to the priests that he was the one God had intended for the Virgin Mary. In the Greenlease composition, Crespi included the staff, but not the dove, likely because it would have been incongruous with the domestic interior setting. In this scene, Joseph’s close physical proximity to Jesus also intimates a familial tie that would have ensured the devotee of the saint’s effective intercessory powers and references his role as a moral guardian and caregiver for the Virgin and her son, and, by extension, those who paid him homage.\textsuperscript{912}

The blooming rod, bow saw, carpenter’s bench and tools, wood plank, sewing basket, and white tunic are symbols that reappear in numerous \textit{Holy Family} paintings by Crespi. For instance, at least eight of Crespi’s paintings of Christ and his extended family depict a bassinet,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{910} Ibid., 152-53.
\textsuperscript{911} Ibid., 153.
\textsuperscript{912} Filas, “Devotion to St. Joseph,” 1039.
\end{flushright}
of the type that appears in the center of the Greenlease composition. However, with the nude Christ child now depicted sitting on his mother’s lap, the basket is empty and set off to the lower left side, where Mary’s mother, Saint Anne, rolls up the infant’s discarded linen binding.\textsuperscript{913} By changing the basket’s position within the composition and removing the child’s binding, the artist visually communicated to the viewer that Christ is no longer a newborn.\textsuperscript{914} Another example of Crespi’s varied use of iconography is demonstrated in his display in other works of the attributes of Saint Joseph that appear in this example. For instance, the Greenlease \textit{Holy Family} depicts a blooming rod leaning against Joseph’s chest and his carpentry tools tidily stored on a background shelf. In contrast, Crespi’s \textit{The Death of Saint Joseph} of 1723 (Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg, Russia), shows his tools strewn on the floor in the foreground and a blooming staff propped at the end of Joseph’s deathbed.\textsuperscript{915} While the Greenlease composition portrays Joseph during an early stage of fatherhood, the Hermitage painting shows him at the end of his life, as the adult Christ bestows a final blessing at his stepfather’s bedside.\textsuperscript{916}

Crespi’s son, Antonio (1712-81), continued his father’s traditional use of iconography, as exemplified in a \textit{Holy Family in the Carpenter’s Workshop} of c. 1765, which nearly replicates the room depicts in the Greenlease painting.\textsuperscript{917} In his composition, Antonio retained the

\textsuperscript{913} Merriman points out these eight paintings, which vary in size and medium, but differ only slightly in composition. She suggests that each was created as a pastiche from master sketches in the studio. See Merriman, "Paintings," 195-200; Rave, "Crespi," 55, 101, 105; cat. nos. 28, 50, 52.


\textsuperscript{915} Rave, "Crespi," 110, cat. 55.

\textsuperscript{916} The Confraternita del Suffragio, located near Modena in Stuffione, commissioned \textit{The Death of Saint Joseph} before 1723. See ibid., 111, cat. 55

\textsuperscript{917} For illustration, see ibid., 258-59, cat. 130.
placement of the tool shelf, carpenter’s bench, and triangular edge of a fireplace hood that appear in this scene.\textsuperscript{918} Indeed, Antonio’s scene reads like a sequel to his father’s visual narrative. It portrays a twelve-year-old Christ standing to the left of the carpenter’s bench. He points with his right index finger at a miniature wooden cross that he holds in his left hand to signify his fate. The bow saw has completed its work and now leans idly against the workbench as Joseph planes the timber that, in the elder Crespi’s version, was being cut. To stabilize the board, the carpenter places his right hand into the slat where the cross’ horizontal plank will slide into position. Showing a cross that is nearly completed relates to the audience that Jesus is closer to his death and resurrection. Further emphasizing this point is that the white tunic depicted in the sewing basket in Lo Spagnuolo’s painting now has a fully stitched collar and is draped across Mary’s lap, perhaps portending the Pietà.

The Greenlease painting’s depiction of Joseph and his tools parallels the words of the fourth-century saint and church father Ambrose of Milan who equated Christ’s earthly father who crafted objects from wood, with his heavenly father, creator of all things.\textsuperscript{919} Thus, Joseph and his workshop act as a sacred metaphor for God, a typology that, according to Carolyn Wilson, was popular in the north of Italy, where Crespi lived and worked.

\textit{Format and Function:} The modest dimensions of the Greenlease canvas suggest that it was meant to be displayed in a domestic interior. Its placement within a personal living space would have facilitated its owner’s devotion to the Nativity and its holy protagonists. The practice of homage was encouraged, for instance, in the \textit{Meditations on the Life of Christ}, which states,

\textsuperscript{918} For a published image of the work, see ibid., fig. 130, 259.
\textsuperscript{919} Carolyn C. Wilson, \textit{Saint Joseph in Italian Renaissance Society and Art: New Directions and Interpretations} (Philadelphia Saint Joseph's University Press, 2001), 60. Ambrose stated, “The Artisan of the lands and sky is the one Father of Jesus. Behold, the father of Christ, another artisan is here present.”
“Every faithful soul and especially religious should visit the Lady at the manger at least once daily in the period [of] the Nativity of the Lord.”\textsuperscript{920} The display in one’s household of a painting such as this could have served as a domestic supplement to church devotions. Although a private patron might have commissioned this work, the marketability of its subject and the fact that he created more than one version of it suggests that Crespi might also have painted this canvas to sell on the open market. In his biography of his father, Luigi Crespi mentioned that his father painted small works to present to his patrons as a Christmas gift. Given as a sign of appreciation for his clients, the artist likely hoped that, in the spirit of seasonal generosity, they would then reciprocate with a donation, monetary or otherwise.\textsuperscript{921} As Viroli noted, since the Rockhurst and Colnaghi \textit{Holy Family} paintings are modest in size and display Nativity scenes, which is an appropriate subject for the season, each could have suited this purpose as a “\textit{quadretto sacro per Natale},” or a small, sacred painting for Christmas.\textsuperscript{922} Additionally, the depiction in this work of Joseph and Mary would have served as a constant reminder to the patron of the artist’s name, Giuseppe Maria.\textsuperscript{923}

\textit{Context:} Traditional portrayals of the Holy Family often relegate Joseph to the periphery, but here the saint is featured prominently with the tools of his trade. This emphasis on Joseph and his iconography reflects the popularity of his cult during the early eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{924} In 1479 Pope Sixtus IV (r. 1471-1484) first promoted the saint’s feast day of 19 May. However, the cult’s popularity in Italy did not reach its apogee until the early 1700s, when Pope Clement XI (r.

\textsuperscript{921} Crespi, \textit{Felsina pittrice}, 208; Merriman, \textit{Giuseppe Maria Crespi}, 241; Viroli, "Sacra Famiglia," 228.
\textsuperscript{922} "Sacra Famiglia," 228.
\textsuperscript{923} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{924} Wilson, \textit{Saint Joseph}, 1-3, 11, 95.
1700-1721) composed a breviary office in the saint’s honor. In Italy, the cult of Saint Joseph took longer to develop and was understandably less popular than Mary’s, largely because of his secondary role as the Virgin’s aged husband and caregiver of a son whose conception was miraculous. However, in Bologna, where Crespi’s workshop was located, there was a long-standing tradition of devotion to the saint. This is likely related to the fact that the church of S. Giuseppe di Borgo Galliera, which was the earliest known church dedicated to Saint Joseph in Italy, was established in that city during the twelfth century. In his numerous religious works, Crespi portrayed Joseph often, depicting him alone or as part of the Holy Family, in his workshop, and on his deathbed. The proliferation of these images of Joseph underscores the importance of this subject during Crespi’s career and for his patrons.

In his portrayal of the saint, Crespi followed tradition, illustrating Joseph as an aged man with wrinkled skin, stooped posture, and white, thinning hair and emphasizing the saint’s custodial role by depicting him protectively watching over his ward. However, as Wilson states, the present-day perception of the saint as merely a guardian and carpenter oversimplifies his character as it was perceived in the early modern church. Indeed, the portrayal of Joseph in this scene seems to support her conclusion. For instance, by bathing the saint’s head in light, Crespi symbolized Joseph’s recognition of the Savior and marked him as “first witness” to the

---

927 The church originally belonged to the Benedictine priory of Sant’Elena and was likely named for Saint Joseph in 1129, and definitely had been dedicated to him by 1183. In 1206 a celebration of a feast for him was mentioned and the neighborhood was documented as “burgo S. Josep.” In 1297, the Servite community took over the Benedictine complex. For this church and related bibliography, see Wilson, Saint Joseph, 11 n. 55.
928 In the Meditations on the Life of Christ, Joseph is presented as a conscientious caregiver in both illustrated scenes and in text. In the images, Joseph either gazes tenderly at Mary and the infant Christ or he actually cradles the child. See figures 34-35, 42, and especially 54, which depicts Joseph holding Christ. Ragusa and Green, Meditations, xxi-iii, 42-43, 53-54.
929 Wilson, Saint Joseph, 10.
sacred birth. The light that shines upon Joseph’s hands directs the viewer to look at the open book, which symbolizes the fulfillment of the prophecy of the Savior’s birth expressed in Isaiah 11:1. The combined focus placed upon Joseph’s forehead and the nearby text also conveys the saint’s post-biblical reputation as an educated thinker. While the perception of Joseph as an intellect might seem at odds with his profession as a tradesman, during the eighteenth century his erudite nature was deemed an essential component for his role as guardian, not only of the Virgin and Christ, but also for the Church Militant, or all Christians living on earth, and therefore, for anyone who viewed this painting. The saint’s illuminated hands may also have reminded the viewer of their professional use. As a carpenter, he was a maker of things, a role that, as stated above, Ambrose equated as an earthly metaphor for God, creator of all.

The Greenlease Holy Family represents a Nativity, but with a twist. Instead of portraying Mary and her husband Joseph with the infant Jesus in a landscape, manger, or cave, as was traditional, Crespi placed the trio in a domestic interior that doubles as Joseph’s carpentry workshop. By drawing on Jacqueline Marie Musacchio’s work on early modern Italian domestic scenes, we shall see that the depiction in this religious picture of a domestic environment and life event would have resonated with period audiences. Scenes of the type that the Greenlease painting represents revealed aspects of contemporary family life that encouraged devotees to identify more intimately with the sacred subject depicted.

---

930 Ibid., 42.
931 Isaiah 11:1 states, “A shoot will come up from the stump of Jesse; from his roots a branch will bear fruit.”
932 Wilson, Saint Joseph, 42-43.
933 Ibid., 47.
934 See n. 37.
of this sort anchored personal devotion to the rhythms and tasks of daily life.

In the case of the Greenlease *Holy Family*, the only overt indication that the scene depicts a sacred subject is the presence in it of kneeling figures and an unseen source of light that illuminates them. Otherwise, one could interpret this as a genre scene of a family inside their abode. The depiction here of a tidy, eighteenth-century domestic interior and workplace could have conveyed to the viewer that the family depicted was industrious and conscientious about the care of their home. This point is further exemplified in the concentrated manner in which the couple tends to their child. The baby is carefully wrapped in clean linens, which could have shown a contemporary audience that the child was receiving proper care and parental attention. An infant tightly wrapped in linen bandages represented an important aspect of eighteenth-century child rearing that had been followed since antiquity. The practice is mentioned in the Old and New Testaments, as well as in the *Meditations on the Life of Christ*, which describes Mary’s care of her son as follows, “How regularly and skillfully she placed the tender limbs while swathing them!” According to contemporary belief, this method of binding children soothed them by limiting stimulation. Indeed, current scientific data validates this and has shown that the practice of swaddling decreases cardiac and respiratory rates in infants. Linen strips for swaddling were often gifted to new mothers and in wealthy families they were typically decoratively embroidered or, as depicted in the Crespi painting, striped.

---

938 For the history of swaddling from antiquity to the present day, see "Swaddling," *The British Medical Journal* 2, no. 5454 (1965): 127-28; "Visual Culture," 191. It is also discussed in the *Art and Love* catalog. See the painting of the swaddled baby attributed to Bronzino.
939 Ragusa and Green, *Meditations*, 34-72, esp. 54.
941 For an illustration of a child swaddled in red and white bands, see Musacchio, *Art and Ritual*, 37, 47-49, 52, fig. 34.
Additional signs of a well-tended home and family that appear in this scene include a sewing basket in the foreground and a carpenter’s block and tools in the background. Although these objects serve as saintly attributes, they also signify male and female domains within the household. For example, the carpenter’s workbench and tools show how Joseph, as patriarch, supports his family financially and Mary’s sewing basket references the domestic chores associated with her matriarchal role. The association of the Virgin with sewing is related in an illustrated copy of the *Meditations on the Life of Christ*, which depicts her using a needle and thread.\(^942\) The illustration’s caption reads, “So, with the spindle and needle; the Lady of the world sewed and spun for money, for love of poverty,” which relates how Mary contributed to her family’s care. Besides domesticity, the sewing basket also symbolized female virtue. Not only was sewing a household chore, but it was also considered an honorable pastime, since it kept the hands and minds of the female sex diligently occupied and, thus, void of temptation.\(^943\) As Marta-Ajmar Wollheim notes, contemporary written sources equate a woman’s sewing skill with a man’s proficiency in writing.\(^944\) Thus, skilled needlework could reflect a woman’s level of education. Indeed, from the time of the Italian Renaissance on, sewing became increasingly associated with the upper class and kits containing needles, thread, and scissors, as depicted here, were often included in a bride’s trousseau.\(^945\) For the contemporary viewer, the Greenlease portrayal of Joseph and Mary in an orderly household, with sewing basket and workbench in

\(^{942}\) Ragusa and Green, *Meditations*, 69, 73, 75, 101, figs. 62-63. The illustration’s caption reads, “So, with the spindle and needle; the Lady of the world sewed and spun for money, for love of poverty,” which relates how Mary contributed to her family’s care.


\(^{945}\) Ibid., 156-59; Sara Matthews-Grieco, “Marriage and Sexuality,” ibid., 107.
place, carefully tending to the infant Christ could have served as an exemplar on how to maintain
a home properly.946 Additionally, their act of kneeling in the presence of Jesus shows devotion
to both God and family and exemplifies a proper balance between active and contemplative
aspects of early eighteenth-century piety.947

**Conclusion:** With its presentation of a sacred subject within a genre-like setting, the Greenlease
*Holy Family* typifies the work of one of Bologna’s finest painters, baroque artist Giuseppe Maria
Crespi. As Merriman rightfully noted and as is demonstrated here, Crespi translated a “profound
sense of actuality” from his genre scenes to his religious works.948 Likewise, scholar Rudolf
Wittkower praised the artist as one of the few who was “equally at home in religious imagery
and the *petite manièure* of domestic scenes.”949 The Kansas City painting exemplifies how
effectively Crespi integrated the sacred and secular spheres, which mutually enhanced the
picture’s meaning. This modestly sized canvas probably was intended for a domestic interior. If
so, by setting this Nativity scene in a humble, eighteenth-century abode, a devotee could identify
more closely with the holy figures depicted and thus assimilating his or her daily devotional
practice within the realm of familiar domestic experience.

---

948 Merriman, "Paintings," 115.
Giambattista Tiepolo was born in Venice on 5 March 1696. He was the youngest of the nine children of a seafaring merchant, Domenico, and his wife, Orsetta Marangon. The family resided on the narrow Corte di S. Domenico in the city’s crowded district, or *sestiere*, of Castello. With the nobleman Giovanni Donà as his godfather, Giambattista was baptized on 16 April in the parish church of S. Pietro. A year later Domenico died, leaving Orsetta widowed and saddled with the task of providing for her large brood. When Giambattista was fourteen years old, his mother sent him to apprentice with a neighborhood artist, Gregorio Lazzarini (1657-1730), who would be the boy’s only instructor. Under that master, the young student developed a solid foundation of technical skills based upon the *mestiere*, or mechanics, of drawing, perspective, and composition.

Even before he left Lazzarini’s workshop, Tiepolo had already attracted favorable attention from the Venetian public for the apostles and prophets that he painted in lateral lunettes in the church of S. Maria dei Derelitti at the Ospedaletto (1715-16) and for his submission of the

---

Crossing of the Red Sea (lost) for an annual outdoor exhibition held at the Scuola Grande di S. Rocco on 6 August 1716. A biography of Lazzarini’s life that Vincenzo da Canal, a nobleman from Vicenza, published in 1732 relates information pertaining to the artist’s early years. In this work, the nobleman commented that the Ospedaletto paintings were “all spirit and fire” and that they diverged from Lazzarini’s more measured approach. Indeed, the Ospedaletto commission shows that two contemporary Venetian artists influenced Tiepolo, as he incorporated the swift and vigorous brushwork of Giovanni Battista Piazzetta (1682-1754) and the emotional vitality of Federico Bencovich (1677-1756). In 1717, Tiepolo was listed for the first time as an independent artist in the Fraglia, or guild of Venetian painters. At this initial stage in his career, Tiepolo was already the favorite artist of Doge Giovanni Corner (1642-1722). This prestigious association with the city’s highest ranking civic officer offered the artist an introduction to elite society and afforded him an opportunity to attract other illustrious patrons.

During the Ospedaletto project, Tiepolo took special notice of a singer in the church’s female choir, Cecilia Guardi. The young woman came from a renowned family of Venetian

---

artists that included her father Domenico (b. 1678) and brothers Giovanni Antonio (1699-1760) and Francesco Guardi (1712-1793). On 21 November 1719 Giambattista married Cecilia and later depicted her in some of his paintings. The couple enjoyed an amicable relationship and raised nine children. Two of their progeny, Giovanni Domenico (1727-1804) and Lorenzo (1736-1776), became their father’s most trusted assistants.

Many of Europe’s elite commissioned Tiepolo to embellish their magnificent residences with his splendid paintings, demonstrating the high regard in which his works were held. One of his first commissions for private interior decoration came from the newly made aristocrat and wealthy publisher Giovanni Battista Baglioni (1659-1724), who hired the artist to paint the grand salone of his villa located outside of Padua in Massanzago (1718). Tiepolo worked primarily in the Veneto and Lombardy regions, including at Udine (1726, 1759), Milan (1731-32, 1737)), Bergamo (1732-33), Vicenza (1757), and Verona (1761). He painted for numerous Venetian aristocrats, for pharmacists and lawyers, as well as for foreign royalty, such as the Prince of Cologne, Clement Augustus von Wittelsbach (1700-1761), the Duke Elector of Saxony and King of Poland Augustus III (1696-1763), and Charles III King of Spain (1716-1788). For Prince-Bishop Karl Philipp von Greiffenklau (1690-1754) the artist completed what is considered to be his masterpiece, the Four Continents of the World, a ceiling fresco in the Treppenhaus, or

---

963 Zampetti, Dictionary of Venetian Painters, 4: 94.
964 Vicenzo Golzio, Seicento e Settecento (Turin: Unione Tipografico, 1968), 2: 1235; Levey, Giambattista Tiepolo; Bayer, "A Documented Chronology of Tiepolo's Life and Work," 29; Pedrocchi, Tiepolo, 45, 67.
966 Pedrocchi, Tiepolo, 28.
967 Regarding the numerous palazzi for which Tiepolo executed domestic decorations, see Bayer, "A Documented Chronology of Tiepolo's Life and Work," 29-34; Pedrocchi, Tiepolo, 44-46, 60-67, 78-82, 93, 103-13, 137-74.
968 Golzio, Seicento e Settecento, 2: 1235; Pedrocchi, Tiepolo, 16.
Stairway Hall, of the Residenz at Würzburg. Unlike the rest of Europe, the French never fully embraced Tiepolo’s work, although in 1760, the artist did send a painting as gift to King Louis XV (1710-1774), who reciprocated in kind.

Tiepolo’s painterly technique allowed him to work at a fast pace, particularly on grand-scale frescoes, which contributed in part to his prolific output. Not only did he complete commissions quickly, but he also demonstrated versatility of style. His early training with Lazzarini sharpened the artist’s observational skills and taught him to replicate accurately the work of other artists. This specialized ability enabled Tiepolo to interpret the late baroque and newer rococo styles equally well. Like other painters who worked in multiple mediums, Tiepolo maximized his productivity by working according to the season. When it was too cold and damp for frescoes to dry properly, he turned his attention to canvases, altarpieces, and small-scale works. So, in addition to the fanciful monumental decorative work that he completed for his aristocratic patrons, Tiepolo also painted religious works, including altarpieces for family chapels, confraternal headquarters, and for religious orders such as the Augustinians.


972 Pedrocco "Becoming Tiepolo," 15.

973 Mariuz, "Giambattista Tiepolo," 171; Pedrocco, *Tiepolo*, 17.

974 Since the painting of frescoes involves the use of wet plaster, warm weather was preferred for that medium. For an explanation of the ideal climate conditions for fresco production, see Ceninno Cennini, *The Craftsman’s Handbook, Il libro dell’arte* (New York: Dover, 1954), 42-52, esp. 44. For a list of some altarpieces and small-scale paintings that Tiepolo completed in the colder months, see Pedrocco, *Tiepolo*, 28, 45.
Benedictines, Dominicans, Carmelites, and Jesuits. He also painted in a variety of genres, from formal portraits and altarpieces to fanciful and erotic mythological scenes, and in a full range of sizes and mediums, from large wall frescoes and vault decorations to modestly sized, oil-on-canvas devotional works for the domestic interior. This flexibility allowed him to attract a considerable amount of business and variety of clients to his workshop.

From the 1730s on, the intensity of activity in Tiepolo’s workshop only increased. Still, he found time to devote to the artist’s academy in Venice, the Accademia di Pittura e di Scultura (Academy of Painting and Sculpture) for which he helped to compile the statutes and, in 1755, served as the organization’s first president. On 31 March 1762, Tiepolo, with his two sons, answered a summons from the King of Spain, Charles III (1716-88) to decorate his throne room for the royal palace in Madrid. When they arrived in Madrid on 4 June, Tiepolo presented the king with his bozzetto for Wealth and Benefits of the Spanish Monarchy (1762-64), which he completed, along with decoration in other areas of the palace, such as the guardroom and queen’s saleta. He also submitted a bozzetto for the vault decoration for the church of S. Idelfonso at La Granja, and for his final project in Spain, the creation of seven altarpieces for the collegiate church of S. Pascual Baylon at Aranjuez (1767-69). Shortly after he completed those designs, Tiepolo died on 27 March 1770 and was buried in Madrid at S. Martino. However, the church

---

975 For commissions that Tiepolo completed for various confraternities and religious orders, see Bayer, "A Documented Chronology of Tiepolo's Life and Work;" Pedracco, Tiepolo, 83-85, 140.
976 Zampetti, Dictionary of Venetian Painters, 4: 94-95; Pedracco, Tiepolo, 21. For a contemporary price comparison of Tiepolo’s altarpieces, see Francis Haskell, Patrons and Painters, 262.
977 Mariuz, "Giambattista Tiepolo," 185; Pedracco, Tiepolo, 20-21.
978 Golizio, Seicento e Settecento, 2: 1236; Bayer, "A Documented Chronology of Tiepolo's Life and Work," 33.
979 Morassi, G. B. Tiepolo, 35-40; Mariuz, "Giambattista Tiepolo," 213.
980 Bayer, "A Documented Chronology of Tiepolo's Life and Work," 34.
981 Ibid.
982 Pedracco, Tiepolo, 179.
has since been destroyed, and thus his tomb has been lost. News of the Venetian master’s death did not reach his family and friends in Venice until 21 April, almost one month later.\textsuperscript{983} At the announcement of Tiepolo’s death in Venice, one of the city’s noblemen, Pietro Gradenigo, wrote “Letters from Madrid apprise me of the sad loss of the famous Venetian painter the most renowned…well-known in Europe and the most honoured in his own country.”\textsuperscript{984} After their father’s death, Lorenzo remained in Madrid in the vain hope of obtaining a post as court painter, while Giovanni Domenico returned to Venice on 12 November with Tiepolo’s sketches and took on the mantle as his successor.\textsuperscript{985} Tiepolo’s wife Cecilia also kept a large collection of her husband’s sketches, but lost them by gambling.\textsuperscript{986}

During his lifetime, Giambattista Tiepolo was highly regarded among his colleagues, art critics, and patrons alike. Now he is considered the last great Venetian painter of the eighteenth century. It is important to note that many scholars now consider Tiepolo to also be one of the most accomplished masters of oil sketches.\textsuperscript{987} Indeed these small works were highly sought after during his life and immediately after his death. For instance, the Italian Neoclassical artist Antonio Canova (1757-1822) was one of the first serious collectors of the artist’s sketches. By 1885 a large batch of them sold at a London auction for a very low price, reflecting that interest among collectors for these works had waned.\textsuperscript{988} During the early twentieth century, Tiepolo’s

\textsuperscript{983} Andrea Bayer, ed. \textit{Art and Love in Renaissance Italy} (New York and New Haven: Metropolitan Museum of Art and Yale University Press, 2008), 34.
\textsuperscript{985} Pedrocco, \textit{Tiepolo}, 179.
\textsuperscript{987} Zampetti, \textit{Dictionary of Venetian Painters}, 4: 97; Mariuz, "Giambattista Tiepolo," 171; Rudolf Wittkower, \textit{Masters of the Loaded Brush: Oil Sketches from Rubens to Tiepolo} (New York: M. Knoedler and Company in association with Columbia University, 1967), xxv. Wittkower touts Tiepolo and Rubens as the period’s best draughtsmen of oil sketches.
\textsuperscript{988} Brown, "In Search of the Prima Idea," 15-20.
A corpus of drawings and oil sketches began to draw scholarly attention as art historians Pompeo Molmenti (1909) and Edward Sack (1910) methodically tried to locate and catalog them. In 1962 Italian scholar Antonio Morassi published a chronology of the artist’s work and studied his drawings, over one thousand of which have survived, likely because so many collectors treasured these affordable autograph works and, therefore, there existed an interest in preserving them. Morassi determined the authorship of these sketches, ascertaining whether Tiepolo, his sons, or his workshop assistants painted them. These attributions have been mostly sustained. In 1993 and 2002, Filippo Pedrocco published monographs on the artist in Italian and English, respectively. In assessing Tiepolo’s oeuvre, Pedrocco posited that, while the artist was bound to his Venetian cultural and pictorial heritage, his resourcefulness and creativity allowed him to surpass his contemporaries.

The first exhibition dedicated entirely to Tiepolo’s preparatory sketches was held at the Kimbell Art Museum in 1993. In the accompanying catalog, curator Beverly Louise Brown pronounced that it was truly exceptional that Tiepolo had such a large output of these small-scale works, that they are of such superior quality, and that so many survive in such excellent condition. Two more exhibitions to feature Tiepolo’s oil sketches include Masters of the Loaded Brush, which Rudolf Wittkower curated in 1967 at the New York gallery of art dealer M. Knoedler and Company a 2006 show at the J. Paul Getty Museum that John Seydl curated and in which oil sketches by Tiepolo in the collections of the Getty Museum and Courtauld Gallery
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990 "In Search of the Prima Idea," 15; Alpers and Baxandall, Pictorial Intelligence, 64-65.
991 Brown, "In Search of the Prima Idea," 20.
992 Pedrocco’s catalog raisonné on Tiepolo’s corpus is forthcoming.
993 Ibid., 16.
were displayed. In 1994, art historians Svetlana Alpers and Michael Baxandall presented the results of an important study that they conducted on the technique and materials that Tiepolo employed in creating his oil sketches. Absent from all of these shows and studies is an oil sketch in the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art of Saint Mark the Evangelist that has been attributed to Giambattista Tiepolo, but that has received scant attention in the literature. As a work that is representative of Tiepolo’s technique and exemplary in its demonstration of his expressive style, this small, oval painting is worthy of further scholarly attention. The discussion below will examine this painting’s attribution to Giambattista Tiepolo and give a fuller consideration to his authorship in light of technical evidence that researchers made available in the 1990s, but that has not yet been applied to the Greenlease Saint Mark the Evangelist. Moreover, the following essay will provide for the first time an in-depth analysis of the painting’s iconography, form, and function within an eighteenth-century Venetian context.

8. Giambattista Tiepolo
Saint Mark the Evangelist
c. 1732-33
Oil on canvas
33 x 26.7 cm (12.9 x 10.5 in.)

A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family

Provenance: Private collection, Marches; Private collection, Rome, early 1933; Finarte Auction, Milan, 1968; Frederick Mont for Frederick Mont, Inc., New York; Virginia Greenlease, Kansas City, 1976 to Rockhurst University.

Description: This small, oval painting depicts Saint Mark the Evangelist, the author of one of
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995 Alpers and Baxandall, *Pictorial Intelligence*.
the four New Testament gospels. Crouched at the saint’s right side is his attribute, a lion. Saint Mark’s muscular figure is placed centrally and dominates the composition. He sits upon a bank of clouds that are dappled in pink, grey, blue, and white. The clouds spill over a stone ledge painted with a similar palette, but that has more cream and grey hues. The stone’s surface is mottled like marble and has a beveled edge that is chipped in a few places. Saint Mark’s pose is open and he faces to his left, with his left foot resting flatly upon a cloud and his right toes pressing into the stone step below. A delicate gold halo, the sign of his sainthood, hovers at an angle over his head. Saint Mark is depicted as balding with a rim of dark chestnut hair encircling his head and a moustache and beard framing his face. The vibrant hue of his Prussian blue garment is set against the image’s comparatively neutral umber and taupe background. The saint’s beige shirt is laced in the front with a thin, yellow cord that zig-zags through the holes to secure it in place. At the neckline, the pointed lapels fold over at the saint’s outer blue garment. The shirt’s right sleeve is rolled up to reveal the saint’s tawny, muscular right biceps and forearm. Slung across his left shoulder and arm is a cream-colored cape decorated with a red cross that is partially hidden among the fabric folds. Mark extends his left arm horizontally in front of him and braces a massive, light brown tome upright upon his sturdy left knee. The weathered book has a tattered beige label, but with no script, attached to its spine. Along the book’s bottom side, a dark brown line cuts across the grey paper edges, perhaps to delineate a break in the pages, where the saint has inserted his left fingers to hold a place in the book.

The evangelist’s countenance is contemplative. He seems to pause, either because he has already written his text or is momentarily seeking further inspiration from the heavens towards which he gazes. From between the forefinger and thumb of the evangelist’s right hand, a feather
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quill pen dangles vertically. Both his index finger and pen point downward, guiding the viewer’s attention toward the lion, his attribute, resting at his side. The lion seems to gaze out at the viewer, which draws the audience into the scene. The artist articulated the lion’s thick mane, broad forehead, wide nose, and paws with deft brushstrokes, applying thick slathers of paint in gradations of grey, taupe, brown, and black pigments with narrow slashes of pink for the mouth, tongue, and inner edge of the lion’s left nostril. The rendering of the lion was executed with such bravura, perhaps to inspire a feeling of spiritual fervor. There is an unseen light source that originates from beyond the composition’s upper right quadrant. Its rays illuminate the foreheads of Saint Mark and the lion. Additional white highlights that were delicately applied with a narrow brush are evident on the saint’s cream-colored cape, top of his left hand, left knee, the arch of his right foot, and the inside edge of his right arm. Flanking the saint in the background are dark, chocolate brown shadows, the contrast of which further emphasizes the saint’s illuminated figure. The evangelist and his attribute are united compositionally, with Mark’s quill pen nearly brushing the top of the lion’s head and his right foot almost touching the feline’s right paw. Likewise, the similar countenance that they share seems to link man and creature psychologically.

The picture’s frame is covered in gold leaf and appears to be from the period [Cat. no. 8.1]. The painting is set in an oval-shaped frame that is embellished with egg and dart molding and mounted in a rectangular-shaped area that is recessed within a Roman temple-like façade. The structure has a triangular pediment that rests upon two fluted, Corinthian columns decorated with volutes and acanthus leaves. The inner edges of the raking cornices and the under sides of the pediment and architrave are decorated with a dentil molding. There are raised, leafy motifs that decorate the pediment’s triangular middle section and the spandrel at each corner of the
rectangular area that encompasses the oval frame. On the outside edges of the frame there is another raised vegetal design, comprised of a rosette at the top with four hanging bouquets of fruit, line up consecutively on a vertical axis. Each is tied with a ribbon and dangles upside down. The two pillars protrude forward from the frame. Three sets of abaci are stacked atop the columns, which provides further elevation for the pediment. From the bottom up, the abaci are decorated with plain, dental, and floral patterns. The columns are positioned atop cube-shaped platforms with three exposed sides, each of which is decorated with a raised square with a rosette at the center. The floral shapes attached at the front are more worn than those attached to the sides of each block. While the columns and their attached bases protrude from the front of the frame, the space between them, where the painting is mounted, is recessed. At the base of the painting and between the flanking column bases is a horizontally-oriented rectangle of raised relief displaying vegetal decoration.

*Condition Description:* Under a raking light, the painting appears uniform, except on the left side between Saint Mark’s right arm and the painting’s edge, where the canvas appears slightly stretched along a thin, vertical line. There are areas of separation between the painting’s edge and the elliptical frame, raising the question as to whether the frame is original or simply ill-fitting. At the lower right edge the gap between the paint and frame measures .8 cm (.315 in.) and runs for a length of 19.7 cm (17.75 in.). Along the upper and lower left quadrants, the distance of separation measures .9 cm (.35 in.) and .5 cm (.197 in.), respectively. Under ultraviolet light small areas of in-painting appear in the areas of a shadow on fabric covering the outer edge of the saint’s right leg and on the far right, in the background. Craquelure appears evenly across the painting’s surface. The areas of raised relief on the front of the columns’ bases
are more worn down than those that appear on the sides. The cube-shaped support under the right column is tilted slightly to the right, either from the effects of warping or from incurred damage.

**Attribution and Date:** Of the works belonging to the Van Ackeren Collection, the Saint Mark painting has appeared most often in the literature, but only in brief references pertaining to its authorship. Scholars who have previously attributed this work to Giambattista Tiepolo include Costanza Lorenzetti (1933), Antonio Morassi (1962), Anna Pallucchini (1968), and Filippo Pedrocco (1993, 2002). The discussion below, which supports their attributation, will expand upon their reasons for associating the sketch with Tiepolo by providing further proof of his authorship of the work that has not yet been considered. Lorenzetti, who was the first scholar to publish this work, introduced it as a very rare, small votive painting by the extremely prolific Venetian master and admired the sense of vitality that the image conveyed. In her analysis, Lorenzetti compared this painting with those that Tiepolo painted for two commissions, including four lunettes that depict eight apostles (1715-16) at the Ospedaletto in Venice, and another lunette at the Colleoni chapel in Bergamo (1732), which was built adjacent to Bergamo Cathedral in the late fifteenth century to house the tomb of the famous Captain General of the Venetian army, Bartolomeo Colleoni (1400-75). Noting that this painting of Saint Mark the
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998 Lorenzetti, "Un'opera," 110.

Evangelist lacks the stark tenebristic quality of Tiepolo’s earlier work at the Ospedaletto, Lorenzetti opted to date this work at c. 1730, closer to the period of the Bergamo commission. On a separate note, scholar Adriano Mariuz observed that, beginning with the Bergamo period, Tiepolo adopted a more heroic style in his figures. This point further corroborates Lorenzetti’s date for this picture, since Saint Mark’s brawny physiognomy can be categorized as heroic in its appearance. Morassi observed the painting’s good quality and concurred with Lorenzetti, dating the Saint Mark to circa 1730-35. Pallucchini offered a slightly more specific date of 1732-33, but countered Morassi, stating that the work was not of high quality. Perhaps Pallucchini assessed this work before the small areas of in-painting were completed, because her observations do not correlate with the present state of this work. The most recent scholar to comment on this work’s authorship is Pedrocco, who agreed with Pallucchini’s proposed date and compared its style to Tiepolo’s sketches for altarpieces for the church of S. Maria della Fava and at the Gallerie dell’Accademia in Venice.

Two works securely attributed to Tiepolo that no one has compared to this portrayal of Saint Mark are the frescoes of the mid-1740s at the church of S. Francesco in Venice that depict the evangelists Luke and Mark. These are featured as two of four pendentives, rendered in grisailles, in the cupola of the Sagredo chapel. Aspects of the pose of Saint Mark in the Kansas City painting are replicated in the Saint Luke pendentive. While the former shows an open pose, and the latter a closed one, both portray the figures with rolled-up sleeves, powerful arms, holding quill pens, and supporting large, closed tomes with two horizontal ridges along their

1001 Mariuz, "Giambattista Tiepolo," 178.
1002 Morassi, Complete Catalogue, 46.
1003 Pallucchini, L'opera completa, 97.
1004 Pedrocco, Tiepolo, 225, fig. 89.
spines. Also, the lion that appears as an attribute in this work, closely resembles the ones in the Sagredo and Bergamo frescoes of Saint Mark, as well as in a secular work securely attributed to Tiepolo, *The Glorification of the Barbaro Family* of c. 1750 (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York).

Another relevant point is that the palette and painterly brushwork of the Saint Mark painting exemplify that artist’s stylistic approach. Conservator of paintings Teresa Longyear (1993) and scholars Svetlana Alpers and Michael Baxandall (1994), who have conducted careful studies of Tiepolo’s oil sketches, noted that the Venetian master used coarse brushes and grainy pigments. This characteristic use of paint is clearly evident in the textured modeling of the lion’s mane and facial features in the Greenlease painting. Alpers and Baxandall showed that, from 1730 on, Tiepolo painted his oil sketches on canvas with ocher-tinted paint over an umber-colored ground. Both of these pigments are visible at the edges of this painting’s oval border, which further substantiates previous scholars’ dating of this work to the 1730s. Additionally, Alpers and Baxandall observed that Tiepolo reserved the most saturated colors for his central figures, often with a mix of Naples yellow and Prussian blue, and juxtaposed the hue against a nondescript, brown-toned background, noting also that he incorporated latent chromatic accents throughout the composition that corresponded with the scene’s central color. With its contrast of Saint Mark’s bright blue garments against a taupe background, and subtle use of light
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1005 For illustration, see Gemin and Pedrocco, *Giambattista Tiepolo: I dipinti, opera completa*, 265, fig. 183/2.  
1006 Pedrocco, *Tiepolo*, 129.  
sapphire tones in the stone steps and white cloak to reflect the color of the evangelist’s robe, this painting perfectly embodies the Venetian master’s technique for oil sketches dating from 1730.1010

Provenance: The earliest known reference to this painting occurs in 1933, when Lorenzetti evaluated this small, oval painting of Saint Mark. At that time, it belonged to a private Roman collector, who had just acquired the work from a collection in the region of Marches, which is located on Italy’s central Adriatic coast.1011 In her article, Lorenzetti referenced a professor of physiology, Silvestro Baglioni, who was born in Belmonte Piceno in the Marches, but, at the time, was living in Rome. However, it is not clear whether the professor was the prior owner from the Marches or the one who had recently purchased the painting. In 1968 the work was offered for sale at a Finart auction in Milan. Frederick Mont of Frederick Mont Inc. (New York) was likely the purchaser, since, eight years later, he sold the painting to Virginia Greenlease. When she acquired it in 1976, Mrs. Greenlease immediately donated *Saint Mark the Evangelist* by Giambattista Tiepolo to Rockhurst University.1012

Iconography: Saint Mark, the patron saint of Venice, is one of four evangelists who authored the Four Gospels of the New Testament. The depiction here of the saint with a quill pen and a large
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1010 Ibid., 66. After applying the ground, Tiepolo lightly drew a design with a fine hair brush with a mixture of bone black and umber. A closer examination of the surface would be necessary to determine whether the same process was used in the Van Ackeren painting’s creation.
1012 Pedrocco’s provenance for this painting does not mention that Frederick Mont owned this work between the Finart sale and when Virginia purchased it from his New York gallery. See Pedrocco, *Tiepolo: The Complete Paintings*, 225, fig. 89.
tome symbolizes that role. Tiepolo’s portrayal of the evangelist adheres to a description of the saint that appears in Jacobus de Voragine’s fourteenth-century compilation of saints’ lives, *The Golden Legend*, which states that Saint Mark was “a well-built man of middle age, with a long nose, fine eyes, and a heavy beard, balding and greying at the temples.”

Stationed at Saint Mark’s side is his attribute, a lion. In Christian iconography the saint’s symbol is adapted from the accounts of Ezekiel 1:10-11 and the Book of Revelation 4:7. These passages reference four winged figures, including a man, lion, oxen, and eagle, that became associated with the four evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, respectively, although the lion depicted here is wingless.

The saint and his attribute are visually linked through the placement of the saint’s quill and his right foot near the feline’s head and right paw, respectively. Similar in countenance, both man and creature have furrowed brows bathed in a sacred light, a shared depiction that further emphasizes their tie. The rendering of the lion reveals one of the most energetic areas of paint manipulation on this canvas and truly showcases Tiepolo’s bravura technique. One might also consider the attention that the artist paid to rendering this aspect of the composition as an expression of the importance of the lion as a symbol of Venice.

While Tiepolo may never have seen this type of animal first hand, a number of visual sources were available to him. For instance, as Lorenzetti noted, the lion depicted in the Van Ackeren painting resembles Bartolomeo Bon’s sculpture of 1438-1442, which portrays Doge

---

1013 *The Golden Legend* also relates that Mark amputated his thumb, either because he was humble, or to avoid the priesthood. However, Tiepolo presents both digits intact. See Voragine, *The Golden Legend*, 2: 244. See also Alban Butler, “St. Mark, Evangelist,” in *Butler’s Lives of Saints*, ed. Herbert J. Thurston and Norah Leeson (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1933), 283-85.

1014 Ezekiel 1:10-11 states “…each of the four had the face of a man, but on the right side was the face of a lion, and on the left side the face of an ox, and finally each had the face of an eagle. Each had two wings spread out above…” Revelation 4:7 states “The first creature resembled a lion, the second was like a calf, the third had a face like that of a human being, and the fourth looked like an eagle in flight.” The next passage describes each figure as having six wings.
Francesco Foscari kneeling before the lion of Saint Mark on the Porta della Carta that links the Palazzo Ducale and the church of S. Marco. I would suggest that Tiepolo might have found another source in Bergamo, where the artist worked around the time that this painting was likely completed. Since, at the time, that city belonged to the Venetian Republic, sculptural reliefs of lions decorated the city’s gates. The relief of a lion on Bergamo’s Porta S. Giacomo is particularly close in appearance to the one depicted in the Kansas City painting.

Venetian ties to Saint Mark date back to 828, when, according to the Golden Legend and earlier sources, two Venetian merchants, Bonus and Rusticus, translated the saint’s body from Alexandria, Egypt to Venice, where it is now located in the church of S. Marco, adjacent to the Doge’s Palace. For Venice, the acquisition of this apostolic relic was politically important, because it established the city’s episcopal primacy in the region and increased the republic’s clout at a time when the Venetians were thwarting the Carolingian and Byzantine empires from taking control of their region. Considering his symbolic importance as the patron saint of Venice, Saint Mark, as he is depicted here, would have been a popular subject for eighteenth-century Venetian patrons to commission.

Format and Function: The Van Ackeren’s Saint Mark displays vivid, brusque brushstrokes that
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1015 Lorenzetti, "Un'opera," 111. However, much of the present sculptural ensemble is a reconstruction.
1016 The Porta S. Giacomo was built in 1592 and is one of four city gates in Bergamo. Sculptural reliefs of lions also appear in the city at the Porta S. Alessandro and Porta S. Agostino, but these do not compare stylistically as well with Tiepolo’s lion as does the Porta S. Giacomo relief.
1018 Ibid.
suggest the draft-like quality of a *bozzetto*, which is a small-scale, preparatory sketch.\(^{1019}\) The term comes from the Italian verbs *abbozzare* (to sketch) and *sbozzare*, which refers to the roughing out of a design.\(^{1020}\) According to Brown, Tiepolo referred to his oil sketches as *modelli*, which is a term that today is understood to relate to a preparatory work that is more finished than a *bozzetto*.\(^{1021}\) For the Greenlease *Saint Mark*, either term seems applicable, because, at close range, the brushwork appears rough, but from a distance the composition has the appearance of a completed work.

In his use of the oil sketch, Tiepolo followed common artistic practice, which meant that he used them for a variety of purposes.\(^{1022}\) For instance, he might have shown such a work to a client in order to demonstrate his abilities and, thereby, attract a patron’s business, or to gain approval for a design on a commission already in progress.\(^{1023}\) According to Brown, if a client lived outside of Venice, then Tiepolo painted even more precisely to accommodate the fact that he would not be present to explain his work.\(^{1024}\) Although artists painted them in preparation for a commission, preparatory sketches, nevertheless, were considered the artist’s property and were
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\(^{1019}\) For the technique and historical development of the oil sketch, see Linda Freeman Bauer, "On the Origins of the Oil Sketch: Form and Function in Cinquecento Preparatory Technique" (PhD diss., New York University, 1975).


\(^{1021}\) Seydl, *Fifteen Oil Sketches*, 14.

\(^{1022}\) For this reason, the term *bozzetto* was not used in reference to Tiepolo’s oil sketches in the 1993 Kimbell exhibition. See Brown, "In Search of the Prima Idea," 17. For an explanation of the various categories of preparatory sketches, see Cole, "What is a Bozzetto?," 123-46; Montagu, "Disegni, Bozzetti," 9-30; Wittkower, *Masters of the Loaded Brush*, xvi-xxv.


\(^{1024}\) Brown, "In Search of the Prima Idea," 16-17.
often sold to clients of lesser means or to collectors, who typically had nothing to do with the original commission. Tiepolo also kept sketches as *ricordi*, or records, to document his completed projects. In addition, *bozzetti* were frequently used as workshop studies and facilitated an apprentice’s training. Additionally, Tiepolo gave oil sketches as gifts to his friends, patrons, and colleagues. As a visual representation of an artist’s *prima idea* or *primo pensiero* (first idea or first thought), a preparatory sketch was considered an expression of artistic genius. Because the creation of a *bozzetto* was closer to the initial creative impulse than the finished work, the cognoscenti considered the sketch to be the original and the painting, a copy. As a result, during Tiepolo’s career, oil sketches of the type that the Greenlease *Saint Mark* represents were popular among connoisseurs.

Whether the Greenlease *Saint Mark* initially served as a proposal for a larger project or was always intended to be a small votive painting remains a mystery, because there is no known altarpiece or fresco associated with this composition. It is possible that a painting did exist once, but that it has since been lost or destroyed. It is also conceivable that this *bozzetto* was created for a commission that never came to fruition, maybe because the patron rejected this
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1027 As an example, after the death of a close colleague, Tiepolo gave a *bozzetto* to that artist’s family as a condolence. See Seydl, *Fifteen Oil Sketches*, 32.
1028 Brown, "In Search of the Prima Idea," 17.
1029 One source often cited is a letter that artist Sebastiano Ricci (1659-1734) wrote to Count Tessin, in which he expresses his sentiment that, because of its proximity to the artist’s creative moment, a *modello*, not the finished painting, should be considered the original work. See Levey, "Altar-piece at Nymphenburg," 256; Brown, "In Search of the Prima Idea," 15; Cole, "What is a Bozzetto?", 124; Steven F. Ostrow, "Bernini's Bozzetti and the Tropes of Fire," in *Material Bernini*, edited by Ewonne Levy and Carolina Mangone. (London and New York: Routledge, 2016), 147-50.
1030 Morassi, *G. B. Tiepolo*, 4-7; Montagu, "Disegni, Bozzetti," 11. Morassi references the multiple extant *bozzetti* that Tiepolo created for the churches of the Scalzi and Gesuiti in Venice.
composition or lacked the funds to hire the artist. Another possibility is that Tiepolo created this sketch for another artist to use as a template for a full-scale work. For instance, Tiepolo’s sons, Giovanni Domenico and Lorenzo, and his brothers-in-law, Giovanni Antonio and Francesco Guardi, commonly borrowed from his sketches and used them as prototypes for their own projects. Although I have conducted a preliminary search on the oeuvres of these artists, no painting has surfaced that is comparable to this one.

Bearing in mind the Greenlease painting’s subject, it seems that it may originally have been conceived of as part of a set of four Evangelists, for example, like the pendentive frescoes in the Sagredo chapel, mentioned above, that depict Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, that Tiepolo painted during the mid-1740s. However, that commission was rendered in grisaille and, as discussed above, the depiction of Saint Mark at the Sagredo does not fully compare to this one. Also, to my knowledge, there are no extant images of the other three Evangelists that would correspond with this one to create a potential set. Considering that this painting depicts Saint Mark facing to the right and with his gaze directed outside of the picture plane, perhaps this composition was planned as a pendant. For example, for the commission at the Colleoni Chapel in Bergamo, Tiepolo paired a lunette of Saint Mark with another one depicting the Martyrdom of

1031 As a comparison, Tiepolo painted three bozzetti, including an Assumption of the Virgin, a Saint John Giving Alms to the Poor, and a Beheading of Saint John that were intended for the duomo, or cathedral, of S. Daniele in Fruili. Although Tiepolo proposed the designs, either he was too busy to fulfill the commission or the citizens of Fruili did not raise enough funds to hire the artist. See Morassi, "Some 'Modeilli'," 4-8, figs. 8-10.
1033 For another artist to use a master’s bozetto for his own project was a common practice. See Alice Binion, "Tiepolo-Guardi: New Points of Contact," The Burlington Magazine 110, no. 786 (1968): 519, 521; Montagu, "Disegni, Bozzetti," 11; Brown, "In Search of the Prima Idea," 18. For illustrated examples of drawings by Tiepolo’s sons that they copied from their father’s corpus, see George Knox, Drawings by Giammbattista, Domenico and Lorenzo Tiepolo from the Graphische Sammlung Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, from Private Collections in Württemberg and from the Martin von Wagner Museeum of the University of Würzburg (Stuttgart: Stuttgarter Galerieverien, 1971).
In this scenario, the Saint Mark painting would have been placed to the viewer’s left, looking toward the direction of its twin on the opposite side. A third possibility for the origin of this work is one that Lorenzetti and Morassi each suggested. Lorenzetti was convinced that, since it has a finished appearance, the painting was not a bozzetto, but rather a votive painting that belonged to a privileged Venetian, perhaps even one with the same name as the Evangelist. Morassi thought that this painting might have something in common with a group of similarly sized works depicting Saint Roche that members of the Scuola Grande di S. Rocco in Venice had commissioned from Tiepolo as a commemoration of their confraternal membership. There are twenty-one of these works that are extant. Saint Roche, whose relics are housed at the scuola named after him, was considered an important plague intercessor. In some respects, the Roche works that Tiepolo painted are quite similar. Like the Greenlease scene, they show the saint placed centrally with his attributes, which include a staff, to symbolize Roche’s pilgrimage to Rome, and a dog that licked Roche’s wounds to cure him of the plague that he had contracted. However, no two figures of Saint Roche are posed alike. So, it seems from their varied appearances that Tiepolo and his workshop customized these works for different patrons, so that each confraternity member could own a personalized painting that portrayed the organization’s patron saint. As Morassi noted, the paintings of Saints Mark and Roche are comparable in size, with the former measuring 33 x 26.5 cm (13 x 10.4 in.), and the
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1034 For illustrations, see Pedrocco, *Tiepolo*, figs. 94.5-94.6.
1035 Lorenzetti, "Un'opera," 112.
1038 Pedrocco notes that the level of quality between the Saint Roch paintings varies, suggesting that his workshop probably produced some of them. See Pedrocco, *Tiepolo*, 204-05.
latter, 44 x 33 cm (17.32 x 13 in.). An additional note is that, initially, the Greenlease support was likely rectangular like the Roche canvases, but was trimmed down to fit its present frame.\textsuperscript{1039} Indeed, no matter their contour, whether round, beveled for a baroque-styled frame, or, as in this instance, oval, Tiepolo only painted his \textit{bozzetti} on rectangular canvases.\textsuperscript{1040} The Roche figures all wear capes. To some of these a shell is attached as a reference to the pilgrimage destination of Santiago de Compostela. However, six of the capes are marked with a red cross similar to the one that appears within the folds of Saint Mark’s white cloak in the Greenlease example.\textsuperscript{1041} In relation to Saint Roche, the symbol references a legend that, according to a 1478 account by Venetian Francis Diedo, relates that, from birth, Roche was miraculously marked on his chest with a red cross.\textsuperscript{1042} For the portrayals of Saint Roche that were made for the Venetian \textit{scuola} the inclusion of the red cross makes sense. However, the reason for its display in the Saint Mark painting is murky, unless the original owner was also a member of the organization. If not, perhaps he belonged to another religious military order.\textsuperscript{1043} Another factor that could potentially connect this painting to the Scuola Grande di S. Rocco is that the gold frame into which the Greenlease painting is mounted bears a close structural resemblance to the Roman temple-like frame for an altarpiece by Tintoretto, entitled \textit{The Apparition of Saint Roche} (1588), which is displayed in the confraternity’s principal meeting

\textsuperscript{1039} For instance, an oval \textit{bozzetto} for the 1732 altarpiece, \textit{Education of the Virgin}, intended for the church of the Fava was cut down from a rectangular shape. See ibid., 204, fig. 39.

\textsuperscript{1040} Morassi, \textit{Complete Catalogue}, 154-62, figs. 63-71; Pallucchini, \textit{L’opera completa}, 96, figs. 77A-M. For examples of Tiepolo’s oval \textit{bozzetti} compositions painted onto rectangular canvases, see Brown, \textit{Giambattista Tiepolo: Master of the Oil Sketch}, cat. nos. 22, 43-44, 54.

\textsuperscript{1041} For images of Saint Roch paintings by Tiepolo that depict a red cross, see Morassi, \textit{Complete Catalogue}, figs. 68, 70, 159; Pedrocchi, \textit{Tiepolo}, figs. 103/2, 4, 6, 11, 17, 21.

\textsuperscript{1042} For a brief account of his life, see Atwater, ”Saint Roch.” 190; Apostolos-Cappadona, \textit{Dictionary of Christian Art}, 292. For a more in-depth discussion of the subject, see Irene Vaslef, ”The Role of St. Roch as a Plague Saint: A Late Medieval Hagiographic Tradition” (PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1984).

\textsuperscript{1043} I thank Douglas Dow for his guidance in assessing this work.
room, the *sala superiore*. Since, as a fledgling artist, Tiepolo experienced his first public critical success at the Scuola di S. Rocco’s annual art competition, it would make sense that his relationship with the organizations and its members would continue. However, without documentation there can be no proof. Besides, the Greenlease frame may not be original to the work and may, therefore, be completely unrelated. Without documentation, it is impossible to know whether the provenance for the Greenlease *Saint Mark* parallels those of the *Saint Roche* paintings that Tiepolo painted for the Venetian *scuola* of S. Rocco. Perhaps, like these small paintings of Roche the artist created, the Greenlease example is a votive work intended for private use, or perhaps the oil sketch originally served as a design proposal for a grand-scale painting. Since *bozzetti* were often multivalent in purpose, it could be that this painting served one or both functions.

*Context:* Considering the painting’s small size and current framing, it seems likely that, at some point in its history, this painting was displayed within a domestic interior as a private devotional work. While the frame’s decorative quality would have beautified any period décor, the display in one’s home of such a painting would also have provided a focal point for daily devotions that would have supplemented church worship within the comfort of one’s own home. The frame’s Roman temple-like appearance compares stylistically with local church façades and altarpieces, with which contemporary Venetians would have been familiar. For instance, the church S. Francesco della Vigna, where Tiepolo painted the Sagredo chapel, has a façade, an altarpiece, and an organ cover that are similar in appearance to this frame, but not as close in the decorative details as the altarpiece mentioned above by Tintoretto in the Sala Superiore. Whatever the source of inspiration for this frame’s design, that a devotee could have viewed the image of Saint
Mark encased in a framework that recalled a general, or particular, church facade or altarpiece, would have further enhanced the prayerful experience, by creating for the worshipper a conscious link between one’s own home and that belonging to God.

Conclusion: During Tiepolo’s career, his bozzetti were highly sought after as collectable works and, by some, were considered the original work, whereas the completed painting was regarded as a copy. When Lorenzetti assessed this work in 1933, she marveled at how an artist, who was used to creating monumental frescoes for royal patrons, could just as successfully paint such powerful, yet intimate, small-scale devotional works as Saint Mark the Evangelist. Because of the oil sketch’s potent display of Tiepolo’s artistic vigor and emotional expression, Lorenzetti was convinced that the painting did not serve as a bozzetto, but that it was a votive painting that belonged to a privileged Venetian, perhaps even one with the same name as the Evangelist. Although Lorenzetti presents the most likely scenario, since both the painting’s original patron and the circumstances under which this work was created remain unknown, the possibility that it functioned as a proposal for a commission or as a copy of another work cannot be fully discounted. At the very least, this small, oval-framed painting of Saint Mark the Evangelist represents the mature work of Giambattista Tiepolo, considered by many as the last great Venetian painter of sacred visions and one of the great masters of the oil sketch.

---

1044 Morassi, G. B. Tiepolo; Levey, "Altar-piece at Nymphenburg." 256-57. Pignatti, "Tiepolo's Revival," 26; Alpers and Baxandall, Pictorial Intelligence, 64.
1046 Ibid., 112.
Part 3: Sculpture and Metalwork

GIL DE SILOÉ
Burgos, Spain, c. 1450-1501

Gil de Siloé was the leading sculptor in Burgos, Spain during the last quarter of the fifteenth century. Burgos is located in the northern part of the Iberian Peninsula, along the major pilgrimage route from northern Europe to Santiago de Compostela. During Gil’s life, the city was the political epicenter of the region of Castile and flourished economically as an exporter of wool to Flanders for cloth manufacture. The commercial ties between Burgos and Flanders contributed to a great influx of German and Flemish artists, who emigrated to Spain during the mid- to late-fifteenth century. Since Gil worked in a Flemish style and there is no record of the artist’s birth or of any of his activity in Burgos prior to the mid-1480s’s, some scholars believe that he came to Spain from the north. Others suggest that Gil may have been a long-term resident in Burgos who trained with a northern European master, or, as has been

---


1049 Alfonso de Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne a la fin du Moyen Age" (PhD diss., Université Charles-de-Gaulle, Lille, 2010), 35-38; Ronda Kasl, "The Making of Hispano-Flemish Style: Art, Commerce, and Politics in Fifteenth-Century Castile" (PhD diss., New York University, 2012), 7-12.


1051 August L. Mayer, "El escultor Gil de Siloe," Boletín de la sociedad española de excursioníes 31 (1923): 254; Georg Weise, Spanische plastik aus sieben jahrhunderten (Reutlingen: Gryphius-verlag, 1925), 50; August L. Mayer, Gotik in Spanien (Leipzig: Klinkhart & Biermann, 1928), 139; Wethey, Gil de Siloé and his School, 111-18; Kasl, "The Making of Hispano-Flemish Style," 121. Mayer was the first scholar to posit that Gil came from the Netherlands or Lower Rhine valley. Weise suggested that the sculptor was trained at the school of Cleve-Emmerich. Wethey recommended instead that the artist fit into the larger context of northern art and pointed out that Gil must have trained in Northern Europe, because the sculptor’s style is not duplicated in Spain.
most recently suggested, that he was a second-generation artist of Flemish descent. Without secure documentation, the artist’s country of origin must remain the subject of speculation.

What is known is that the sculptor married a Spanish woman with whom he had two daughters and two sons, one of whom, Diego de Siloé (c. 1490-1563), emerged as a prominent Spanish Renaissance sculptor and architect. De Siloé’s lucrative career afforded him the opportunity to purchase houses near the Calle de la Calera in the exclusive suburb of La Vega, which is located across from Burgos on the Arlanzón River.

Heading a large workshop in Burgos, at a time of great economic prosperity in that city, gave Gil the ability to fulfill monumental commissions for prestigious clients, including wealthy merchants, the clergy, and the sculptor’s principal patron, Isabel I (1451-1504), Queen of Castile and León and consort to Ferdinand II, King of Aragon (1452-1516). Gil’s earliest securely attributed work, an altarpiece dedicated to the Immaculate Conception for the funerary chapel of

---

1052 Emile Bertaux, "La renaissance en Espagne e Portugal," in Histoire de l’art depuis les premiers temps chrétiens jusqu’à notre jours, ed. André Michel (Paris: A. Colin, 1905-29), 821-52; Mayer, "El escultor Gil de Siloe," 254; Gotik in Spanien, 139; Wethey, Gil de Siloé and his School, 3-6, 19-22, 113; Kasl, "The Making of Hispano-Flemish Style," 67-80, 109. Early scholars believed that the bishop of Burgos, Alfonso de Cartagena (1384-1456), who brought northern artist Juan de Colonia (1410-1481) from Basel to set up his workshop in the city, also urged Gil to work there. However, Kasl shows that the chronology does not support this theory and suggests instead that Gil was, like Juan de Colonia’s son, Simon, a second-generation northern artist active in Burgos. Using the sculptor’s name as evidence Mayer theorized that “Siloé” was of Flemish or German origin, but Bertaux posited that Gil, which was a common name in Spain, was a converted Jew, or conversos, who, as was typical, adopted a biblical name for his surname. For instance, “Siloam” can refer to a spring, a pool, or a tower in Jerusalem. Wethey recommended that this matter, which remains unresolved, needed the attention of a Spanish philologist.

1053 In Diego’s will, Gil’s other children, Juan, Ana, and Maria, are identified as Diego’s siblings. See Beatrice Gilman Proske, Castillian Sculpture Gothic to Renaissance (New York: Hispanic Society of America, 1951), 91 n. 86.

1054 Within a span of two years, from 1496 to 1498, Gil transitioned from being a renter to a property owner, which marks his success as a sculptor. See Wethey, Gil de Siloé and his School, 18; Proske, Castilllan Sculpture, 91 n. 86; Pérez, "Burgos en el Siglo XV," 25.

1055 Wethey, Gil de Siloé and his School, 50; J. V. L. Brans, Isabel la Católica y el Arte Hispano-Flamenco (Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispanica, 1952), 154-64, figs. 65-74. For economic conditions in Burgos for the period, see Pérez, "Burgos en el Siglo XV," 21-50.
Bishop Luis de Acuña (1456-1495) in Burgos Cathedral, was completed in 1484. He was then commissioned with fellow artist Diego de la Cruz (active 1482-1500) to create a retable of similar design for the funerary chapel of the bishop of Palencia, Alonso de Burgos (1477-1499), in the church of S. Pablo in Valladolid.

Queen Isabel may have been introduced to Gil’s work through Alonso, who was her confessor, or perhaps she encountered the sculptor’s work as he was finishing the Acuña retable, when, in July of 1483, her retinue passed through Burgos on its way to Miraflores. The Spanish queen must have been duly impressed with Gil’s skill, because she entrusted him with the important task of creating alabaster tombs for her parents, Henry IV of Castile (1425-1474) and Isabella of Portugal (1428-1496), and for her brother, Prince Alfonso (1453-1468), at the monastic church of Miraflores. In May of 1486, the sculptor submitted sketches to the regent for her approval. Between April of 1489 and 2 August 1493, Gil and his workshop completed a sepulcher for the queen’s brother, which was placed in a niche near his parents’ tomb. The recumbent, marble effigies of Isabel’s parents were set upon an elaborate, eight-point star-shaped platform that displayed Flemish and Mudéjar, or Islamic-inspired, styles.

---


1057 Proske, *Castillian Sculpture*, 44-47; Kasl, "The Making of Hispano-Flemish Style," 109 n. 217. For Bishop Alonso’s commission, Kasl cites the *Libro Becerro de San Gregorio* of 1769, fols. 263-64. This hand-written history of the monastery of S. Gregorio, which is now preserved in the Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid, relates that the bishop at S. Gregorio commissioned “Mastre Guilles Escultores,” or the master sculptor Gil, to fashion a high altar retable in the manner of Burgos for the monastery’s chapel, which was constructed in 1489. This document is important, because it references monastery records that have since been destroyed and also, through its reference to the earlier Burgos commission, provides information for that project, for which no records exist.


1059 That the work at Miraflores was important to Queen Isabel is evident from the fact that she stipulated in her will that, even in the event of her death, the tomb project should reach completion. Wethey, *Gil de Siloé and his School*: 3, 24-55; Proske, *Castillian Sculpture*, 66; Cuadrado, "Gil de Siloé," 724.

1060 Proske, *Castillian Sculpture*, 57, 66-73. After the Moors’ twelfth-century occupation of Spain, non-Muslims incorporated the Islamic-inspired Mudéjar technique into their own art and architecture.
On at least two more occasions Gil collaborated with his partner Diego de la Cruz, creating polychrome retables for the Saint Ann Chapel at Burgos Cathedral (c. 1486-1492) and for the high altar at the church of Miraflores (1496-1499), where Gil had recently completed the royal sepulchers.\textsuperscript{1061} A walnut retable that covered three sides of the apse at the College of S. Gregorio at Valladolid, completed c. 1488, is thought to have been destroyed during the Napoleonic invasion of Spain (1808-1813).\textsuperscript{1062} Between April of 1495 and September of the following year Gil and his atelier worked on another retable, this time for the church of S. Esteban in Burgos, but it, too, is no longer extant.\textsuperscript{1063} The date of Gil’s death is unknown, although his lack of activity after 1500 suggests that he either died or retired during the first decade of the sixteenth century. Perhaps he retired after his primary patron, Isabel I, died in 1504.

Only two civic documents, a will and a rental agreement for some houses that pertain to Gil de Siloé are known.\textsuperscript{1064} Since there are few extant records for the sculptor, scholars look to the late eighteenth-century Spanish antiquarians Don Antonio Ponz (1725-1792) and Juan Augustín Ceán Bermúdez (1749-1829), who completed archival research on the artist’s commissions at Miraflores, before the monastery’s records were destroyed during the

---

\textsuperscript{1061} Scholars disagree regarding the roles that Gil and Diego de la Cruz played in the commissions they shared. Weise posits that Gil sculpted the Miraflores retable and Diego painted and gilded it. Wethey counters that artists of the time worked in multiple media, so that each artist would have been capable of both tasks. Proske, however, points out that in any commission in which both are named, Diego is only ever mentioned as a painter. Consensus now is that Diego painted and Gil sculpted. See Mayer, "El escultor Gil de Siloe," n. 10; Wethey, \textit{Gil de Siloé and his School}, 17, 22-23, 70-92, fig. 1; Proske, \textit{Castillian Sculpture}, 65.

\textsuperscript{1062} Wethey, \textit{Gil de Siloé and his School}, 17; Proske, \textit{Castillian Sculpture}, 48, 58, 65 n. 46.


\textsuperscript{1064} Wethey, \textit{Gil de Siloé and his School}, plate 82. The two documents consist of Gil’s will and a rental agreement of 25 May 1496 for properties that have since been destroyed. The latter references Gil as “Maestre Gil” and describes him as a sculptor and son-in-law of Pedro de Alcalá.
Napoleonic invasion.\textsuperscript{1065} Two later writers, Juan Arias de Miranda (1843) and Tarín y Juaneda (1896) primarily reiterated what their predecessors had related.\textsuperscript{1066}

In 1923, German art historian August L. Mayer mentioned how remiss scholars had been in overlooking Gil, who he considered one of Spain’s finest late medieval artists.\textsuperscript{1067} A decade later, American art historian Harold E. Wethey wrote a dissertation (1934), followed by a monograph on the artist (1936).\textsuperscript{1068} Both studies focused primarily on issues of style and attribution. Gil’s larger commissions are the subject of a chapter on fifteenth-century Castilian sculpture that Beatrice Gilman Proske of the Hispanic Society of America published in 1951.\textsuperscript{1069} An international congress that the Institución Fernán González sponsored in 1999 at the Academia Burgense de Historica y Bellas Artes, a cultural institute based in Burgos, focused on the sculptor and his epoch. Two years later select papers from the congress were published.\textsuperscript{1070}

More recently, Gil has been mentioned in the dissertations of Alfonso de Salas (2010), whose research pertains to the Spanish iconography of Saint Anne, and Ronda Kasl (2012), who contextualizes the sculptor’s career within the scope of northern European artists who flourished professionally in Castile during Isabel’s reign.\textsuperscript{1071} None of these works references a sculpture of

\textsuperscript{1065} Antonio Ponz, \textit{Vía de España: en que se da noticia de las cosas más apreciables, y dignas de saberse, que hay en ella} (Madrid: La Viuda de Joaquín Ibarra, 1793); Juan Augustin Ceán Bermúdez, \textit{Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de las Bellas Artes en España} (Madrid: Imp. de la Viuda de Ibarra, 1800). Portions of these texts, which relate the substantial design, labor, and material costs paid to the sculptor for the Miraflores projects are published in Albert F. Calvert, \textit{Sculpture in Spain} (London: John Lane Company, 1912), 61; Wethey, \textit{Gil de Siloé and his School}, 16-23, 122.

\textsuperscript{1066} Juan Arias de Miranda, \textit{Apuntes históricos sobre la Cartuja de Miraflores de Burgos} (Burgos: Imp. de Pascual Polo, 1843); Francisco Tarín y Juaneda, \textit{La Real Cartuja de Miraflores (Burgos): Su historia y descripción} (Burgos: Imp. y Libreria, Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez, 1896).

\textsuperscript{1067} Mayer, "El escultor Gil de Siloé," 252-57.

\textsuperscript{1068} Harold E. Wethey, "Gil de Siloé and Sculpture in Burgos Under the Catholic Kings" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1934); \textit{Gil de Siloé and his School}.

\textsuperscript{1069} Proske, \textit{Castillian Sculpture}, 20, 41-90.

\textsuperscript{1070} Joaquín Yarza Luaces, ed. \textit{Actas del Congreso Internacional sobre Gil Siloe y la Escultura de su época: Burgos, 13-16 octubre de 1999, Centro Cultural "Casa del Cordon"} (Burgos, Spain: Caja de Burgos, 2001).

\textsuperscript{1071} Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," 60-62, 225; Kasl, "The Making of Hispano-Flemish Style," 4-6, 46, 88-121.
Saint Anne, the Virgin, and Child that is attributed to the atelier of Gil de Siloé and belongs to the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art. In concluding his own research, Wethey urged scholars to search private collections for “first-rate examples” of the period’s sculpture, suggesting that these would be worthy of investigation.1072 This is precisely the case with the Greenlease sculpture, which remains unpublished, and, therefore, as a well-preserved example of the understudied subject of late-fifteenth-century Spanish sculpture, warrants careful scholarly assessment.

This sculpture is of a type known as a Saint Anne Trinity.1073 Although this work is Spanish in origin, its subject derives from Northern Europe. Many scholars believe that this type developed during the medieval period in Germany and the Netherlands, where it is known as an Anna Selbdritt and an Anna te Drieën, respectively. These terms translate roughly to “Anna, herself makes three,” which implies that Saint Anne is added as the third figure in a composition that more commonly includes only two, the Madonna and Child.1074 In Italian, the subject is known as a Sant’Anna metterza; in French it is called a Sainte Anne trinitaire; and in English, a Saint Anne Trinity.1075 However, there was no precise terminology in Spanish for this type until

1072 Wethey, Gil de Siloé and his School, 5.
1947, when scholar Manuel Trens adopted the term Santa Ana-triple. Beda Kleinschmidt undertook the first iconographic study of Spanish sculptures of this type. In his 1928 article on the subject, the German scholar expressed his astonishment that, despite the large number of Saint Anne Trinity sculptures that had existed in Spain since the late thirteenth century, no one had studied them. By 2004 little had changed, as Virginia Nixon, an expert on Northern European iconography of Saint Anne has noted that, though they were worthy of study, Spanish examples of this type have been overlooked in the literature. For his 2010 dissertation, de Salas ambitiously cataloged over 1,000 Spanish works of diverse media and compositions that depict Saint Anne, but his overview does not include the Greenlease example. Moreover, in assessing such a large number of works, de Salas was only able to present a cursory discussion of each object, leaving much room for further exploration. Like Wethey seventy years before her, Nixon proposed that scholars could find works within private collections that merited attention and that each “…could be the subject of a study in its own right.” Therefore, the contextual scholarly analysis of this object that follows not only will add another work to Gil’s known oeuvre, but it will also increase our understanding of late medieval Spanish religious iconography. Additionally, with its blending of northern subject and Flemish and Spanish styles,

---


1079 Nixon, *Mary's Mother*, 1-3, 134, 162-63. Nixon observes that, while the Netherlandish and German Anna Selbdritt sculptures have been researched in depth and those made in Italy and England have received marginal attention, the Spanish, Scandinavian, French, and eastern European examples have been overlooked.
this statue provides an excellent representation of the dissemination of northern European artistic
traditions to the south, a subject that, in general, needs further study, especially in the English-
language literature.  

9. Atelier of Gil de Siloé  
_Saint Anne Trinity_  
c.1484 - 1501  
Polychrome mahogany  
Height 81.3 x width 53.3 x depth 45.7 cm (32 x 21 x 18 in.)  
Circumference 144.1 cm (56 ¾ in.)  

A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family  


_Description:_ Saint Anne is the central figure of this polychrome mahogany statue. She sits  
frontally upon a backless, ebony-hued chair with sloped armrests that end in curved knobs.  
Propped upon Anne’s knee is her grandson, the infant Christ, and to her right sits her daughter,  
the Virgin Mary. Saint Anne dominates the sculpture’s triangular composition. Her voluminous  
cloak envelops her progeny, as she protectively positions her right hand on the back of Mary’s  
right shoulder and supports the Christ child’s torso from behind with her left hand. The saint’s  
fingers are long and slender, in contrast to her short thumbs. She twists her torso slightly in the  
direction of Mary, who holds a book in her lap, marking her place among its pages with her right  
thumb. Only some of the original gilding that once appeared along the pages’ edges remains.  

---  

Greenlease sculpture also represents the type of work about which Kasl stated the following: “…[i]n the near  
absence of written documentation, there is often little besides the surviving artworks themselves by which to gauge  
the magnitude and importance of the fifteenth–century Flemish art trade with Spain.” Bergmann, who is an historian  
of early modern Spain, discusses the popularity of Saint Anne’s cult in Seville. Her essay employs the Spanish term,  
“Santa Ana Triple.”
Jesus, who sits on the opposite side, extends his right arm, balancing a black orb, either a globe or fruit, in the palm of his hand as a symbol of his divine rule on earth.\(^{1081}\) The sphere’s hue likely darkened over time, perhaps from blue or gold, if the object was a globe. A small indentation on the sphere’s top and bottom indicate that it may represent an apple, in which case its color would have been red. Similarly, the base upon which the trio sits now appears as a brown mound, whereas at one time, it must have been green in color, judging from the blades of grass that are incised on the base’s side.

The features of this trio of holy figures share a familial likeness, as each has an elongated, oval face; long, narrow nose; pointed chin; and heavily lidded eyes that slant downwards at the outer edges and have a puffy ridge running horizontally on the lower lids. Their cheeks and lips are tinged in pink and they have brown irises. The figures gaze in different directions, with Anne focusing downward at her daughter and Christ looking outward over the viewer’s left shoulder. Mary gazes down, perhaps in the direction of a devotee, who might have viewed the statue from below, either while kneeling or standing, depending upon the object’s original placement.

Saint Anne wears a red veil over a white wimple, or toca in Spanish, that frames the saint’s face and fits snugly under her chin.\(^{1082}\) The cloth covers her neck and puckers into loose crinkles across her sternum. The wimple’s bottom edge runs horizontally across the top of her bust-line. The saint’s veil falls over her blue mantle, or manto, which wraps around her arms and

\(^{1081}\) The infant Christ’s pose is adopted from the depictions of a sovereign, who holds an imperial orb in his or her left hand as a sign of rule. See Nixon, *Mary’s Mother*, 137.

\(^{1082}\) For a comparable example in sculpture of a Spanish toca, see the marble effigy of Teresa Chacón from Ocaña of c. 1520, in the collection of The Hispanic Society of America in Ruth Matilda Anderson, *Hispanic Costume 1480-1530* (New York: The Hispanic Society of America, 1979), 171-72, fig. 351.
shoulders. The mantle drapes across her lap in stiff, inverted, parallel arcs and overlaps in hefty folds on the topside of her right thigh. The hemline of Anne’s dress falls onto the top of her thick, brown-soled, square-toed, black leather shoe, or zapato. It could be that the square area of fabric covering Anne’s chest was once painted purple like the rest of her dress, but the pigmentation has now worn off, so that underlying white gesso is exposed. Her cloak’s azure color signifies eternal truth, divinity, and sorrow, and the purple shade of her dress represents majesty.

The infant Christ is nude and sits with his left leg tucked underneath his right one, which is bent and dangles over his grandmother’s lap. The foot, calf, and knee of the right leg are well articulated. However, the right thigh extends from the torso at the waist-line, rather than from the hip, and the circumference of the right thigh is half that of the left. Perhaps the right leg was rendered smaller than the left and set at a higher elevation to accommodate a view from below. The child’s genital area is fully visible, revealing a small bump, either intended to signify his genitalia, or, perhaps, there was once a penis there, but it has since broken off. Christ’s right arm extends outwardly with the upturned palm holding an orb. His left arm is bent akimbo at the elbow, with the hand resting at an inward angle upon the inside of his left thigh. The infant Jesus has a long torso, with subtly articulated pectorals, sternum, and lower ribcage. His belly protrudes oddly off-center to the left, perhaps to accommodate a worshipper’s view from below.

In Spain, all classes of women wore the manto, which was a sleeveless cloak that was open at the front. See ibid., 235-37.


A painting by the Osma Master (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; accession no. 88.3.82) compares to the Greenlease statue because it also shows Christ’s genitals as exposed, but not fully articulated. Considering this stylistic comparison, it could be that the Greenlease Christ’s genitals were never rendered.
The Virgin’s dark brown hair is parted in the middle. Her thick tresses fall along her right shoulder and down the entire length of her back. Mary’s hairline is located at the mid-point of the top of her skull, in keeping with the contemporary fashion of women, who shaved their foreheads.\textsuperscript{1087} The tome that the Virgin holds in her lap is thickly bound with a prominent spine and individually defined, vellum-hued pages. With its subtle metallic sheen of silver, the Virgin’s vibrant, emerald-green dress contrasts Anne’s more modest attire and both reflect contemporary dress styles.\textsuperscript{1088} Like Anne’s dress, Mary’s garment has a rectangular neckline, but unlike her mother’s, it covers most of her bosom. Mary wears a white chemise that ties with a drawstring securely at her neck, which creates tiny, regular folds that extend downward on parallel diagonals. The square neckline is trimmed in gold and has a gold band that runs vertically down the center of her bodice. The Virgin’s dress may be a saya, which fits the torso closely and has a full skirt.\textsuperscript{1089} A gold belt with a zig-zag pattern of alternating upright and inverted triangles encircles the Virgin’s waist. On Mary’s dress, traces of gold are visible on the hemline, or cortapisa, a continuous band that is incised parallel to the fabric’s edge and measures approximately .9525 cm (3/8” in) width.\textsuperscript{1090} Anne’s garments are embellished similarly, with a trim that was probably once gold. Now the majority of its length has been repainted blue and maroon.

Mary’s mantle is the most elaborate vestment. Although much of the gilding has worn off, traces of an ornate gold arabesque and floral motif remain decipherable on the burgundy

\textsuperscript{1087} Wethey, *Gil de Siloé and his School*, 53-54.
\textsuperscript{1088} Koslin, "Value-Added Stuffs," 235.
\textsuperscript{1089} Anderson, *Hispanic Costume*, 201.
\textsuperscript{1090} Ibid., 207.
cloth, especially on the lower portion of the cape. This technique, known as estofado, was used to simulate contemporary silk and velvet fabrics. For its application, the paint surface was first incised and then pigment was applied to the incisions to create gold and silver patterns on richly colored backgrounds. The use of this technique and design is typical of work from the Castile-León region of Spain.

On the sculpture’s back, a horizontal iron bar that measures 43.18 x 3.81 x .635cm (17 x 1 ½ x ¼ in.) is attached with hand-made nails at the height of Anne’s shoulders [Cat. no. 9.1]. Perhaps the bar was used to stabilize the object against a vertical surface. The back of the statue is hollowed out, indicating that an audience was intended to view the object only from the front and sides, and that perhaps the statue was originally located in a niche, up against a wall, or was once part of a retable. A metal stave of unknown function is inserted into the statue’s base at the front. At the top of the carved recess at the back of the sculpture is a light green monogram. This insignia, perhaps a collector’s mark of currently unknown origin, comprises of a horizontal bar that connects the apexes of two letters, ‘AA’.

When the Greenlease sculpture was carved, the Saint Anne Trinity was a well-established
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1091 The floral motif may have consisted of lilies, pomegranates, or roses, as was typical for Spanish depictions of the Virgin’s cloak. For discussion of Gil de Siloe’s use of polychromy, see Teresa Gómez Espinosa, “Policromía del Gótico Final. Retablo Mayor de la Catedral de Toledo y Obras Burgalesas de Gil Siloe,” in Actas del Congreso Internacional sobre Gil Siloe y la Escultura de su época: Burgos, 13-16 octubre de 1999, Centro Cultural “Casa del Cordón,” ed. Joaquín Yarza Luaces (Burgos: Caja de Burgos, 2001), 573-82. See also Lesley K. Twomey, The Fabric of Marian Devotion in Isabel de Villena’s Vita Christi (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer Ltd., 2013), 112-14.
1092 In his Arte de la Pintura, Francisco Pacheco (1564-1654), a Spanish artist who was also a teacher to Diego Velázquez (1599-1660), explains the technique of estofado. For a translation and a description of the patterns that were used, see Calvert, Sculpture in Spain, 63-67; Zahira Veliz, ed. Artist’s Techniques in Golden Age Spain (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 56-63; Koslin, “Value-Added Stuff,” 240. For a demonstration of the process, see “Making a Spanish Polychrome Sculpture,” J. Paul Getty Trust, 2009, at http://www.getty.edu/art/gettyguide/videoDetails?segid=4305.
1093 Perhaps a small bucket or coin box to collect alms hung from the stave, but, this study has not yet found a comparable example with which to compare this feature. For the use of sculptures of Saint Anne for the collection of alms, see Brandenbarg, "Saint Anne," 32-38; Nixon, Mary's Mother, 101; Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," 322-26.
theme, but the statue’s Hispano-Flemish style reflects a newer development for the period. This style combines aspects of Flemish art, such as the fastidious rendering of garments and facial features, with qualities that were indigenous to Spanish art, including a general disregard for physiognomic accuracy. As mentioned above, the development of the Hispano-Flemish style began during the mid-fifteenth century and corresponded with a large influx into Spain of Northern European artists, especially stonemasons and sculptors. In Burgos, Gil de Siloé was the most adept sculptor working in the Hispano-Flemish style, which the Spanish queen, Isabel I preferred.

**Condition Description:** Although the polychrome on this sculpture has darkened with age and built-up grime, it remains in generally good condition. Small areas of paint loss appear across the painted surface, showing the underlying gesso layer along some areas, such as on the garment creases, on the fabric that drapes across Mary’s lap, the cloth of Anne’s dress at her bust, Christ’s right foot, and the right knees of the Virgin and Saint Anne. Only a faint suggestion of the *estofado* pattern that once decorated the Virgin’s cloak remains evident. Residual gilding appears along the hemline of the Virgin’s dress, within a scored border that runs parallel to the fabric’s edge. A comparison with the wood and polychrome statues of the Virgin that Gil de Siloé completed at the monastery of Miraflores, shows that Mary’s hair may once have been gilded, but that the gold has since worn away. Under ultraviolet light irregular
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1096 For Queen Isabel’s preference for Hispano-Flemish art, see Brans, *Isabela la Catolica*; Salas, "L’Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," 58; Kasl, "The Making of Hispano-Flemish Style," 1, 48.
1097 For a description of the artist’s use of gilding on hair, see Wethey, *Gil de Siloé and his School*, 48.
patches of retouching are evident on Anne’s shoe, her mantle, and on the base. The sculpture is intact except for Saint Anne’s left thumb, which is missing its tip. Christ’s genitals are missing entirely, which suggests that either the area was damaged or never carved, maybe because it was intended to be covered by another element, such as a cloth. Christ’s right arm appears to have been reattached at the elbow. The lower half of the chair’s left side is original. The chair’s right side and both of its arms are loose, indicating that they were likely added as a repair. The replacement parts likely replicate the original shape, since their contours are consistent with examples of comparable geographic and temporal origin.

**Attribution and Date:** The report that New York art dealer Edward Lubin submitted to Virginia Greenlease, when she purchased this work from his firm in 1971 attributed the sculpture to the atelier of Gil de Siloé, an attribution that appears to be accurate. Lubin based his attribution on a comparison with sculptures at Miraflores and Burgos Cathedral that are securely attributed to Gil de Siloé. He provided Mrs. Greenlease with Xerox copies of images of these works from Wethey’s book and marked the points of comparison, which included the rendering of physiognomy, fabric, and elements of the Hispano-Flemish style. The Spanish characteristics that he identifies include the wood medium’s density and the facial type. Lubin suggested that the “extremely high quality [of the polychrome] and the elegance of the carving indicate a sculptor very close to the master himself, perhaps his major associate, Diego de la Cruz.”

However, when Gil and Diego collaborated on projects together, typically the latter painted,
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1098 Burton L. Dunbar, Fine Art Appraisal Report, 10 May 2010, GGA.
1099 For example, a Saint Anne Trinity statue of c. 1490-1500 from Burgos or Palencia that was rendered with a similar chair was available for purchase from November to December of 2015 at the auction house of Kunstzalen A. Vecht in Amsterdam: [http://www.vecht-worksofart.nl/work-of-art/saint-anne-trinity](http://www.vecht-worksofart.nl/work-of-art/saint-anne-trinity) (accessed 14 November 2015).
1100 Lubin Report, Gil de Siloé: Acquisition file, GGA.
while Gil sculpted. Therefore, it is plausible that Diego may have applied the polychromy to the
Greenlease sculpture, but he likely did not sculpt this work as Lubin suggested. In his
assessment, Lubin also provided the results of a wood analysis that states that this statue was
carved from a type of wood known as *cerocarpus*, or mountain mahogany, a species of tree
native to Spain, where the sculptor worked.\textsuperscript{1101} Since there are no documents related to this
sculpture’s commission, physical and stylistic aspects offer the only clues for authorship.
Evidence that Lubin’s assessment is correct comes from a compelling comparison between this
sculpture and other works that are securely attributed to the sculptor and his workshop. For
example, in its rendering, the Greenlease Christ Child resembles four high-relief sculptures of
children that flank a statue of a knight depicted on the tomb of Queen Isabel’s brother, the
Infante Alonso, at the monastic church of Miraflores mentioned above.\textsuperscript{1102} Like the Miraflores
figures, the Greenlease Jesus has a receding hairline with stylized curls, a pear-shaped face with
full cheeks, subtly articulated pectorals, and a protruding, round belly that has a narrow flesh fold
along its top edge and a navel that punctuates its center. On the inner side of Christ’s right thigh,
midway between his knee and groin, is a crease in the same position as one that appears on the
right leg of the child standing to the Miraflores knight’s left side. Additionally, the Greenlease
Mary resembles a sculpture of the Virgin in a scene of the Assumption that the atelier of Gil de
Siloé and Diego de la Cruz completed for the high altar at Miraflores.\textsuperscript{1103} Both figures display a
high, shaved forehead with long, wavy hair that is parted in the middle, heavy-lidded eyes, a
narrow nose, small lips, and a pointed chin.

\textsuperscript{1101} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1102} Wehtey, *Gil de Siloé and his School*, plate 30.
\textsuperscript{1103} Ibid., plates 23, 65. At the monastic church at Miraflores, one of the statues of Mary that Gil completed appears
atop an engaged column opposite the figure of Gabriel in a scene of the Annunciation in the wall tomb of the Infante
Alonso and the other one appears in a scene of the Assumption.
The rendering of Mary’s and Saint Anne’s garments finds a complement in a secular sculpture by the artist, the allegorical figure of Esperanza, or Hope, from the tomb of John II at Miraflores. Bunched-up fabric lies diagonally in swaths over Esperanza’s abdomen in a manner analogous to, but in the opposite direction of, the cloth of Mary’s dress. Also, the lower half of the garments of Saint Anne and Esperanza are sculpted identically with fabric folds on the right thigh stacked in successive layers and then draped between the shins, creating deep, angular pockets, which correspond to Wethey’s description of “sharply creased, box-like stuffs” that are associated with this sculptor’s oeuvre. Also, both sculptures show triangular-shaped creases that descend down from the right knee, with a hemline that drapes over the top of a square-toed shoe. A comparative example for the thickly soled shoe with a boxed toe is found in a work in the Saint Anne chapel at Burgos Cathedral that is securely attributed to Gil’s workshop. The statue portrays Saint Anne in a standing position, supporting miniature figures of Mary and Jesus on her right arm and an open book in her left hand.

In his study of Gil’s oeuvre, Wethey determined certain characteristics, which he aptly termed “Siloésque,” that define the appearance of Siloé’s sculptures. These physiognomies include a marked resemblance in the figures’ facial features, such as heavy-lidded eyes that are puffy across the lower orb, emphatic eyebrows, oval-shaped faces, incised irises, and small mouths with pronounced naso-labial folds to each side of a narrow nose, all characteristics that are evident in the Kansas City sculpture. Additionally, Gil’s workshop produced hands with, as Wethey describes, “varying degrees of clumsiness,” with four long, slender fingers of equal
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1104 Ibid., plate 14. Wethey identified the shape as “peculiar to the artist, a fact which should not be minimized.”
1105 Ibid., 114-15, plate 14.
1106 Ibid., plate 73.
1107 Ibid., 54.
length and a very short thumb, as is the case with Saint Anne’s hands in the Greenlease sculpture.\textsuperscript{1108} The Spanish sculpture expert also observed that for Gil’s female sculptures, the hair is typically parted in the middle with long, wavy lengths of hair that extend down to the figure’s elbow and with a high hairline that reflects period fashion.\textsuperscript{1109} The Greenlease Mary’s hairstyle conforms to this description. Other features that Wethey describes as emblematic of Gil’s work are the bands along the garment’s edge, which exemplify a stylization that was indigenous to the area and time period of Gil’s artistic activity, and the fragile, metallic sheen of his sculptures’ surfaces.\textsuperscript{1110} Indeed, the silver applied beneath the emerald green paint of the dress adds a subtle richness to this sculpture in the style of Gil de Siloé’s œuvre.

The similarities between this work and others mentioned above that are securely attributed to Gil de Siloé, confirm Lubin’s attribution of the Greenlease Saint Anne Trinity to the Burgos sculptor and his atelier. When Lubin sold this sculpture to Mrs. Greenlease, he dated it from c. 1475 to 1500. However, there is no proof that Gil de Siloé was active in Burgos before 1484, which indicates that the dealer’s earlier date needs amending, but Lubin’s terminal year of 1500 is appropriate, since Gil’s activity seems to have ceased during the first decade of the sixteenth century. Therefore, a more suitable dating for this sculpture is c. 1484 to 1500.

\textit{Provenance:} Records related to Lubin’s sale of this sculpture to Virginia Greenlease in July of 1971 list the work’s provenance as “ex-Hinckle Smith” and indicate that the statue was displayed at “Timberline.”\textsuperscript{1111} This was the name given to the 133-acre, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania estate

\textsuperscript{1108} Ibid., 53.
\textsuperscript{1109} Ibid., 53-54, 114.
\textsuperscript{1110} Ibid., 8, 115.
\textsuperscript{1111} Edward R. Lubin, “A Very Important Late Gothic ‘Anna Selbdritt’ Group,” July 1971, Gil de Siloé: Acquisition file, GGA.
of millionaire William Hinckle Smith, who served as director of Girard Trust, Penn Mutual Life, and Baldwin Locomotive, among other interests. Smith collected Spanish and Italian antiques, which he used to decorate the interior of his palatial, Italianate residence designed by renowned American architect Charles A. Platt (1861-1933) that was built in 1907. Rockhurst’s sculpture does not appear in published photographs of Timberline’s great hall, dining room, or library, but the residence’s architectural plans show a number of possible locations where the sculpture may have been displayed, including, on the ground floor, in the corridor, morning room or study, or upstairs in the hallway or any of the six bedrooms. After Smith’s death in 1943, his Bryn Mawr mansion fell into disrepair. Five years prior to its demolition, Timberline was emptied of its contents, which were sold through the Philadelphia-based auction house, Samuel T. Freeman and Company. The Rockhurst sculpture can be identified as lot number 296, a thirty-two-inch tall, “Gothic Polychromed Carved Wood Altar Group” of a “Seated Blessed Virgin with Holy Child on Her lap, and Angel seated at Her knee.” While the item’s height and medium match those of the Greenlease work, the figure of the Virgin is incorrectly identified

1112 W. Hinckle Smith was also a patron and trustee of the University of Pennsylvania Museum, Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, Bryn Mawr Hospital, and Fairmount Park Art Association, as well as a financier who had interests in Guggenheim copper and served on the board of directors for Midvale Steel, Mack Truck, and Curtiss-Wright corporations. For a short biography, see William Morrison and Michael C. Kathrens, The Main Line: Country Houses of Philadelphia’s Storied Suburb, 1870-1930 (New York: Acanthus Press, 2002), 102-05. For information on Timberline’s architecture, see Keith N. Morgan, Shaping an American Landscape: The Art and Architecture of Charles A. Platt (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1995), 161.


1114 Timberline was demolished to make way for construction of the “Blue Route,” U. S. Interstate 476. As to which person[s] was in possession of the millionaire’s estate between the time of his death and when it was sold by the estate’s trustees requires further investigation. For the auction catalog, see "The collection of the late W. Hinckle Smith, important paintings and bronzes by Charles Marion Russell and Frederic Remington, Italian Renaissance furnishings, removed from "Timberline," Bryn Mawr, PA," ed. Samuel T. Freeman and Co. (Philadelphia: Samuel T. Freeman and Co., 1971).

1115 Ibid., n. 296.
as an angel, probably due to the cataloger’s unfamiliarity with the work’s iconography. On or between 27 and 29 April 1971, Lubin purchased this statue at the Hinkle Smith auction and then, in July of that year, sold it to Virginia Greenlease, who immediately donated it to Rockhurst University.

**Iconography:** As the Greenlease sculpture’s name indicates, Saint Anne, whose feast day is celebrated 26 July, is the primary figure in this work. Devotion to Saint Anne began as early as the mid-sixth century in Constantinople and Jerusalem and, by the late medieval period, had spread throughout Europe. Anne is not mentioned in the New Testament. Instead, she is introduced in the *Protoevangelium James*, an apocryphal text written c. 170-180, and appears in the *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew* of c. 600-625, which is based on the aforementioned source, and the *Golden Legend*, a collection of saints’ lives compiled during the mid-thirteenth century by Jacobus de Voragine (1230-1298). By the mid-fourteenth century, the latter text was translated into Catalan under the title *Vides de sants rossellones* and into Castilian, in two redactions called the *Gran flos sanctorum*, or Large Flowers of the Saints, and the *Estoria de los*
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1116 The Freeman catalog mentioned above identifies seven estate auctions, including Stanford White (1907), Rita Lydig (1913), Kent-Shmavon (1915), Davanzati Palace, Florence, Italy (1916), Thomas B. C. Clarke (1916), Stefano Bardini (1918), and Luigi Grassi (1927), from which Smith acquired works for his collection. However, none of these lists a work that matches the Greenlease sculpture in its description. Therefore, more investigation is necessary for information on the provenance of this work before Smith acquired it.


During the last decade of the fifteenth century, three more literary sources in which Saint Anne appears were published in Spain. These included two Latin texts, the *Vida de la Gloriosa santa Anna*, or Life of the Glorious Saint Anne, (1490), by the Valencia-born author Joan Roic de Corella (1425-1497), and *Vita Christi*, or the Life of Christ (1496), by the Franciscan friar Francesc Eiximenis (c. 1327–1409). These also were translated into Catalan and Castilian, respectively. A third source was a *Vita Christi* written by Isabella de Villena (1430-1490), an abbess at the Clarissan convent of Santa Trinitat in Valencia. In 1497 de Villena’s book, which focuses primarily on the female protagonists in Christ’s life, was printed posthumously at the request of Queen Isabel, who wanted not only to obtain a copy for herself, but also to make the text available to her subjects. That the Greenlese sculpture’s date of production coincides with the publication of these three texts demonstrates Saint Anne’s popularity at the time.

The earliest extant depiction of Saint Anne dates from 650 CE and is painted on a wall in the church of S. Maria Antigua in Rome. The origin story for the first Saint Anne Trinity image is related in a popular medieval tale, entitled *Emmericus of Hungary*. During the late
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1121 Cabré, "Medieval Women’s Writing in Catalan," 25. The original Latin text of *Vida de la Gloriosa santa Anna* was written circa 1480 to 1485. The only known copy once belonged to the book collection of Christopher Columbus’ son, Fernand, now at the Séville, bibliothèque, (Columbine, n. 14756, 110). Eiximenis’ text was published in Granada in 1496.


fifteenth century, people who lived in the region where this sculpture was created were familiar
with this account, likely because the story takes place along the famous pilgrimage route that
passes through Burgos and leads to Santiago de Compostela.\textsuperscript{1125} According to the legend,
Emmericus was traveling to Santiago when he encountered Saint James the Great, whose relics
are housed in the cathedral there.\textsuperscript{1126} The saint told Emmericus that he should depict Saint Anne
with the Virgin and Child and thereafter pay homage before the image by lighting three candles
and reciting three prayers each of the “Our Father” and “Hail Mary.” Upon his return home,
Emmericus painted the three holy figures on the side of his city’s clock tower, but when he
finished, he slipped and fell. Miraculously, Anne’s cloak caught him and prevented his
otherwise certain death. This event, which demonstrated the strength of the saint’s intercessory
powers, is also perhaps referenced in this sculpture through the manner in which Anne
protectively envelops her progeny in her cloak.

Because of Anne’s close, familial relationship to both the Madonna and Child, the
Christian faithful considered her to be a powerful intercessor. In sixteenth-century Spain, Saint
Anne served as a maternal exemplar and helped with issues pertaining to infertility, pregnancy,
childbirth, breastfeeding, infant mortality, and ill or wounded children.\textsuperscript{1127} Her assistance was
also sought for curing rabies, hernias, bleeding, and fever, and for healing afflicted nipples, teeth,
eyes, heads, faces, and ears.\textsuperscript{1128} Tuesday was the preferred day to venerate Saint Anne, because

\textsuperscript{1126} The story of Emmericus is related in Brandenbarg, "Saint Anne," 32-36; Nixon, \textit{Mary’s Mother}, 101-03 n. 8;
\textsuperscript{1127} Sheingorn, \textit{Interpreting Cultural Symbols}, 48-51 n. 87; Christian Jr., \textit{Local Religion}, 245.
\textsuperscript{1128} Christian, Jr., \textit{Local Religion}, 29, 33, 98, 175; Brandenbarg, "Saint Anne," 46, 56; J. P. Asselin, "Anne and
association with the Catholic University of America, 2003), 1: 468-70; Nixon, \textit{Mary’s Mother}, 76-78; Salas,
"L’Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne,” 147-51.
it was on that day it was believed that she was born, gave birth to the Virgin, and died.\footnote{Brandenbarg, "Saint Anne," 32; Nixon, \textit{Mary's Mother}, 103; Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," 154-57, 160-76.} For Spanish devotees, her example of a good death was particularly important.\footnote{Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," 169-76, 342-36.} After the Virgin Mary and Sebastian, Anne was the third most popular saint to serve as patron and protector for towns and villages in late medieval Spain.\footnote{For a list of saints and the number of Spanish cities and villages to which each was dedicated, see table 3.2 in Christian Jr., \textit{Local Religion}, 37, 67, 70, 123. A town’s dedication to Saint Anne was not unique to Spain. For instance, the Florentines chose Anne as their patron saint in conjunction with their revolt against the Duke of Athens on her feast day in 1343. See Roger J. Crum and David G. Wilkins, "In the Defense of Florentine Republicanism: Saint Anne and Florentine Art 1343-1575," in \textit{Interpreting Cultural Symbols: Saint Anne in Late Medieval Society}, ed. Kathleen Ashley and Pamela Sheingorn (Athens, GA and London: University of Georgia Press, 1990), 131-68.} Confraternities and guilds also adopted her as their patron; many rural churches were dedicated to her; and, in Castile-León, farmers asked her to protect their crops from hail storms.\footnote{Asselin, "Anne and Joachim, SS.,” 469; Nixon, \textit{Mary's Mother}, 6, 18, 55, 66, 101-04; Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," 147. However, as the historian of Spanish religion William A. Christian Jr. observes, because Anne’s powers were not as specialized as, for instance, those of Saint Sebastian who was believed to prevent plague, communities often did not remember for what reason in particular their ancestors had committed themselves to Saint Anne. See Christian Jr., \textit{Local Religion}, 33-37, 60-69, 175.} In Spain, her cult was securely established during the reign of Alfonso X the Wise (1253-1284), who was the king of Castile, León, and Galicia.\footnote{Kleinschmidt, "Anna selbdritt in der spanischen Kunst," 150-53. King Alfonso built a church in Triana, on the west bank of the Guadalquivir River in Seville, and dedicated it to Anne for her help in curing him of an eye ailment. Also, the King of Aragon and Castille, James II (1267-1327), built a cloister dedicated to Saint Anne, which shows further proof of late medieval devotion to Saint Anne in Spain. Also, in a 1307 decree, Pope Clement V mentioned that the castle chapel at Palma in Mallorca was named after her. There is a high-relief sculpture of Saint Anne above that church’s portal.} Thus, the area where this sculpture was carved has the oldest known tradition of devotion to Saint Anne in Spain.

In a late medieval society that prized chastity as a superior virtue, Anne’s example showed value in motherhood and family life and her appeal was widespread. For married women, Anne was someone with whom they could particularly identify because she was a devout female who engaged in conjugal relations, as demonstrated in the belief that Anne was
married three times, a serial marital status that is referred to as the \textit{trinubium}.\footnote{For more on Saint Anne as her cult relates to medieval and early modern family dynamics, see Warner, \textit{Alone of All Her Sex}, 23; Ton Brandenbarg, "Saint Anne and Her Family: The Veneration of Saint Anne in Connection with Concepts of Marriage and the Family in the Early-Modern Period," in \textit{Saints and She-Devils: Images of Women in the 15th and 16th Centuries} (London: The Rubicon Press, 1987), 101-28; "Saint Anne," 45-46.} An important impetus for Spanish devotion to Saint Anne was the country’s economy, which relied heavily upon the production of sheep’s wool for export and cloth manufacture.\footnote{Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," 40-42.} Anne was understandably a favored saint among a large segment of the population, because her husband, Joachim, was with shepherds when he learned about his wife’s unexpected pregnancy. The female-dominated subject would also have been especially well-suited for a female viewership, for instance in a convent.\footnote{Jeffrey F. Hamburger, \textit{Nuns as Artists: The Visual Culture of a Medieval Convent} (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997), 148-50; Nixon, \textit{Mary's Mother}, 24-26; Bergmann, "A Maternal Genealogy," 153-55.} With the growth of Saint Anne’s cult, Ana became a particularly popular name for children. So, it could be that the patron of this work may have been named Anne, Mary, or a combination thereof.\footnote{Kleinschmidt, "Anna selbdritt in der spanischen Kunst." 150. For examples of the female patronage of \textit{Anna Selbdritt}, images see Sheingorn, "Appropriating the Holy Kinship," 171, 87; Brandenbarg, "Saint Anne," 31; Nixon, \textit{Mary's Mother}, 21-26.} Male and female members of the Carmelite and Franciscan Orders were especially devoted to Saint Anne.\footnote{Sheingorn, \textit{Interpreting Cultural Symbols}, 25-42.} Since the Carmelites believed that their predecessors, the friars of Mount Carmel, had convinced Anne’s mother, Erementiana, to wed, they took credit for Anne’s birth, a circumstance that made Christ’s presence on earth possible.\footnote{Brandenbarg, "Saint Anne," 43-50; Nixon, \textit{Mary's Mother}, 28-29.} For Franciscan friars and Clarissan nuns, the sculpture embodied the Immaculate Conception, the belief that the Virgin was conceived without sin.\footnote{Brandenbarg, "Saint Anne," 36-37.} Indeed it was a Franciscan pope, Sixtus IV (r. 1471-1484), who,
in 1482, established a liturgical office for the celebration of the Immaculate Conception. Just two years later, Gil di Siloé completed his retable dedicated to the very subject at Burgos Cathedral. With the pope’s edict, Anne’s saintly status increased and the subject of the Immaculate Conception gained even more popularity, resulting in commissions for works of art such as the one at the Greenlease gallery.

This sculpture’s composition derives from, but reduces to three central figures, the Holy Kinship, a late medieval portrayal of Christ and his extended maternal family. This representation of Christ’s earthly relatives developed in the Netherlands and Germany as a visual and theological pendant to the Tree of Jesse, a genealogical chart that traced Mary’s male ancestors back to the kings of Israel. Scenes of the Holy Kinship honor Christ’s matrilineal line by presenting Saint Anne as the central figure with the Virgin and infant Christ flanking her, along with Anne’s three husbands, three children, and seven grandchildren. As de Salas shows, in Spain, the Holy Kinship imagery never took hold. Instead, devotees favored images of the Saint Anne Trinity like the sculpture at Rockhurst University. By not including the male relatives from the Holy Kinship and representing only its three central figures, the Greenlease Saint Anne Trinity likewise honors the matrilineal line. Furthermore, the composition offers a differently gendered counterpart to the Holy Trinity, which consists of God the Father, his son,

1142 Wethey, Gil de Siloé and his School, plate 69; M. Gnocchi, "Immacolata Concezione," in Iconografia e arte cristiana, ed. Liana Castelfranchi and Maria Antonietta Crippa (Milan: San Paolo, 2004), 331-35.
Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, as Masaccio famously depicted (1426-27) at S. Maria Novella in Florence.\textsuperscript{1147} Whereas the Holy Trinity signifies the origin of the divine Christ through his paternal line in heaven, the Saint Anne Trinity shows the source of his humanity.\textsuperscript{1148}

A plausible source for the iconography of a seated mother and child, as depicted here, are the Matronen, or carved wood statues of fertility goddesses that were plentiful in the Rhineland, where the Anna Selbdritt originated.\textsuperscript{1149} These female fertility deities were also worshiped in Spain, as religious scholar, William A. Christiansen discusses in his study of sixteenth-century, rural religious practices in that country. Christiansen explains that devotion to Mary, and later to Saint Anne, supplanted the worship of these early mother goddesses and shrines housing statues, for instance a Saint Anne Trinity, were often built where pagan temples were once located.\textsuperscript{1150} It is possible that the Greenlease sculpture was once displayed in such a shrine.

During the late medieval period this portrayal of a mother seated with her child on her lap appears in images of the Maestà, or Virgin in Majesty, which artists such as the Florentine Cimabue (1285-1286) and the Sienese Duccio di Buoninsegna (1308-1311), painted.\textsuperscript{1151} These works depict the Madonna sitting upon the sedes sapientiae, or Seat of Wisdom, which


\textsuperscript{1148} Sheingorn, "Appropriating the Holy Kinship," 175-76; Brandenburg, "Saint Anne," 31, 40-41. Sheingorn explains that the Saint Anne Trinity emphasizes the important role of “women as progenitors of the sacred.”


\textsuperscript{1150} Christian Jr., Local Religion, 21, 91-98.

references the wise King Solomon’s throne, as described in Kings 10:18-20. In images of this kind, Mary appears as a *Theotokos*, or “God-bearer” and her lap serves as Christ’s throne.

Likewise, the Saint Anne Trinity portrays Anne as the mother of the mother of God, and her lap also serves as Christ’s throne.\(^{1152}\) In its adaptation of iconography that is typically associated with the Virgin, this sculpture underscores Anne’s important status as Christ’s grandmother.

The open book that appears on Mary’s lap may reference Christ’s incarnation or the Virgin’s understanding of her destiny as prophesied in the Old Testament.\(^{1153}\) Whereas sculptures of this type normally show Anne holding a book and with Mary holding her son, here the reverse is true.\(^{1154}\) As such, it appears that the Greenlease Saint Anne Trinity constitutes a rare example of an iconography that is more typically associated with scenes of the Education of the Virgin or the Annunciation. However, in scenes of the former Mary is typically depicted as a seven-year-old child, whereas here she appears as a young woman, perhaps to emphasize her role as Jesus’ mother.\(^{1155}\) The physical proximity of Saint Anne and Mary likely relates to the nature

---


\(^{1154}\) For examples of Saint Anne Trinity sculptures that depict Saint Anne holding a book, see Kleinschmidt, "Anna selbdritt in der spanischen Kunst," figs. 2, 4, 7-9, 11-12, 15; Peter te Poel, *Op de drempel van een nieuwe tijd: De Maastrichtse Beeldsnijder Jan van Steffeswert [voor 1470 - na 1575]* (Maastricht: Bonnefantenmuseum, Snoeck-Ducaju & Zoon, 2000), 296, cat. 67; M. Van Vlierden, *Hout-en steensculptuur van Museum Catharijneconvent c. 1200-1600* (Utrecht: Zwolle, Waanders Uitgevers, 2004), 150; Peter te Poel, *Collectie Middeleeuws Houtsnijwerk* (Maastricht: Bonnefantenmuseum, 2007), 25, 63; Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," figs. 58, 64, 565; cat. nos. 60, 82, 128, 178; Dagmar Preising and Michael Rief, *Mittelalterliche Bildwerke aus Utrecht 1430-1530* (Museum Catharijneconvent, Utrecht: Belser, 2013), 267-68, cat. 47; Famke Peters, ed. *A Masterly Hand: Interdisciplinary Research on the Late medieval Sculptor(s) Master of Elsloo on an International Perspective* (Brussels: Royal Institute for Cultural Heritage, 2013), figs. 1.1, 1.10, 1.11, 1.24, 2.1, 11.3a, 11.41; Sudiraut, *Dévotion et seduction*, 270, figs. 37. From these and other sources I searched, the only other published work I found that depicts Mary having contact with the book is a panel painting at the bishop’s museum in Vich, Spain that depicts both her and her mother holding an open book together. For image, see Kleinschmidt, "Anna selbdritt in der spanischen Kunst," fig. 5.

of the medium as a cylindrical section of a tree trunk. However, the grouping may also symbolize the passing on of knowledge from one female generation to the next, particularly at a time, when, as Spanish history expert Emilie Bergmann observes, usually only males were educated.\textsuperscript{1156} While viewing Mary’s open book could have inspired educated worshippers to devote more time to reading their own psalters, as de Salas points out, the majority of the population in Spain during the sixteenth-century was illiterate.\textsuperscript{1157} So, most devotees would likely have interpreted this sacred iconography from a mystical perspective.\textsuperscript{1158} As Kleinschmidt shows, Spanish compositions of this type often juxtapose a book with a fruit, such as an apple, but in the Greenlease sculpture an orb appears instead.\textsuperscript{1159} In Northern Europe, where the iconography for this sculpture originated, an apple (\textit{Apfel}) and an orb (\textit{Kugel}) that represented the world (\textit{Welt}) were interchangeable symbols. This was because they had a similar shape and represented a play on words, since the earth was referred to as a \textit{Weltapfel} (world-apple) or \textit{Weltkugel} (world-ball). Whether Spanish or Netherlandish in origin, the contemporary viewer would have understood the globe to symbolize Christ’s heavenly reign on earth.\textsuperscript{1160}

\textit{Format and Function:} There are two primary formats for Saint Anne Trinity sculptures, the “standing type,” which depicts Saint Anne upright and holding a miniature-sized Mary and Christ Child in her arms, such as the Saint Anne retable sculpture of 1484 by Gil de Siloé

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1156] Nixon, \textit{Mary's Mother}, 138.
\item[1158] Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," 9, 70.
\item[1159] For examples of Spanish Saint Anne Trinity sculptures that include a book and fruit, see Kleinschmidt, "Anna selbdritt in der spanischen Kunst," 150-65, figs. 1-5, 7, 11-12.
\item[1160] Ibid., 158; Nixon, \textit{Mary's Mother}, 137.
\end{footnotes}
mentioned above, and the “bench-type,” which the Greenlease sculpture typifies. In Spain the earliest extant sculptures of this category date from the late twelfth to the fourteenth centuries and come from Aragon and Castile-Léon. The Saint Anne Trinity category of sculpture was particularly widespread there, probably because of trade and geographical ties with the Netherlands, where the iconography is believed to have originated.

The Greenlese example presents one of a number of poses adopted for bench-type works of Spanish provenance. While some works depict the Virgin sitting either in front of, or, as here, next to Saint Anne, others position Mary on her mother’s lap as in a statue by Hispano-Flemish artist Nicolau Chanterene (c. 1485-1555) at the cathedral museum at Santiago de Compostela. As established above, these images usually show Mary cradling Jesus in her lap, unlike in the Greenlease example, where he sits on his grandmother’s knee. Depictions of Anne and Mary, in which the two women are of comparable size are found in the bench-type composition, which shows them sitting adjacent to one another on the same bench. This type, in which Christ stands between his mother and grandmother or sits on Mary’s lap, is represented by a sculpture that Gil’s son, Diego de Siloé completed for Burgos Cathedral and also appears in a woodblock

---

1161 For other examples of Spanish provenance, see Kleinschmidt, "Anna selbdritt in der spanischen Kunst," 160-62, figs. 16-19; Wethey. *Gil de Siloé and his School*, plate 69. For North European examples, see Williamson, *Netherlandish Sculpture*, 128-31, cat. nos. 39-40; Sudiraut, *Dévotion et seduction*, 236-37, 276-80, cat. nos. 29, 33.


1163 Eleven of the fourteen extant, late thirteenth-century, Spanish examples are from Castille-León, and two are from Burgos, where Gil de Siloé’s workshop was located. De Salas points out that the majority of these early Spanish examples of the Saint Anne Trinity, which he aptly refers to as “Cinderellas waiting for recognition,” await scholarly assessment. See Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," 6, 147-49, 357-59, fig. 1.


1165 For Netherlandish examples of c. 1500-1510, see Williamson, *Netherlandish Sculpture*, 48-49, cat. no. 6.
print in a widely disseminated book of 1511, the *Vida y Milagros de santa Ana* (Life and Miracles of Saint Anne), by Juan de Robles. The Saint Anne Trinity also appeared in illuminated manuscripts, frescoes and panel paintings, retables, stained glass, iron grills, embroidered chasubles, altar cloths, and even atop a lavish, gold monstrance that Queen Isabel owned. However, of all the media in which the subject was depicted, the wood and polychrome sculpture, as exemplified in the Greenlease work, was the most favored representation. This medium was relatively affordable and its naturalistic appearance provided worshippers with a three-dimensional sense of immediacy that would have enhanced the experience of prayer.

The sculpture’s hollowed-out back, indicates that a viewer was meant to see the statue only from its front and sides, revealing that it was likely originally placed in a niche or affixed to a wall by means of the horizontal bar that is located at the level of Anne’s shoulders on the back. Whether the iron fixture is original or was added at a later date is unclear, although the handmade iron nails that attach it to the work look quite old. If it was once located in a church, this bench-type statue was probably not affixed to a pier, since usually only the standing sort were placed in such a position because their upright compositions were more suited to a vertical pillar. Taking into consideration the figures’ elongated torsos, shortened legs, and downward gazes, the sculpture must originally have been placed above eye level, to accommodate viewing from below. At a little over eighty centimeters tall, the Greenlease work falls in the middle range of sizes for extant Saint Anne Trinity sculptures, which range sixty to

---

1166 Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," 244, cat. nos. 32, 82; figs. 58.
1167 Ibid., 66, 224-60, cat. 41, fig. 28. The monstrance belonging to Queen Isabel was made in Nuremberg, Germany.
1168 Ibid., 5, 141-51.
Although the partial re-painting of this work has enhanced its appearance, the generally good condition of the sculpture’s wood and original polychromy suggests that it was likely displayed indoors and its relatively large size indicates that it was probably intended for a family chapel, confraternity or guild meeting hall, monastery, convent, girls’ school, or rural church.

**Context:** According to Kleinschmidt, Spaniards remained devoted to the Saint Anne Trinity, so that the majority of such sculptures have remained in situ, in contrast to Germany and the Netherlands, where most are found in museums. During the early decades of the sixteenth century in Northern Europe, the Saint Anne Trinity fell out of favor as disapproval of the trinubium grew and as Protestant reformer Martin Luther criticized parishes that used the Saint Anne Trinity as a means of tripling their profits by encouraging devotees to purchase three candles for each of the three saintly figures, as opposed to one for the entire group. That Spaniards were aware of this conflict is evident in the comment of early-sixteenth-century Spanish author, Juan de Robles, who suggested that, the lighting of one candle would suffice if the worshipper could not afford to buy more. With the decline of Saint Anne’s cult during

---

1170 See list of extant Spanish images of the Saint Anne Trinity in volume two of Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," 373-79. Private devotional images of the Saint Anne Trinity in Spain typically appeared as a small sculptural relief or as the centerpiece for a small portable altarpiece.


1172 In a discussion of his travels through Spain, Kleinschmidt remarks upon the countless village churches that retain their Saint Anne Trinity sculptures, in contrast to Germany, where the majority are displayed in museums such as the Maerkische Museum (Berlin), Suermondt-Museum (Aachen), Schnütgen Museum (Cologne), and the Bischöfliches Museum (Paderborn). See Kleinschmidt, "Anna selbdritt in der spanischen Kunst," 164-65.

1173 According to the *Golden Legend*, Anne married three times because she outlived each of her husbands. The Virgin’s father, Joachim, was her third husband. See Sheingorn, "Appropriating the Holy Kinship," 168; Voragine, *The Golden Legend*, 2: 149-50; Nixon, *Mary's Mother*, 1, 100.

1174 For images of single-sheet prints published in the Netherlands and Germany of devotees kneeling before a Saint Anne Trinity with three candles lit nearby that are augmented with printed prayers, see Brandenbarg, "Saint Anne," 43; Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," 160-67, figs. 93, 97-98.
the early sixteenth century, images of the Saint Anne Trinity created during that period tended to portray Anne as an elderly woman with a wrinkled face and stooped back, rather than as an upper class, middle-aged matron as she appears here, with smooth skin and sitting upright.\textsuperscript{1175}

As befit a married woman at the turn of the sixteenth century in Spain, as elsewhere in Europe, Anne’s hair is modestly covered with a \textit{toc}. The cloth used to make this type of headdress was cut in a half circle, with the straight edge falling across the forehead and down a little bit beyond the shoulders and the rounded edge covering part of the back, as is evident in this work.\textsuperscript{1176} Her \textit{manto}, or mantle, mimics a mid-quality cloth called “camelin” that middle- to upper-middle class Spanish women wore.\textsuperscript{1177} Thus, contemporary devotees would probably have recognized that the fabric rendered was of a quality suitable for a woman of Anne’s saintly status to wear. The appearance of the round-toed, or \textit{romos}, shoe occurred in the Netherlands around 1480, before the style was adopted in Spain. The timing of this development nearly coincides with this sculpture’s earliest possible date.\textsuperscript{1178} With their black leather and thick brown soles, Anne’s \textit{zapato} (shoe) adhered to contemporary fashion. This type of footwear was typically crafted from unlined calfskin or lined goatskin, and likely had a base of cork, the material most commonly used in Spain for sole manufacture during the late fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{1179} Other works of art that reflect this contemporary style in footwear include an intarsia portrait of Queen Isabel at Plascencia Cathedral and other statues by Gil de Siloé, including one of Saint Helen and another of a female personification of the Church, both in the chapel of Saint Anne at

\textsuperscript{1175} For the decline of Saint Anne’s popularity see Brandenburg, "Saint Anne," 44; Asselin, "Anne and Joachim, SS.,” 470; Nixon, \textit{Mary’s Mother}, 19-20, 121-31.
\textsuperscript{1176} Anderson, \textit{Hispanic Costume}, 171-73, fig. 351.
\textsuperscript{1177} Koslin, "Value-Added Stuffs," 235-37.
\textsuperscript{1179} Anderson, \textit{Hispanic Costume}, 228-29, fig. 533.
According to Spanish costume expert Ruth Anderson, women of all classes wore this type of shoe. During the fifteenth century in Spain, soles measuring “two to three finger widths,” as depicted here, cost fifty percent less than those five fingers in height. Therefore, in the sense of contemporary fashion, Saint Anne’s shoes would have been considered modest and suitable for a middle-class matron.

Mary’s chemise reflects a typical style for aristocratic women in Spain during the period in question. Sometimes the white, linen undergarment was embroidered with gold thread along its edges. However, late fifteenth-century sumptuary laws prohibited this type of embellishment, which might explain its absence in this depiction, although original gilding might also have been painted over or lost. As seen in the Virgin’s dress, contemporary women’s styles separated the bodice from the skirt, often with the use of a gold belt. The squared neckline of Mary’s dress was introduced to Flemish fashion, around 1483. The Virgin appears similarly dressed in a scene of the Annunciation at the high altar of Placencia Cathedral by Queen Isabel’s court painter, Juan de Flandes (c. 1465-1519). The angled collar, combined

\[1180\] Brans, *Isabela la Catolica*, figs. 73-74.
\[1182\] For example, shoes with soles five fingers in height cost 132 maravedis, as opposed to ninety for the lower ones. See ibid., 228. During the mid-fourteenth century, the above-mentioned, Franciscan author Eiximenis decried the expense of the taller shoes, known as *chopines*, faulting the cost for ruining household budgets, as well as lessening contributions to local parishes. See Wethey, *Gil de Silóé and his School*, plates 70, 72-73; Anderson, *Hispanic Costume*, 226, fig. 533; Twomey, *The Fabric of Marian Devotion*, 153-68.
\[1183\] Queen Isabel’s 1503 Segovia wardrobe inventory itemizes pairs of black *pantofles* and the garment list of her daughter, Joanna, mentions an “old pair of black leather shoes” which indicates that the period’s aristocrats also wore this shoe. See Anderson, *Hispanic Costume*, 228 n. 568.
\[1184\] A similar chemise is depicted in ibid., 204-05, fig. 465.
\[1186\] For comparison, a silver girdle of 1500 at the Metropolitan Museum of Art Cloisters is similar in appearance to the one the Greenlease Virgin wears. See Thomas Hoving, *The Secular Spirit: Life and Art at the End of the Middle Ages* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art with E. P. Dutton & Co. Inc., 1975), 78 n. 85.
with a fitted bodice, tightly belted waist, and full skirt, or *saya*, remained fashionable in Spain until 1501, a period that coincides with the date of this work.\textsuperscript{1188} The collar's rectangular border is trimmed in ribbon that follows a split down the front panel of the dress. This cut allowed for breast-feeding, as pictured, for instance, in a Castilian, Hispano-Flemish painting, the *Virgen de la Leche*, by Pedro Berruguete (c. 1450-1503).\textsuperscript{1189} Thus, by early modern Spanish standards, this sculpture’s depiction of Mary’s dress suits her role as a new mother. Moreover, in the secular world, the green color of Mary’s dress could have identified her as a young, newly betrothed woman, which further emphasizes this point.\textsuperscript{1190} As Sor Isabel noted in her *Vita Christi* published in 1497, the green color of the Virgin’s dress connoted mercy and hope for salvation through the birth of Christ, a theme that this sculpture also symbolizes.\textsuperscript{1191}

**Conclusion:** In summary, the Greenlease Saint Anne Trinity attributed to the workshop of Gil de Siloé served as a focal point for veneration of Saint Anne and was created at a time when the popularity of her cult had peaked in Spain.\textsuperscript{1192} In terms of its subject, iconography, medium, format, naturalistic rendering, and Hispano-Flemish style, this wood-and-polychrome sculpture stands as an example of the most favored representation for Saint Anne in the region of Castille-León, where it was created during the reign of Queen Isabel I. Physical evidence indicates that the sculpture was affixed to a wall above eye level. The statue may have been displayed in a

\textsuperscript{1188} Anderson, *Hispanic Costume*: 201. In the painting *Virgen de la Mosca* by Flemish artist Gerard David (1460-1523) at the collegiate church of Santa María la Mayor in Toro, near Valladolid, Queen Isabel is depicted wearing a dress that is similar in style and coloration to the Greenlease Virgin’s attire.

\textsuperscript{1189} See the paintings of c. 1480 to 1500, *Virgen con el Niño* (Museo Municipal de Madrid) and *Virgen de la Leche* (Colección Roda, Madrid), by Castilian artist Pedro Berruguete (1450-1503) in Pilar Silva Maroto, "La pintura hispanoflamenca en Castilla," in *La pintura gótica hispano flamenco: Bartolomé Bermejo y su época*, ed. Francesc Ruiz i Quesada (Bilbao: Museo de Bellas Artes de Bilbao, 2003), 76, 468-70, cat. no. 72.

\textsuperscript{1190} Buren and Wieck, *Illuminating Fashion*, 5.

\textsuperscript{1191} Twomey, *The Fabric of Marian Devotion*, 168.

\textsuperscript{1192} Nixon, *Mary's Mother*, 1; Salas, "L'Iconographie de Sainte Anne en Espagne," 1.
convent, family chapel, confraternity or guild hall, or rural church. The composition, which emphasizes the matrilineal line of Christ’s family, is derived from scenes of the Holy Kinship and offers a differently gendered, counterpart to the Holy Trinity. This work’s iconography originated in the Netherlands and Germany as an Anna Selbdritt, and references the Throne of Wisdom, Education of the Virgin, and Immaculate Conception. In terms of its symbolism and style, this sculpture underscores the close cultural and artistic ties that the region shared with Flanders. While in early sixteenth-century Spain devotion to Saint Anne did not waiver, in Northern Europe a rising discomfort with the concept of the trinubium and criticism from protestant reformer Martin Luther contributed to a decline in the popularity of her cult. In Spain, however, Saint Anne remained an important intercessor and the Greenlease Saint Anne Trinity presents the mother of Mary and grandmother of Christ in her devotional prime.

1193 Nixon, Mary’s Mother, 1, 162; Kasl, “The Making of Hispano-Flemish Style.”
In 1975 Virginia Greenlease purchased a sculpture of a Madonna that was attributed to the Master of Elsloo and dated to 1500. However, as we shall see below, the sculpture probably originated from a town in Upper Swabia in southwest Germany during the mid-fifteenth century. The name “Master of Elsloo” was coined in 1940 by art historian J.J.M. Timmers who used it to refer to the sculptor of an Anna te Drieën (Saint Anne Trinity) statue that remains in situ in the Augustinuskerk, or church of Saint Augustine, in Elsloo, near Maastricht in the Netherlands.

Since then, over two hundred sculptures have been attributed to the anonymous master, based solely upon stylistic analysis. Beginning in January of 2010 Christian Ceulemans, the interim Director General of the Royal Institute for Cultural Heritage in Brussels, and Peter te Poel, then Curator of Sculpture and Applied Arts before 1850 at the Bonnefantenmuseum in Maastricht, initiated a two-year interdisciplinary study to determine the identity of the Master of Elsloo.

Three years later they published their study, which concluded that the Master of Elsloo should be understood as a “regional phenomenon,” rather than as a single sculptor and/or workshop. An integral component of the research was the examination of seventy-seven unsigned works

---


1196 Ibid., 15. Project coordinator Famke Peters summarized that, due to the large number of sculptures attributed to the Elsloo Master and subtle stylistic variations inherent in those works, it is more likely that they originated from a number of independently run ateliers that employed a generally uniform working method, which produced a large number of stylistically similar wooden statues that suited the tastes of their patrons.
attributed to the Master of Elsloo. Since the sculptures lacked documentation, researchers focused on assessing their technique and style.\textsuperscript{1197} However, the Van Ackeren sculpture was not part of this study and, therefore, an assessment of the sculpture’s attribution to the Master of Elsloo is warranted.

Most of the art historical literature from this period and region concerns painting and sculptures of the type that the Kansas City example represents are typically overlooked in the literature. Contributing factors to this oversight include a lack of documentation and the fact that such a work is often tied to a small region that generally attracts less scholarly attention than the larger centers of production. However, it is important to note that the majority of mid-fifteenth century, northern European, wood sculptures that depicted saints have been lost, stolen, or damaged, either by the effects of time, or from the destruction that occurred during the 1563 iconoclasm, when Catholic religious works were destroyed as a result of the Protestant reformation.\textsuperscript{1198} This situation makes it all the more imperative that extant examples, like the one in the Van Ackeren collection, receive their due attention.

Until fairly recently, scholarly discussions of the period’s northern European sculpture appear primarily in Dutch and German. Studies in English that serve as exceptions include, publications by scholars Charles Kuhn (1965), Jeffrey Chipps Smith (1994), and Paul Williamson (2002).\textsuperscript{1199} Kuhn and Williamson, who each authored a catalog of the collections of late-medieval, northern European sculpture in the museums with which they were affiliated, pointed out the lack of scholarship on the subject in English and emphasized the importance of

\textsuperscript{1197} Ibid., 97. For instance, regarding the twenty-one Elsloo sculptures that remain \textit{in situ} at the church of Saint Lambert in Neeroeteren, not one had sufficient documentation to confirm its origin.


assessing extant fifteenth- and sixteenth-century sculptures from the region.\textsuperscript{1200} In his publication of German Renaissance sculpture from 1520 to 1580, Chipps Smith made an important contribution to the initial art historical discussion of an understudied genre and also provided a brief summary of the role of religious art in pre-Reformation Germany.\textsuperscript{1201} The assessments of the oeuvres of sculptors, such as Tilman Riemenschneider (1460-1531) and Jan van Steffeswert (1470-1525), has also improved our understanding of northern European sculptures and the increasing availability of comparative works that have undergone analysis has allowed for a better assessment of attribution for sculptures such as that in the Van Ackeren collection.\textsuperscript{1202} In order to gain a better understanding of northern European sculpture from 1450 to 1550, Kuhn and Williamson encouraged their colleagues to study “less well-known pieces in museums and private collections.”\textsuperscript{1203} Thus, the present analysis of this sculpture represents exactly the type of study that the calls of Kuhn and Williamson warranted.

10. Anonymous, Upper Swabia, Germany

\textit{Virgin [?], Saint Barbara [?], or Saint Catherine [?]}

1450/60

Limewood [?] or willow [?]

Height: 133 cm (52 3/8 in.)

A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family

Provenance: Galerie Hermitage; Private Collection, Paris; Edward R. Lubin, Inc., New York; Virginia Greenlease to Rockhurst University, 1975 [?].

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{1200} Ibid., v.

\textsuperscript{1201} Chipps Smith, \textit{German Sculpture of the Later Renaissance}, 10-30.

\textsuperscript{1202} Peters, \textit{A Masterly Hand}; Peter te Poel, \textit{Op de drempel van een nieuwe tijd: De Maastrichtse Beeldsnijder Jan van steffeswert [voor 1470 - na 1575]}, (Maastricht: Bonnefantenmuseum, Snoeck-Ducaju & Zoon, 2000); Iris Kalden-Rosenfeld, \textit{Tilman Riemenschnieder: The Sculptor and his Workshop} (Königstein im Taunus, Germany: Verlagsbuchhandlung KG, 2004).

\textsuperscript{1203} Williamson, \textit{Netherlandish Sculpture}, 20.
\end{footnotesize}
Description: The female saint faces forward and stands on a rounded base that resembles a mound of earth. Her right knee is bent and presses slightly against her skirt. She wears a crown and tilts her head slightly to her right. Her forehead is prominent and rounded and she has a receding hairline. The figure’s hair frames her face, folding back on itself to form a tubular curl that consists of parallel hair strands, which are incised horizontally. The orbs and lids of her eyes are defined and puffy ridges line her lower lids. The saint has a long, narrow nose; thinly chiseled nostrils; and a small, pointed chin. Two well-defined, vertical ridges extend between the bottom of her nose and the top of her thin upper lip. Noticeable creases at the corners of her mouth indicate that the female saint is smiling subtly.

A tri-lobed finial, representing the Trinity, extends vertically from the crown’s center. Along the diadem’s top rim, inverted cusps align to create a contour of points with alternating heights. Breakage of each of these tips show that they were once topped with finials, including four larger ones that likely matched the remaining extension, and with smaller embellishments placed in between, such as three conjoined balls, which may also represent the Trinity. Raised circle and diamond shapes run horizontally across the diadem’s mid-section, simulating a row of precious gems. Encircling the crown’s lower rim is a twisting, two-stranded, braid.

The saint’s crown sits atop her veil, whose stiff pleats extend down toward her left shoulder and then cut horizontally across the sternum. At the other shoulder, the fabric descends vertically along the outside edge of her arm, forming another set of acutely-angled pleats. To the right side of her face, a section of veil falls more naturally, folding underneath itself at the hem’s edges. A thick cloak drapes over the figure’s shoulders and envelops her form. With her left forearm, the saint gathers up the bulky fabric, which creates deep, inverted, box-like folds that

---

1204 For examples of sculptures with this type of crown, see *Laat-Gotische Beeldsnijkunst*, cat. nos. 69, 356 A, B; Poel, *Op de Drempel*, cat. no. 56.
drape in a rhythmic pattern at the front and sides of the garment. Underneath the mantle, she wears a gown that is gathered at the waist, causing vertical ridges to appear at the bust-line. The dress spills to a length longer than the figure’s height and the hemline of her gown drapes across the pointed tip of her right shoe. Cloth pools at her feet, forming a row of stiff, ‘L’- and ‘Z’-shaped creases.

The female saint’s arms are bent, with the elbows hidden within the garment folds, tucked back and near her waist. The saint’s hands were carved separately from the core sculpture and attached at the wrist. They extend in front of her, emerging from rectangular-shaped cuffs. Her fingers appear long and elegant and have fully articulated nailbeds. The left palm faces upward, with its thumb close to, but not touching, the index finger, and the rest of the hand relaxes gracefully. The right wrist twists, so that the tops of the fingers face outward. The tips of the saint’s right index finger and thumb touch to form a closed circle and the remaining digits curl in unison, as if they once wrapped around an object, perhaps cylindrical in shape. The attributes that they once held are now missing. The sculpture is hollowed out at the back. An iron hook that appears old, but is of undetermined age, is inserted along the shoulder line in the back, indicating that the statue was likely once attached to a wall or a niche.

While the grain of the wood from which this sculpture was carved is now exposed, there is evidence that it was once polychromed.\textsuperscript{1205} For instance, along the left side of the Virgin’s neck, the surface appears uneven, as if chipped paint was covered over with a brown glaze.

\textsuperscript{1205} Monochrome sculptures were painted in a brown glaze to heighten the wood’s natural appearance and were not covered in a preparatory layer of gesso for polychrome and gilding. The artist who introduced this method was Tilman Riemenschneider, a prominent German sculptor active in Würzburg from 1485 to 1525. The sculptor may have produced monochrome statues as early as 1490. Numerous examples of works that have lost their original polychromy appear in the following: Michael Baxandall, \textit{The Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany} (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1980), 18-19; James Snyder, \textit{Northern Renaissance Art: Painting, Sculpture, the Graphic Arts from 1350 to 1575} (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Inc., 2005), 117; Lemmens, \textit{De Meester Van Elsloo}; Williamson, \textit{Netherlandish Sculpture}; Ceulemans, \textit{Laat-Gotische Beeldsnijkunst}. 
Also, under direct light, a trace of red paint suggests the shoe was once painted. Additionally, to make up for the loss of definition in painted details, monochrome sculptures are typically carved in a variety of textures, particularly of garments, but the surface of this sculpture is generally smooth, inferring that paint was used to articulate its features.\textsuperscript{1206}

\textit{Condition Description:} The statue’s surface is built up with layers of stain and varnish.\textsuperscript{1207} The ring and little fingers of the right hand were cut and replaced at a later date. It is likely that the replaced fingers are not original.\textsuperscript{1208} The right middle and the left ring fingers broke off, each at the middle knuckle, and were not reattached. A nail that is positioned on the outside edge of the figure’s right wrist was used to reattach that hand. The decorative finial that appears at the front and center of the crown was broken off on its vertical segment and reattached in two locations, at the base and midpoint. The tips of the crown’s inverted cusps appear jagged, suggesting that finials once extended from these points, but have since broken off and have not been replaced. Two plugs, each measuring 5.08 x 3.175 cm (2 x 1 ¼ in.), were inserted into the right side of the figure’s gown and are positioned at a height of 40.64 and 63.5 cm (16 and 25 in.) from the ground. Just above the left hand, at the cloak’s edge, a rectangular section, with dimensions of 11.43 x 4.445 cm (4 ½ x 1 ¾ in.), was attached separately. Laminated sections of the gown’s drapery were added to the core sculpture at the lower right and left sides. A vertical segment of fabric that measures 20.32 cm (8 in.) broke off underneath the left hand, at the cloak’s edge. In

\textsuperscript{1207} Some of this condition report confirms the findings of Burton Dunbar in the assessment that he completed for the statue’s insurance appraisal on 10 May 2010. Master of Elsloo file, GGA.
\textsuperscript{1208} I thank Michael Rief, Vice-director and Head of Collections at the Suermontd-Ludwig-Museum in Aachen and Dr. Stefan Roller, curator at the Liebieghaus sculpture museum in Frankfurt, for sharing their expertise with me. Both agree that the sculpture’s broken fingers were likely replaced with new ones during the nineteenth century.
the interior of the sculpture’s hollowed core at the back, patches of burlap fabric were applied, perhaps to prevent further cracking. The sculpture’s footprint is shaped like the letter “C.” At its mid-point, a thin wedge of wood has been inserted, presumably to fill a crack.

**Attribution and Date:** Based upon their observations of the figure’s patterning of hair, high forehead, and the individual way that the sculptor cut the drapery at extreme right angles, both the New York dealer Edward R. Lubin (1975) and art historian Burton Dunbar (2010) attributed this work to the Master of Elsloo. For Lubin to have made this assessment at the time is understandable, since the so-called Master of Elsloo was used as a catch-all attribution for sculptures of the Van Ackeren type. Sculptures of the Elsloo type display stiff, box-like folds in the dress fabric, particularly over the stomach and upper thighs, and sharply-angled garment pleats at the hemlines. Typically, such figures have pointed shoes that jut out over the edge of a rounded base and are posed with one knee that is slightly bent and pressing against a gown. The 2010 Brussels study of Elsloo sculptures mentioned above provided a group of securely attributed examples with which the Van Ackeren sculpture could be compared, as a means by which to verify or deny its attribution to the anonymous master. For an accurate visual comparison, the Van Ackeren statue was photographed in the same manner as those sculptures that were part of the Belgium study, shot from eight angles against a neutral background. A comparison between these related images reveals disparities in the articulation of the hair framing the figures’ faces and their eyes. Whereas the tresses of the Van Ackeren sculpture fold back to form a continuous tubular curl along each side of the face, the Elsloo type sculpture has hair that is rolled back, but evenly segmented into horizontal sections. Also, the former has

---

1209 Van Ackeren file, box 209, GLA. Also see n. 1230.
puffy lower eyelids, while the latter has lines incised horizontally across the lower lid. Upon the present author’s request, Famke Peters, who coordinated the Brussels study, generously agreed to assess the Van Ackeren photographs and confirmed that the Kansas City sculpture’s attribution to the Master of Elsloo was incorrect. At Peters’ suggestion, the pictures were forwarded to Michael Rief, the Vice-director and Head of Collections at the Suermondt-Ludwig-Museum in Aachen, who consulted with his colleague, Dr. Stefan Roller, who is a curator and Head of the Department of Medieval Sculpture at the Liebieghaus museum Frankfurt.\(^\text{1210}\)

Acknowledging the difficulties inherent in not viewing the object in person, Rief and Roller suggested that this statue was likely sculpted from a soft wood, such as limewood or willow. A dendrochronology test was not performed to confirm this as fact. However, such a medium would assure a provenance for this sculpture, since German carvers preferred lindenwood, also known as limewood, while Netherlandish sculptors used oak and walnut, to resist dampness.

Based upon stylistic analysis, the two German medieval sculpture experts are convinced that the Van Ackeren statue was likely made in a town in Upper Swabia, or southwest Germany, around 1450 to 1460.\(^\text{1211}\) The technique employed to create this sculpture seems to confirm this, because it is consistent with mid-fifteenth century practice. For instance, as was usual for wood sculptures of this type, the back is hollowed out and there is a hole in the top of the head where a clamp stabilized the sculpture in a horizontal position as it was being carved. Also, wooden pegs were used to attach sections to the central core that were carved separately, such as the

\(^{1210}\) E-mail, Famke Peters to Loren Whittaker, 1 March 2017; e-mail, Michael Rief to Loren Whittaker, 2 March 2017.

figure’s hands and oval face.\textsuperscript{1212} The latter was attached with five pegs. Considering the disparities in style and technique between this sculpture and others attributed to the Master of Elsloo and the opinions of Peters, Rief, and Roller, all esteemed experts in this field, it seems that Lubin’s assessment of this work as a sculpture of 1500 to 1525 by the Master of Elsloo is incorrect. Therefore, the present study suggests that the sculpture is probably of Upper Swabian provenance and was created around 1450 to 1460.

\textit{Provenance:} According to Edward Lubin, the earliest known location for this work was the Galerie Hermitage in Saint Petersburg, Russia, after which it belonged to a private collector in Paris, from whom the New York art dealer had acquired the work.\textsuperscript{1213} However, Lubin did not provide any related dates of ownership for this provenance list. When Mrs. Greenlease purchased the statue from Lubin in 1975, she immediately donated it to Rockhurst University in anticipation of the opening of the Van Ackeren Gallery.

\textit{Iconography:} When Lubin sold this sculpture in 1975 to Virginia Greenlease, he identified it as a \textit{Madonna}.\textsuperscript{1214} Until now, no study has questioned the accuracy of this identification. Perhaps because this figure wears a crown, both the dealer and his client recognized her as the Queen of Heaven. Though this stylized headpiece was often depicted in fifteenth-century northern European portrayals of the Virgin, such as a statue by the German Renaissance sculptor Viet Stoss (1450-1533) at the Germanisches Nationalmuseum in Nuremberg, it was not exclusive to

\textsuperscript{1212} Rief also noted this point in an e-mail communication with the author on 2 March 2017. For a similar woodshop practice, see "The Kalkar School of Carving," 123, 128-33; figs. 13-14, 17-18. Kargère shows examples of sculptures from this period in which strands of hair, fingers, hands, or drapery were attached with small wooden dowels.
\textsuperscript{1213} Edward R. Lubin, Inc. Object Report, Master of Elsloo: Acquisition, file, GGA.
\textsuperscript{1214} Van Ackeren Gallery file, box 209, GLA.
her. For example, contemporary representations of Jesus Christ, God the Father, King Solomon, and assorted female martyrs were also portrayed with this type of crown. The standardized use of this decorative diadem likely originates from the printmaker known as Master E. S., since the period’s artists generously borrowed designs from his prints, which were widely disseminated among northern European workshops. Thus, the crown alone cannot identify this sculpture as a Madonna and with the original attributes gone, important information is lost that could either confirm or negate the identity of this female saint.

Nevertheless, the sculpture bears some physical evidence that may provide clues. For instance, the figure’s hand positions suggest what type of objects they might once have held. In his 2010 assessment of this work, Burton Dunbar posited that the figure’s left palm, which faces upward, once supported an orb, also called a Weltkugel, or literally “World-ball,” that signified the earth as the Savior’s domain. Another object, which because of its shape held similar connotations, was the apple. Referred to as a Weltapfel, or “World-apple,” this symbol also

---


1216 On the Master E. S.’s influence, see Shestack, *Master E. S.*; Baxandall, *The Limewood Sculptors*, 13-20; Chapuis, *Tilman Riemenschneider*, 57, 62, 162, 196-98, 203, 205, 222-25, 229-32, 248, 260, 287; cat. nos. 10, 14, 16; figs. 2-3; Poel, *Op de Drempel*, 183-85. Other northern sculptors who rendered crowns in this style include Rimenschneider and van Steffeswert mentioned above, as well as Veit Stoss (1450-1533). Images by the Master E. S. of figures wearing this type of crown appear in Shestack. They include the Virgin Mary (figs. 21, 66-67), Christ (figs. 21, 66), King Solomon (fig. 30), and Saint Barbara (fig. 53). Shestack explains that it is not clear whether the Master E. S. originated this design on his own, or whether drew the figure from a statue by sculptor Gregor Erhart. In Chapius, fig. 16 reproduces the image of a sculpture that, like with the Greenlease example, wears a crown with its finials broken off. In the same catalog, a very similar crown appears on an unidentified female saint (cat. no. 10). For an example of a depiction of God the Father with a finial crown, see Max H. von Freeden, *Tilman Riemenschneider: Leben Und Werk* (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1981), cat. no. 89. For similar sculptures of Saints Barbara and Catherine wearing crowns, see Poel, *Op de Drempel*, 74, 206-07; cat. nos. 58, 63, 72, 73. An example of a statue of the Virgin by Viet Stoss with a similar crown is found in Baxandall, *The Limewood Sculptors*, plate 39.

1217 See n. 13.
referred Mary’s identity, as a new Eve. Typically, as in an engraving of c. 1465 by the Master E. S., the Virgin was depicted handing the fruit to the infant Jesus, whom she held in her other arm. However, the Greenlease sculpture’s right arm is not positioned to have supported a Christ figure. Instead, her right hand seems to have been made to wrap around a cylindrical object, perhaps a scepter or staff. Dunbar suggested as much, noting that repaired holes, positioned at heights of sixteen and twenty-five inches from the ground, could have served as points of attachment for the attribute’s support.

While this sculpture might represent the Madonna, other possibilities merit consideration. It could be that the cylindrically-shaped attribute that this figure once held was a sword or a palm frond, which is a common symbol for martyrs. Two female saints who were popular in fifteenth-century Germany and often depicted with either, or both, of these attributes were Barbara and Catherine of Alexandria. The cults of those two holy women were widespread among northern European worshippers and, because of their popularity, they were often

---


1219 The image is reproduced in *The Limewood Sculptors*, 15, fig. 6; Poel, *Op De Drempel*, 185, fig. 17.4. For more on the Master E. S., see “Introduction” in Shestack, *Master E. S.*, Baxandall, *The Limewood Sculptors*, 13-19. Others have cited the 1465 engraving of a *Virgin and Child* as a source of inspiration for many of the period’s statues of the Madonna. Some influence from the Master E.S., either from the sculptor’s direct knowledge of this source, or at least from his familiarity with someone else who was, is evident in the Greenlease figure’s attire, wearing a similar crown with jewels and garments with angular, box-like folds; as well as in her appearance, having an oval face, small mouth, and pointed chin. An image of the related print of the Virgin and Child is reproduced in ibid., 15, fig. 6; Poel, *Op de Drempel*, 185, fig. 17.4.

1220 For a period sculpture of the Virgin holding a scepter and the Christ Child, see Baxandall, *The Limewood Sculptors*, 202-05, cat. no. 4.

1221 See n. 13.

1222 Diane Apostolos-Cappadonna, in *Dictionary of Christian Art* (New York: Continuum, 1994), 265. Adopted from the classical Greco-Roman symbol of triumph, the palm frond represented for early Christians victory over death as a symbol of martyrdom.

portrayed in contemporary paintings and sculptures. Aristocrats and bourgeoisie alike were devoted to these two female saints, primarily because of their association with the cult of the Fourteen Holy Helpers. This cult originated in Nuremberg, just north of Upper Swabia, during the fourteenth century, and became widespread, largely due the combined intercessory power that the fourteen saints represented. After 1445, the cult gained prominence, when a pilgrimage site developed at a Cistercian monastery in Langheim, Germany, because of a vision that the son of a shepherd experienced near there of Christ with fourteen children as his holy helpers. The Fourteen Holy Helpers include Saint Christopher, three virgin martyrs (Barbara, Catherine of Alexandria, and Margaret), three bishops (Denis of Paris, Blaise, and Erasmus, called Elmo), three knights (George, Achatius, and Eustace), a physician (Pantaleon), a deacon (Cyriac), a martyr (Vitus), and a monk (Giles).

Fifteenth-century German images of Saint Barbara, whose feast day is 4 December, often situate a small tower at her side or show her holding a miniature version of one balanced upon her palm. The tower symbolizes the structure in which Barbara’s pagan father, Dioscorus, hid her from suitors. The saint was also sometimes depicted with a sword, to signify that her father beheaded her for converting to Christianity, or with a chalice and a host, since she asked for the sacrament of the Eucharist upon her death. As a Christian martyr, Saint Barbara is

---


1228 Cosetelloe, "Saint Barbara," 89.
also portrayed wearing a crown, like the Van Ackeren figure, and holding a palm.\textsuperscript{1229} The curling of the figure’s right fingers indicates that they once held a cylindrical object, perhaps a scepter if the sculpture represented the Virgin Mary, or a martyr’s palm or sword for Saint Barbara. On the figure’s right side there are two wooden plugs, positioned at a height of eighteen and twenty-five inches from the ground, that might have served as points of attachment for a tower. It is also feasible that she balanced a smaller version, since there is a rectangular repair on the mantle’s edge that might have correlated with the contour of the square base of a miniature tower.\textsuperscript{1230} The repair’s shape presents the possibility that she once balanced a book with her left hand. Perhaps in her right hand she held a martyr’s palm like the image of Saint Barbara as depicted in a Master E. S. engraving that shows her standing next to a tower and and inserting her left thumb between the pages of an open book that she supports with her left, upward-facing palm.\textsuperscript{1231} Any combination of this iconography would have signified to the contemporary viewer that the figure depicted was Saint Barbara.\textsuperscript{1232}

It could be that the sculpture represented Saint Catherine of Alexandria, whose feast day is 25 November. Like Barbara, she appeared in period images with a martyr’s palm, sword, book, and crown of martyrdom, the latter because of her royal heritage, as well as her status as a martyr.\textsuperscript{1233} According to the Golden Legend, Catherine was the daughter of King Costus.\textsuperscript{1234} Because of Catherine’s mental acuity, Emperor Maximus (Maxentius) challenged her to debate

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1229} Ibid.; Braun, \textit{Tracht und Attributen}, 116-17.
\item \textsuperscript{1230} For a fifteenth-century German sculpture of Saint Barbara holding a miniature tower and a martyr’s palm, see Braun, \textit{Tracht und Attributen}, 114, fig. 49.
\item \textsuperscript{1231} J. W. Valentiner, "The Name of the Master E. S.,” \textit{Art Quarterly} 11 (1948): 218-49; Shestack, \textit{Master E. S.}, cat. no. 53.
\item \textsuperscript{1232} An image of an example of a wood sculpture of Saint Barbara by Jan van Steffeswert that stands next to a tower and holds a book in one hand and a martyr’s palm in another is found in Poel, \textit{Op de Drempel}, 288-89, cat. no. 63.
\item \textsuperscript{1233} Costelloe, "Saint Catherine of Alexandria," 267-68.
\item \textsuperscript{1234} Voragine, \textit{The Golden Legend}, 2: 134-41.
\end{itemize}
fifty of his scholars about Christianity.\textsuperscript{1235} When she successfully argued her point, so much so that she converted her opponents in the match, the ruler ordered her to be beheaded. Since she was educated in the liberal arts, she was sometimes depicted with a book, and to signify the circumstances of her death, she is also portrayed with a martyr’s palm and/or a sword. As established earlier, the Greenlease sculpture could have held either of these in its right hand, while supporting a book in the other one.\textsuperscript{1236} Before her decapitation, Catherine was tortured with a spiked wheel, so that sculptural portrayals of her show a half of a wheel connected to the statue’s side.\textsuperscript{1237} In German religious iconography from this period, the wheel is the most important symbol for Saint Catherine.\textsuperscript{1238} Thus, it is feasible that the plugged repairs on the statue’s right side may have served as insertion points for the wheel and/or its spokes.\textsuperscript{1239} In consideration of this sculpture’s physical evidence, the precise identify of this figure remains inconclusive. The statue may depict the Virgin, Saint Barbara, or Saint Catherine.

\textit{Format and Function:} Without its original polychromy the Greenlease sculpture has lost some of its original impact for the viewer. Nevertheless, from extant works of this type one can imagine that she likely had a cream-colored complexion, perhaps with a hint of a pink tint on her cheeks and either pink or red lips.\textsuperscript{1240} Her eyebrows and lids may have been lightly outlined in black, with darkened pupils that contrasted the whites of her eyes. During the fifteenth and

\textsuperscript{1235} Apostolos-Cappadonna, 73-74; Voragine, \textit{The Golden Legend}, 2: 334-41.
\textsuperscript{1236} An example of a crowned figure of Saint Catherine that appears with these attributes is found in a wood block print of 1517 in a book entitled, “Laude devotissime et sanctissime,” by Leonardo Giustiani. The image is reproduced in Dünninger, "Fourteen Holy Helpers," 837.
\textsuperscript{1237} For a sculpture with this iconography, see Susanne Schreiber, "Studien Zum Bildhauerischen Werk Des Niclaus (Gerhaert) Von Leiden" (PhD. diss., Technische Universität Berlin, 1996), 249, fig. 9.
\textsuperscript{1238} Braun, \textit{Tracht und Attributen}, 415-418.
\textsuperscript{1239} Williamson, \textit{Netherlandish Sculpture}, cat. nos. 9, 54-55; Schreiber, "Niclaus (Gerhaert) Von Leiden," fig. 9.
\textsuperscript{1240} Ceulemans, \textit{Laat-Gotische Beeldsnijkunst}, 46, plate 11.
sixteenth centuries, sculptures of the Greenlease type were typically placed in monasteries, churches, or in the homes of the wealthy. An increase in individual commissions called for works to be placed on an altar, in a tabernacle, or in private chapels.\textsuperscript{1241} It is also possible that the sculpture was part of an assemblage of the \textit{Fourteen Helpers} or figures from an altarpiece. If the former were true, then the sculpture would have been one of seven figures stationed to each side of a central subject, such as a sculpture of a \textit{Saint Christopher Carrying the Christ Child}, a \textit{Man of Sorrows}, or a \textit{Madonna and Child}.\textsuperscript{1242} As an indicator of the popularity of this sculptural grouping, there are numerous extant examples of the Saint Christopher statue, as well as of the individual saints, such as this one.\textsuperscript{1243} The backs of many of these sculptures were hollowed out, meaning that they were intended to be seen from the front. The fourteen sculptures were either lined up near the high altar or atop a rood screen, which divided the area in a church that, during Mass, was designated for the laity from that of the clergy.\textsuperscript{1244} As these ensembles were disassembled, private collectors and museums purchased the individual sculptures, so that they appear now separately, divorced from their original context. However, it cannot be discounted that this sculpture was commissioned as an independent work.

Although we may never know the original location for this work, by bearing in mind the sculpture’s size and structure, and then assessing similar works from the period that remain \textit{in situ}, we can arrive at some conclusions regarding the original display of the Greenlease

\textsuperscript{1241} Baxandall, \textit{The Limewood Sculptors}, 10-12; Williamson, \textit{Netherlandish Sculpture}, 18.
\textsuperscript{1242} Dünninger, "Fourteen Holy Helpers," 836-37.
\textsuperscript{1243} For an image of a sculpture of this type of Saint Christopher, see Poel, \textit{Op de Drempel}, 302-03, cat. no. 70.
sculpture.\textsuperscript{1245} For instance, at the church of Saints Ulrich and Afra in Augsburg and in parish churches throughout southern Germany, statues of saints that are similar to this one in terms of size and subject remain on display. These saintly figures are placed on the high altar’s retable, in side chapels, and also line the nave, where each figure stands on a separate pedestal that is attached to a pier. Some statues are affixed with a large iron hook to a wall, pier, column, or within a niche and, as we have seen above, this sculpture has such a hook attached to the back. However, although the hook appears old, it may not be original to the work. Spread throughout the interiors of churches, these sculptures provided, and continue to provide, multiple focal points of prayer and contemplation for the worshipper. For example, during Mass, an attendee in the church’s nave might sense that he or she is celebrating communally with fellow worshippers and the figures of saints that line the nave overlooking the congregation, whereas a devotee kneeling in closer proximity to a saint situated on an altar or in a niche in a side chapel, might have experienced a more private encounter for personal devotion. In both instances, the church sculptures would have acted as focal points for prayerful meditation, serving as a conduit for God’s intercession. Another possibility is that this sculpture was placed near an exit. Although it is not certain that these statues are in their original locations, a comparative example of the Greenlease sculpture is found in a pair of female saints flanking the interior doors at the west end of the church in Venvray. Each holds a palm frond, which, like Saints Barbara and Catherine, identifies the figures as virgin martyrs. Sculptures such as this that were positioned near an exit served as a reminder to the faithful of the saintly protection that they would receive as they

\textsuperscript{1245} For example, the retable altarpiece for the high altar in Marienkirche, Cracow of c. 1477-89 by Veit Stoss, depicts figures of comparable size in its central shrine. See Wixom, "Late Medieval Sculpture in the Metropolitan: 1400 to 1530," 7, fig. 6. For how these sculptures were affixed to piers, see Baxandall, \textit{The Limewood Sculptors}, figs. 135-36.
entered into the secular world.  

**Conclusion:** The Greenlease sculpture was likely stained and varnished to look like a monochrome statue in the style of Tilman Riemenschneider, but it was once painted, as the trace of red pigmentation on the shoe and uneven surface suggest. When Lubin sold this work to Virginia Greenlease, he attributed it to the Master of Elsloo and identified it as a *Virgin*. However, as we have seen above, the sculpture is likely from a town in Upper Swabia, in southwestern Germany, and dates to 1450 to 1460. While this female figure may represent the Virgin Mary, there is the distinct possibility that it depicts either Saint Barbara or Saint Catherine of Alexandria. The curved shape of the figure’s left hand suggests that it might have once held a martyr’s palm, sword, or staff. The position of the figure’s left forearm coupled with a rectangular cut in the drapery above that arm indicate that the upturned palm of the left hand might once have supported a book or a miniature tower and two plugs on the sculpture’s left side might be former sites of attachment for a tower or a wheel. The tower and wheel are symbols for saints Barbara and Catherine, respectively, and the martyr’s palm, staff, and book are associated with both of these saints, who were also popular in fifteenth-century Germany as two of the Fourteen Helpers. Nevertheless, it cannot be discounted that the Van Ackeren sculpture may depict the Virgin Mary.

---

CÉSAR BAGARD

---

\*1246 Wixom, "Late Medieval Sculpture in the Metropolitan: 1400 to 1530," 3, 4.\*
Nancy, France, 1620-1707

César Bagard was baptized on 27 April 1620 in the parish church of Saint-Sébastien in Nancy, France.\(^\text{1247}\) He was born into a family of sculptors in the Lorraine region of northeastern France and was one of three sons of the sculptor Nicolas Bagard (active early 17\(^{th}\) c.) and his wife, Anne.\(^\text{1248}\) The young Bagard may have been named after a sculptor, César Foullon, who was also his godfather.\(^\text{1249}\) At the age of thirteen, César was apprenticed, first to a local painter, Jean Gérard, and then to Nicolas Jacquin (1625? – 1695?), a Parisian, who had relocated to Neufchâteau, just southwest of Nancy.\(^\text{1250}\) On 1 February 1650, César married Francoise Tarcy, the widow of a man named Claude Bielet.\(^\text{1251}\) With Francoise, Bagard had four children, one of whom, a son called Toussaint, succeeded him as Lorraine’s premier sculptor.\(^\text{1252}\)

Early in his career, Bagard assisted the painter Claude Deruet (1588-1660) in creating decorations for the palace of Duke Charles IV (1604-1675) in Lorraine. The young sculptor also helped create ephemeral works for triumphal entries into that city, including for those of the Duke of Lorraine in 1655 and 1658 and for King Louis XIV (1638-1715), who passed through


Nancy in 1657.\textsuperscript{1253} Two years after the French king’s visit, Bagard traveled to Paris, perhaps with Jacquin, the teacher from his youth.\textsuperscript{1254} While there, César made ephemeral statues of Hercules and Minerva, the medium of which was not stipulated, that temporarily adorned the Port Saint-Antoine during the celebration of the marriage between Louis XIV and Maria Thérese of Spain (1638-1683).\textsuperscript{1255} The artist sculpted in a variety of media, including marble, sandstone, and wood. On 21 October 1669, César was appointed Sculpteur Ordinaire, or chief court sculptor, for Duke Charles IV, for whom he completed many works, including a cupid for a fountain and a lion for the duke’s palace garden.\textsuperscript{1256} Although documents associated with the court appointment of Le Grand César as he was known, indicate that he had studied abroad, they provide no information regarding where he may have traveled.\textsuperscript{1257} Some believe Bagard’s Italian baroque style suggests that he had trained in Italy.\textsuperscript{1258} His workshop had a high yield of production, serving many of the churches and monasteries in and around Nancy and completing commissions for the Jesuit, Dominican, and Carmelite orders.\textsuperscript{1259} For the Jesuits, César and his son Toussaint sculpted six statues and in 1673, Bagard completed a grave memorial for the Jesuit college’s founder, the bishop of Toul Jean de Porcelet de Maillane (1581-1624).\textsuperscript{1260} Now on display at the Musée Historique au Palais Ducal in Nancy, this sculptural ensemble features a marble statue each of Hope and Faith that flank a male allegorical figure, which holds a

\textsuperscript{1253} For Claude Dereuet, see Pfister, Histoire de Nancy, 1: 125-26, 144; DeWitt H. Fessenden, The Life and Works of Claude Dereuet-Court Painter, 1588-1660 (Brooklyn: DeWitt H. Fessenden, 1952).
\textsuperscript{1254} Wiener, Attribuées a Bagard, 4; Pupil, "César Bagard," 48.
\textsuperscript{1255} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1256} Wiener, Attribuées a Bagard, 4 n. 2; Pfister, Histoire de Nancy, 1: 201; Lidnow, "César Bagard," 266-67.
\textsuperscript{1257} Pfister, Histoire de Nancy, 1: 201; Pupil, "César Bagard," 48.
\textsuperscript{1258} Pupil, "César Bagard," 48.
\textsuperscript{1259} Wiener, Attribuées a Bagard, 4-5; Pfister, Histoire de Nancy, 1: 201. In 1658, Bagard sculpted a work entitled Honoré for the Dominicans that was placed on a pedestal of gold and silver in their church in Nancy.
\textsuperscript{1260} Wiener, Attribuées a Bagard, 5-6. For the Jesuits in Nancy, Toussaint sculpted statues of Saint Stanislas Koska and Saint Louis Gonzaga. The subject of the statues that César worked on for the order is not clear.
medallion portrait that depicts the bishop.\textsuperscript{1261} Of his other documented works, at least two are statues that portray the Virgin Mary; one was positioned above the entrance of the convent of Saint Elisabeth, and the other in the chapel of Mont-Carmel in the church of the Carmelites.\textsuperscript{1262} During the French Revolution, the latter was placed for safekeeping in the city’s museum, and then later transported to the cathedral of Nancy, where it remains.\textsuperscript{1263} For the Carmelites, he also sculpted statues of Saint Teresa (1515-1582) and Saint John of the Cross (1542-1591), both founders of that order’s reformed branch, the Discalced Carmelites.\textsuperscript{1264} These sculptures were placed in niches behind the church altar.\textsuperscript{1265} While the former work no longer exists, the latter belongs to the collection of the Musée Lorrain.\textsuperscript{1266} For the basilica of Saint-Epvre in Nancy, the artist completed a relief sculpture that depicts the \textit{Two disciples of Emmaus}. As related in Luke 24:13-35, these were two men, one of whom was named Cleopas, who encountered the risen Christ during their journey on the road to Emmaus.\textsuperscript{1267} Other works by Bagard include a \textit{Saint Peter} at the cloister of the Cordeliers and a life-size \textit{Ecce Homo} in nearby Saulxures-lès-Nancy.\textsuperscript{1268} However, due to their religious subjects, the majority of Bagard’s sculptures was destroyed during the French Revolution.\textsuperscript{1269}

When in 1689 King Louis XIV decreed that, to facilitate payment of France’s war debts,

\textsuperscript{1261} Ibid., 5.
\textsuperscript{1262} Pupil, "César Bagard," 48.
\textsuperscript{1263} Pfister, \textit{Histoire de Nancy}, 1: 376.
\textsuperscript{1266} Marchesseau, "Saint Jean de la Croix," 177-82.
\textsuperscript{1267} Luke does not identify the second man, only Cleopas.
\textsuperscript{1268} Wiener, \textit{Attribuées a Bagard}, 4-5.
\textsuperscript{1269} Ibid.; Lidnow, "César Bagard," 266.
aristocrats must relinquish to the crown any decorative objects made of metal, many turned to Bagard’s workshop to carve replacements for the confiscated works. The medium of these substitutes was typically *bois de Sainte-Lucie*, a dense cherry wood from the Lorraine region.1270 An example of one of these substitutions, a decorative wall sconce that is tentatively attributed to César’s workshop, belongs to the J. Paul Getty Museum.1271 Other sculpted works that he created for the domestic interior include a crucifix, a *Virgin with Saint Lucy*, a *Christ with Saints Peter and Paul*, and an *Infant Hercules*.1272 A life-size, wooden crucifix of 1680 that remains *in situ* in the church of Saint-Sébastien in Nancy (estab. 1593) is considered his most accomplished work, along with the stone decoration of c. 1670 at the Charterhouse of Bosserville, a former Carthusian monastery that was built in 1666 on land Duke Charles IV owned south of Nancy.1273 César Bagard died in his hometown on 10 March 1707 and was buried there in the church of the Minimes, where his wife had been laid to rest after her death on 4 April 1682.1274

According to Lucien Wiener, the author of a compendium of Bagard’s known works that was published in 1874, Bagard’s work was particularly recognizable to residents of the Lorraine region, who prized his wood sculptures, Weiner explained that if someone from Lorraine were to

1270 That Bagard sculpted in the medium *bois de Sainte-Lucie* is noted in Wiener’s description of a statuette of the Virgin by the sculptor as “*Une Vierge en bois de Sainte-Lucie.*” See Wiener, *Attribuées a Bagard*, 5.
1272 Wiener, *Attribuées a Bagard*, 5. The statuettes mentioned in the 1874 compendium of the sculptor’s extant works belonged at the time of publication to a banker, M. Richard; a lawyer, M. Abram; a city bailiff, M. Breton; and a local priest, M. Deforge. The text mentioned that the priest and city bailiff kept their sculptures by Bagard in cabinets within the home, showing their intended function as works for domestic display.
1273 Pfister, *Histoire de Nancy*, 1: 787-88; Pupil, ”César Bagard,” 3: 48. At Bosserville, Bagard worked with his son Toussaint, sculpting an *Immaculate Conception* that decorated the front portal, as well as statues of the prophet Elijah, and Saints John the Baptist, Paul, and Bruno. The former monastery, which is now a school, is located on the right bank of the river Meurthe, a tributary of the Mosel River.
encounter a work by the sculptor, he or she would be prone to proclaim, “C’est un Bagard!” or “It is a Bagard!”1275 Although historically in Lorraine César Bagard has remained a celebrated sculptor, elsewhere he is largely unknown.1276 Not only is the scholarly literature on Bagard scant, but what little does appear is only in French. Indeed there is a significant dearth of information on the artist between Pfister’s 1908 history of Nancy and a 2001 article regarding the attribution to Bagard of the Saint John of the Cross mentioned above that is in the Musée Lorraine.1277 That Bagard has escaped scholarly attention is not surprising, since he worked primarily as a regional artist, so that those beyond Lorraine’s borders would have had little chance to become acquainted with his work. Other factors that impede research on the artist are a lack of surviving examples of his sculptures and related documents. Because he clearly had a prominent and accomplished career as premier court sculptor to Duke Charles IV and also completed ephemeral works for King Louis XIV, César Bagard and his oeuvre are worthy of study. Further, with so few of his works remaining, an effort to analyze those that have survived becomes even more imperative. The following close assessment of an unpublished, framed, sculpted Crucifix with Saint Mary Magdalene that belongs to the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art is a rare study in English on a work of César Bagard and marks a step in the direction of reconstructing his oeuvre.

11. César Bagard

Cruciﬁxion with Mary Magdalene

C.1690-1700

Fruitwood, or bois de Sainte-Lucie

Without frame: 57.15 x 33.655 x 6.985 cm (22 ½ x 13 ¼ x 2 ¾ in.)

---

1275 Wiener, Attribuées a Bagard, 3.
1276 Marchesseau, "Saint Jean de la Croix," 177-78.
1277 Pfister, Histoire de Nancy, 1; Marchesseau, "Saint Jean de la Croix," 177-82.
With frame: 69.85 x 50.165 cm (27 ½ x 19 ¾ in.)

A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family


*Description:* The Crucifixion scene attributed to César Bagard has a decorative wooden frame that is beveled along its inner and outer edges. The wooden sculpture portrays Christ nailed to the cross, with Mary Magdalene kneeling to his right. A coat of arms with a helm balanced at its apex is centered at the base of the cross and overlaps the frame’s edge. Jesus is depicted as he nears death. His eyes, still open, look skyward, as he tilts his head back and to his right. With his lips parted slightly, he seems to take a last breath, or utter some final words. He has a mustache, a full, pointed beard, and a thick mane of swirling locks that cascades over his shoulders. Jesus’ arms, which were carved separately and attached at the shoulders, extend away from his body at an upward forty-five degree angle. A loin cloth is modestly draped just below his hip bones and angles on a downward slope to the right, with the ends lifting, as if capturing a gentle breeze. Nails with pyramidal-shaped heads pierce his hands, attaching them to the crossbeam, or *patibulum*, of the cross. Equidistant from the horizontal beam’s center, there are two rectangular-shaped traces of residue, perhaps glue, where a banderole may once have been attached. The position of Christ’s hands, with his index and middle fingers delicately lifted and his thumbs falling forward, do not evince the pain that he endures. Arching his back, Jesus thrusts his chest forward and away from the cross, which reveals that the figure is carved fully in-the-round. His lean physique is fully articulated, showing his pectorals, thighs, calves,

---

strained tendons, and taut abdominal wall. With his left knee jutting further forward than his right, his body falls in an elegant pose that animates the sculpture. Each of Christ’s feet is nailed separately to a *suppendaneum*, or foot block.\textsuperscript{1280} Thick rivulets of blood flow from each of his four wounds, but there is no wound yet inflicted into his side.

Saint Mary Magdalene kneels in the composition’s lower left quadrant. She leans towards the cross without making contact with the wood. She bends her arms at the elbow and places her right hand on her breast. Her right middle and fourth fingers touch, while the rest are spread apart. With her left hand, she clutches the fabric of her dress and wrenches it into a ball. However, it is difficult to discern whether the cloth comes from her mantle, or is a separate strip of cloth. The Magdalene tilts her head to the left, emphasizing her Greco-Roman profile and its finely detailed features. The tip of her nose and chin are slightly squared and her lips are full. The orb of her eye is large and her upper and lower eyelids are clearly defined. Mary Magdalene’s furrowed brow registers her grief. A single teardrop spills over the lower edge of her right eye. The Magdalene’s hair is wound away from her face and conceals her right ear, except for its lobe. Her long locks are arranged into a bun at the nape of her neck and covered at the back of her head with a narrow fabric strip. One tendril that resembles the curved pattern of Christ’s curls escapes over her right shoulder. Mary Magdalene’s mantle envelops her body and drapes across her right arm, and around the right side of her torso. Her visible sleeve has a narrow cuff that tightly encircles her forearm, but at the elbows the fabric loosens into bunched-up folds. A ribbon that is tied and knotted just below her bustline presses the fabric of her garment into downward, diagonal pleats. Her sandaled foot rests upon the folds of her dress.

which spill over the frame’s edge into the viewer’s space. Her shoe strap follows the arch of her foot lengthwise and intersects with another strap to form an inverted ‘V’ across the top of her toes.

Centered below the *suppedaneum* is a coat of arms with two sets of minute nail holes at each side of its base, indicating that a small inscription may once have been attached at that point. Starting at the upper left (Dexter Chief) and extending to the lower right (Sinister Base) of the shield, a wide band, or bend, diagonally divides the escutcheon, or field, in half.\(^{1281}\) Carved into each side are three raised circles, or *pesans*, which, when displayed on a shield, were typically of different materials or colors, such as silver or gold.\(^{1282}\) However, there is no indication that any polychrome was ever added to these areas, making identifying this field with a particular family difficult. The back of the Greenlease sculpture bears an inscription, which relates that, during the late seventeenth century, the dauphin of France presented the object to the nuns of Saint Mary in Lorraine. However, it is not possible to verify whether this inscription was made when the object was created, or at a later date by someone other than its original owner.

*Condition Description:* Over time, the varnished wood sculpture has developed a dark patina.

---

1281 John Guillim, *A display of heraldry: To which is added, a treatise of honour military and civil, according to the laws and customs of England. By Capt. John Logan. Illustrated with the arms, crests, supporters, and motto’s of the royal family, and nobility: the arms of the sees of the English bishops, and several of the gentry. Together with the proper habits of the different degrees of the nobility of England, and the emblems of the chief orders of Knighthood in Europe; all fairly engraved on copper plates. Also an exact list of the baronets, from their first creation to this present time; and most of their arms blazon’d. With an account of the customs, government, and privileges of the city of London, the other cities of England, and shire-towns of each county, and their arms. Likewise a supplement of scarce tracts relating to the office of arms, taken from authentick copies. And a dictionary, explaining the several terms used by heralds, in English, Latin and French. With proper tables to the whole / by John Guillim, pursuivant at arms.,* 6th ed. (London: T.W. for R. and J. Bonwicke and R. Wilkin, and J. Walthoe and T. Ward, 1724), 23, 33.

Some regions show lighter coloration, as if the surface was rubbed in those places, maybe because they protrude more than others. The areas in question include the end of Christ’s beard, his diaphragm, left knee, and the tips of his big toes. On the Magdalene’s figure, lighter areas appear on the hair that is rolled back on the right side of her head, along the top ridge of each garment fold, her right knee, and the tips of her right toes. The area where the most wear is evident is at the shield’s center and is equivalent in size to a thumbprint. Christ’s fourth finger on his right hand is missing. There is damage to the frame at the lower left corner, where a squared section, measuring 2 cm (.787 in.) has broken off. Uneven breakage under the frame’s lower left edge extends from the corner toward the center for a length of 19.304 cm (7 5/8 in.). Some minor separation has occurred at the frame’s joins, which are positioned at a distance of 2 cm (5.08 in.) and 6 cm (15.24 in.) from the top and bottom edges of each side.

Attribution and Date: While the present gallery label identifies the maker of this work as César Bagard, Rockhurst has no records to indicate who attributed this work to the artist from Lorraine. However, the discussion below will support this attribution. Indeed, the treatment of physiognomy and drapery in the Greenlease sculpture closely resembles that of works securely attributed to César Bagard. For instance, in terms of their stylistic rendering, the allegorical figures from the tomb sculpture of 1673 that Bagard created for Nancy’s Jesuit college founder and Bishop of Toul, Jean de Porclet de Maillane, present a compelling comparison for the Greenlease sculpture. The ensemble consists of three nearly life-size statues. The central figure is a muscular male with long hair with a leather-like strap that cuts across his bare chest.

1284 The Musée Historique au Palais Ducal, where the tomb sculpture is on display, is located in the ducal palace in Nancy, where Bagard served as court sculptor. Whether he sculpted in the palace (or on the palace grounds) or remained in his workshop while working for the Duke is unclear.
and with fabric that drapes over his left shoulder. In front of him he holds a sculpted relief portrait of Bishop Porcelet that is presented in an oval-shaped, acanthus leaf frame. The deceased cleric is depicted with a mustache and pointed beard, and wearing a pectoral cross over his mozzetta. Flanking the central figure are two female allegorical figures that gaze inwardly toward the portrait. Hope appears to his right and Faith to his left. The figures wear sandals and cloaks that cover their heads and envelop their bodies. The Greenlease Magdalene compares closely with Hope, showing a similar facial profile, neck contour, foot shape, shape of sandal, and hair style, which is parted in the middle and swept back underneath a veil, with the lower portion of their right earlobes showing. Both the penitent sinner and allegorical figure gesture with a similar expressiveness, clasping one hand to the breast and spreading out all but the middle and ring fingers. Additionally, the treatment of drapery in the sculptures is identical in that it clings closely to the body, and like Faith’s garment, the Magdalene’s mantle is neatly folded and tucked beneath a round collar. Another point of comparison is found in the rendering of Christ’s thick plaits of curling hair that twist to the front of his shoulders, which find a complement in the hairstyle of the male allegorical figure holding the bishop’s portrait on the tomb. Based upon a stylistic comparison with the allegorical figures of the Porcelet tomb, sculptures securely attributed to César Bagard, the Greenlease Crucifixion should likewise be attributed to the same sculptor.

Around 1900, several framed sculptures of the same type as the Greenlease Crucifixion by Bagard appeared on the French art market. The reason for this occurrence requires further

---


1286 An image of Faith is reproduced in Pfister, Histoire de Nancy, 3: 637.
investigation. Lidnow posited that these works originated from Bagard’s workshop. However, he proposed that Bagard himself did not sculpt them, reasoning that the sculptor would have instead delegated these works that he considered minor, because of their size and intended location for display, to his assistants. More recently, it is understood that creating smaller objects for the domestic interior was not beyond the scope of most master artists. The Greenlease sculpture’s quality of execution alone counters Lidnow’s claim that a sculpture of this size would be unworthy of Bagard’s attention.

The Greenlease sculpture was previously dated from c. 1700, although by whom is not certain. César Bagard died in 1707 at the age of eighty-seven. So, the likelihood that he sculpted a work of such high quality at such an advanced age is questionable. Yet, it is conceivable that this small, wooden sculpture was created after 1689, when the Bagard workshop’s production of objects for the domestic interior was amplified as a result of Louis XIV’s decree, which forced aristocrats to relinquish their decorative metalwork to facilitate the payment of war debts. On the other hand, considering its close stylistic affinity with the Porcelet tomb’s figures of 1673, the Greenlease sculpture could also have been carved a few decades earlier. Another point to consider is that, as mentioned above, by 1680, Bagard had completed what is considered to be his most masterful work, a marble Crucifixion. Thus, at least two decades before the end of the eighteenth century, he was famously associated, at least on a regional level, with the subject of the Greenlease sculpture. Stylistically the Greenlease sculpture relates to Bagard’s work from 1673. Yet, as a domestic, wooden sculpture, the object may also have been produced after 1689. Therefore, this study proposes to broaden the date of

1288 For descriptions of objects made for the domestic interior during the Italian Renaissance and the artists who created them, see Marta Ajmar-Wollheim and Flora Dennis, ed. At Home in Renaissance Italy (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2006).
origin of c. 1700 previously assigned to the Greenlease sculpture to include the last decade of the seventeenth century, or 1690-1700.

Provenance: The Crucifixion by César Bagard was the first work of art that Virginia P. and Robert C. Greenlease bequeathed to the Jesuit community at Rockhurst University. Although the Greenleases probably did not initially intend to create a larger collection of art at the time, their donation of the object on 13 October 1967 signaled the development of the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art at Rockhurst University in Kansas City, Missouri. Any prior provenance for the sculpture is unknown.

Iconography: For Christians, the subject of this sculpture represents the opportunity for spiritual salvation, which was made possible through Christ’s death on the cross. In Bagard’s interpretation of the subject, Saint Mary Magdalene is the sole witness to the event. Of the four Evangelists, only John (19:25), places Mary of Magdala next to the cross during the crucifixion, but she does not kneel nor is she alone, as she appears in the Greenlease sculpture. John describes Mary of Magdala as standing next to the cross with Mary, Jesus’ mother; the sister of Jesus’ mother, Mary the wife of Clopas; and the disciple “whom he loved,” who is associated with John the Evangelist. Therefore, artists typically included other figures, such as the Virgin Mary and Saint John the Evangelist, who usually flank the cross to Christ’s right

1289 “Treasury Collection: Thomas More Centre and Rockhurst College,” Van Ackeren file, box 209, GLA.
1291 John 19:25 mentions the Magdalene was present at the Crucifixion, standing near the Virgin Mary, the Virgin’s sister, Mary of Clophas, and Christ’s favorite, interpreted as John the Evangelist.
1292 Mark 15:40 and Matthew 28:55-56 place Mary Magdalene standing with other women at a distance from the Crucifixion. Luke 23:49 also states that women “stood at a distance,” but he does not specifically name the Magdalene.
and left respectively, or, as in French art from the Baroque period, Christ was often depicted alone on the cross.\textsuperscript{1293} Since Bagard adheres to neither of these familiar interpretations of the subject, the Greenlease sculpture is rare in terms of its composition and that rarity could suggest a place of origin for this sculpture.

The sculptor rendered Jesus during the final moments of his mortal life. Christ gazes upward; his lips are parted; and the Roman centurion, Longinus, has not yet inflicted a sword wound in his side.\textsuperscript{1294} Although naturalistic in its physiognomy, the figure does not convey the intensity of pain that Jesus would have endured during his agonizing death. Crucifixion was a particularly cruel and severe form of capital punishment that was practiced in the Mediterranean region between the sixth century BCE and the fourth century CE, until Emperor Constantine the Great banned the practice in 337 CE.\textsuperscript{1295} On the way to his execution, the condemned man carried a horizontal beam, or \textit{patibulum}, upon his shoulders, and not the entire cross, as is often shown in scenes of Christ on his way to Calvary.\textsuperscript{1296} The vertical post was permanently positioned at the execution site and the crossbeam that the criminal had carried there was either inserted into a groove at the pole’s apex or suspended from a notch carved into its front side, which is the way the Greenlease cross is constructed.\textsuperscript{1297} The condemned person’s hands and feet were bound or nailed to the cross in order to support the body’s weight partially, thus prolonging the person’s agony before dying from exposure and/or asphyxiation, as the body’s

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1293} Schacher, "Crucifixion in Art," 4: 397. According to Schacher, French artists often depicted Crucifixion scenes without additional figures, so as not to distract the viewer’s focus from Christ as the central subject.
  \item \textsuperscript{1294} Schoenberg, "Crucifixion," 4: 388. After Jesus died, a soldier, known as Longinus, pierced his right side. The gospel of John is the only account that relates that the centurion actually pierced Christ’s side. See John 19:33-36.
  \item \textsuperscript{1295} Ibid., 388-91.
  \item \textsuperscript{1296} Although it is historically inaccurate, late medieval to baroque artists depicted Christ carrying an entire cross on the way to Calvary. For instance, Andrea di Bartolo, whose work is represented in the Van Ackeren collection portrayed this subject in a painting of c. 1410 that belongs to the Fundación Colección Thyssen-Bornemisza, Pedralbes, Madrid).
  \item \textsuperscript{1297} Schoenberg, "Crucifixion," 4: 389.
\end{itemize}
weight compressed the lungs.\textsuperscript{1298} Only the Gospel of John (20:25) mentions, in the story of doubts Thomas, that nails punctured Jesus’ hands, and the lance, his side; but nothing is specified regarding how his feet were affixed to the vertical beam. Nevertheless, artists have interpreted this aspect in varying ways. Bagard used four nails, one for each hand and each foot, to affix the figure of Christ to his cross. The feet are nailed separately and side by side to the \textit{suppedaneum}.\textsuperscript{1299} This approach to depicting the Crucifixion pre-dates the thirteenth century. After 1300, Jesus is usually shown on the cross with both feet, one over the other, attached to the vertical post with a single nail. Thus, Bagard seems to have deliberately archaized Christ’s representation and, like many artists, presents a scene that is historically inaccurate, since the \textit{suppendaneum} was not used during antiquity, nor is it mentioned in the gospels.\textsuperscript{1300} In fact, the depiction of a living Christ who does not physically register the intense agony that he would have been suffering, hearkens back to the \textit{Christus triumphans}, an early type of representation of the Crucifixion that focused on Jesus’ transcendence over death and which remained popular until the thirteenth century in Europe, when the \textit{Christus patiens} was introduced, which depicted the suffering Jesus with a bowed head and body sagging as it succumbed to gravity.\textsuperscript{1301} As is typical for depictions of the Crucifixion, the Greenlease Christ’s hips are draped with a loincloth. Although there is no certainty as to whether or not Christ was clothed during his crucifixion, he

\textsuperscript{1298} Ibid., 388.
\textsuperscript{1300} Schacher, ”Crucifixion in Art,” 4: 395. It is true that sometimes a block of wood was attached to the vertical post, but at the middle, where it served as a kind of seat to support the body’s weight partially. This prolonged the condemned person’s agony, just as binding or nailing the body to the cross achieved a similar goal.
\textsuperscript{1301} For the earliest representations of Jesus as \textit{Christus triumphans} see Graydon F. Snyder, \textit{Ante-Pacem: Archaeological Evidence of Church Life Before Constantine} (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2003), 58-64. By the thirteenth century, images of the crucified Jesus as the \textit{Christus patiens} were quite popular. In these depictions, Christ’s suffering is evident. See Anne Derbes, \textit{Picturing the Passion in Late Medieval Italy: Narrative and Painting, Franciscan Ideologies, and the Levant} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 1-11; Appolonia, ”The Origins of the Iconography of the Cross,” 11-16.
is usually portrayed in this manner as a sign of modesty, but also, as art historian and critic Leo Steinberg posits in his seminal writing on the subject, to emphasize his humanity.\footnote{1302}{Schacher, "Crucifixion in Art," 4: 391-97; Schoenberg, "Crucifixion," 4: 388-91. Because death by crucifixion was such a painful and humiliating means by which to die, Romans reserved this death sentence only for those who were not Roman citizens. Convicted persons were usually crucified in the nude, but Romans made concessions for Jews, whom public nudity offended. Therefore, Christ is portrayed wearing a loincloth. I thank Dr. Philip Stinson, who clarified for me this and other points pertaining to the Roman practice of crucifixion.} Steinberg explains that as early as the fourth century, Christ’s body was interpreted as hierarchical in its representation, with the upper body equating his divine nature and the lower, girdled area and feet as his manhood.\footnote{1303}{Leo Steinberg, The Sexuality of Christ in Renaissance Art and Modern Oblivion, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 27. Steinberg cites Saint Augustine (354-430) and Saint Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386) as the earliest writers to interpret the representation of Christ’s body in this hierarchical manner.} Historically, during a crucifixion, a text relating the criminal’s offense was posted at the cross’ apex. Thus, the transgression that Pontius Pilate accused Christ of, as being Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews, abbreviated to INRI, hung on his cross.\footnote{1304}{Mark 15:26, Matthew 27:37, Luke 23:38, and John 19:19 each relate that a placard was written in three languages, Hebrew (Aramaic), Greek, and Latin. However, each Evangelist differs in his account of what was written on the epitaph. Schoenberg, "Crucifixion," 4: 388-91.} Traces of glue on the Greenlease cross’ patibulum indicates that such an inscription was once attached to the crossbeam, and that it was, perhaps, shaped like a banderole. Whether the sculpture was accurate in its depiction of a historical event likely would not have mattered to the original patron and certainly would not have detracted from its function as a devotional work that inspired prayer and meditation.

We have seen above that the female figure depicted is Saint Mary Magdalene, rather than the Virgin Mary, as the present gallery label at Rockhurst indicates.\footnote{1305}{J. E. Fallone, "Saint Mary Magdalene," in New Catholic Encyclopedia, ed. Berard L. Mathaler (Washington, DC : Thomson Gale in association with the Catholic University of America, 2003), 9: 285-90.} As her name suggests, Mary was a native of Magdala, a fishing village located on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee.\footnote{1306}{According to tradition, she was a member of a group of affluent women who}
financially supported Christ and his disciples.\textsuperscript{1307}

The Magdalene was commonly believed to be a sinner, or \textit{peccatrix}, who had repented of her life as a prostitute.\textsuperscript{1308} Now scholars largely agree that this understanding of the Magdalene’s persona was based on a misinterpretation of biblical sources that resulted from a conflation of three separate gospel stories that pertained to Mary Magdalene; Mary of Bethany, who was the sister of Lazarus and Martha; and an anonymous, female sinner introduced in the gospel of Luke (7:36-50).\textsuperscript{1309} The latter relates that a woman, who entered into the house of the Pharisee while Jesus was dining there, used her tears to wash Christ’s feet and her hair to wipe them dry, before anointing them with perfumed ointment from an alabaster jar.\textsuperscript{1310} Through Luke’s account of the anonymous penitent woman, Mary Magdalene became linked with an act of contrition, a longstanding association that dates at least as early as the reign of Pope Gregory the Great (540-604), when that pontiff promoted this narrative in a homily.\textsuperscript{1311} Therefore, she was often

\textsuperscript{1310} As Warner and Haskins, among others, posit, the hierarchy in the Catholic Church showed its misogynistic tendencies in its association of the role of a sinning whore to Mary Magdalene, thus placing her as a binary opposite to the chaste and immaculate Virgin. Haskins refers to the story of Mary of Magdala as part of the “forgotten history of women,” and the pairing of her with the Madonna as the “diptych of Christian patriarchy’s idea of woman.” Combined in this way, the roles of the Virgin and the “whore” characterized the narrow duality in which the contemporary female character was perceived. See Marina Warner, \textit{Alone of All Her Sex}, 225-32; Susan Haskins, \textit{Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor} (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1994), 134-191, 366-400.
\textsuperscript{1311} As some scholars note, the pope himself likely did not make this mistake on his own, but rather gave voice to a perception that already existed. In 1517, Jacque Lefèvre d’Étupes challenged the pope’s interpretation of the Magdalene as a prostitute, and as a result was convicted of heresy. See the preface in Warner, \textit{Alone of All Her Sex}; Haskins, \textit{Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor}; Franco Mormando, "Teaching the Faithful to Fly: Mary Magdalene and Peter in Baroque Italy," in \textit{Saints and Sinners Caravaggio and the Baroque Image}, ed. Franco Mormando (Chicago: University of Chicago Press in association with McMullen Museum of Art, Boston College, 1999), 107-12; Fallone, "Saint Mary Magdalene," 9: 285-90; Hunt, "Irony and Realism," 170, 182; Rachel Geschwind, "The Printed Penitent," 107.
portrayed, as she is in the Greenlease sculpture, kneeling and weeping near the feet that she was thought to have anointed. Although sometimes she was depicted with long, flowing hair to represent her sensuality, Bagard portrayed her with her tresses bound and only a few locks escaping over her shoulders. Presented in this modest way with her hair bound, Mary Magdalene appears as a respectable woman, implying that her conversion has already taken place. As such, she offered for the viewer a model for his, or more likely her, own devotion.

According to Jesuit scholar Franco Mormando, the portrayal of Saint Mary Magdalene in seventeenth-century Crucifixion scenes serves as a transmitter of the event’s intense sorrow. As is standard for such narratives, the Greenlease Magdalene appears grief-stricken. Her brow is furrowed and she clutches a cloth that she might use to wipe away the teardrop that escapes over the outside edge of her lower right lid. The artist was observant in his placement of that single drop, because, in moments when tears well instantaneously in the eyes, the first drops fall precisely in the location that Bagard placed the Magdalene’s tear on this sculpture. As art historian Vibeke Olson convincingly argues, those tears, or *donum lacrimorum*, should also be interpreted as one of the saint’s attributes.

1314 Mormando, "Teaching the Faithful," 112-14. Mormando explains that, while works of art and literature have represented Mary Magdalene’s emotional response at the base of the cross, there is no foundation in the Gospels for these interpretations.
of remorse and compassion were interpreted as a gift and a sign of absolution and the Magdalene’s tears elicited empathy in viewers who recognized in her their own state of sin and the impetus for repentance. As such, the Magdalene’s grief-stricken pose in the Bagard sculpture would have provided an exemplar for those engaged in their devotions before it.

Format and Function: Considering its size and religious subject, Bagard’s framed sculpture of the Crucifixion was intended for use in private devotional practice, either in a home or, perhaps, in a cloistered space, where it would have provided a focal point for spiritual meditation. Because of Mary Magdalene’s gender, this religious work would have resonated particularly well with female devotees. The Magdalene’s position in the composition provided the viewer an emotional point of entry into the scene, and, by extension, an opportunity to envision more fully the martyrdom that took place on Golgotha. The naturalistic rendering of Christ’s physiognomy, including the rivulets of blood flowing from his wounds, would have added another sensory component to enhance the experience. The devotee who focused upon Christ’s face as he gazes upward to the heavens might have recalled one of final phrases that the gospels relate that the Savior uttered, such as “Father forgive them for they know not what they do,” “Truly, I say to you, today you will be with me in paradise,” or “Father, into your hands I

1316 Olson, "Woman Why Weepest Thou?," 364-66.
1317 Ibid., 369.
1319 Dillenberger, "The Magdalen," 32-37, 47-50. Jane Dillenberger explains that Mary Magdalene serves as one of the principle emotive embodiments of the Passion and that her presence prompted emulation.
commit my spirit,” (Luke 23:34, 43, and 46).\textsuperscript{1320} With the emotional depiction of its subject, the Greenlease sculpture represents the type of devotional work that Olson argues offered its beholder a virtual experience of the Crucifixion, so that viewing it served as an effective pilgrimage substitute for Christians, who were unable to make the trip to Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{1321}

\textit{Context:} The sculpture’s iconography may provide important clues as to the circumstances that may have led to its commissioning. In considering why Mary Magdalene is featured so prominently in this composition, there are a few possible explanations. First, it is very important to consider the sculpture’s place of origin, because France was closely associated with the Magdalene’s life following Christ’s death and resurrection. According to the \textit{Golden Legend}, fourteen years after Christ died, Mary Magdalene and a group of Christ’s followers, including Maxim, whom Saint Peter had appointed as the Magdalene’s guardian, set forth in a rudderless boat that landed on the beach at Marseilles.\textsuperscript{1322} Once there, the Magdalene converted pagans, destroyed temples, and built churches and then spent three decades living in the forests of Sainte Baume, a mountain ridge in southern France. She spent her last years there and was buried in Aix-en-Provence, where a cult in her honor was established and then popularized in the region. In 769, Gerard, the duke of Burgundy, built a monastery in Vézelay, which is located 365 kilometers from Nancy, where Bagard’s workshop would one day be located. Wanting the Magdalene’s relics for his newly constructed church, the duke sent a monk to Aix to abscond

\textsuperscript{1320} According to the gospels, other phrases that Christ uttered include “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” (Matthew 27:46 and Mark 15:34); “I thirst,” (John 19:28); “It is finished,” (John 19:29-30), and “Woman, behold your son: Son, behold your mother,” (John 19:26-27). Since Jesus directed the latter statement to John the Evangelist, when Jesus placed his mother, the Virgin Mary, in John’s care and neither of these figures is depicted in this scene, the phrase has no relevance to the Greenlease sculpture.

\textsuperscript{1321} Olson convincingly argues that Crucifixion scenes had the power to transport the viewer to Golgotha virtually. Olson, "Woman Why Weepest Thou?,” 380-82.

\textsuperscript{1322} Voragine, \textit{The Golden Legend}, 2: 381-82; Mormando, "Teaching the Faithful," 116-20.
with the relics. In 1279, the Benedictines of Saint Maximin countered that Gerard’s emissary of half a millennium earlier had made off with a decoy, and that the “real” body had remained in Vézelay. Regardless of the truth of the matter, the Magdalene had long been venerated as the quintessential penitent sinner and her hagiography was closely tied to the area’s history. Although the Magdalene was a popular exemplar throughout the Christian world, her image may have had a particular resonance for those living in the Lorraine region with which her hagiography was associated.

More importantly, the cult of the Magdalene had local ties to Nancy, where Bagard’s workshop was located. In July of 1618, members of the Discalced Carmelites established themselves in that city. The order’s Spanish founder, Saint Teresa of Avila (1515-82), had, during her lifetime, promoted the veneration of Saint Mary Magdalene. Thus, the Carmelites’ spiritual life was closely intertwined with their adoration of the penitent saint. As a result, the subject of the Greenlease sculpture would have had relevance for anyone associated with that order. Nancy’s Discalced Carmelites attracted the region’s aristocratic women to their ranks. In fact, when, sometime between 1618 and 1624, Duke Henry II gave permission to the cloistered order to build a new convent, the noble families whose daughters had joined the order financed

1324 Mormando, "Teaching the Faithful," 116-20; Haskins, Mary Magdalene: Myth and Metaphor, 99. Mormando cites Haskins, who observed that, by the end of the thirteenth century, there were at least five corpses, many whole arms, and smaller pieces considered as relics of the Magdalene.
1325 The cult dedicated to Mary Magdalene was initiated at Vézelay, as early as the 1020s, and spread from there to Cluny and Fleury in France. On the popularity of Mary Magdalene’s cult in France, see Warner, Alone of All Her Sex; 228. See also Geschwind, "The Printed Penitent," 107-33; Geary, Furta Sacra, 74-78.
1327 Haskins, Mary Magdalene: Myth and Metaphor, 254; Steggink, "Saint Teresa of Avila," 13: 826-30. Haskins relates that Saint Teresa, who founded the first convent for the Discalced Carmelites on 7 February 1562 in Avila, wrote of her “great devotion to the glorious Magdalene,” of whose conversion she was often reminded, particularly when she took communion.
the construction. As mentioned above, the Carmelites commissioned Bagard to sculpt at least three life-sized works for their church. Considering the sculptor’s association with the convent, it stands to reason that someone associated with the Discalced Carmelites might have commissioned a work from the sculptor. For instance, such a work might have belonged to a nun for private use in her cell or a lay devotee in his/her home. Another possibility is that a patron of that institution might have purchased the work and bequeathed it to one of the cloistered women, perhaps a daughter or someone from whom a donor sought intercessional prayers on his or her behalf. However, without documentation the original location for this work remains speculative.

Another reason why someone might have commissioned a sculpture that included the Magdalene may be due to the canonization on 28 April 1669 by Pope Clement IX of the like-named Maria Maddalena de’ Pazzi (1566-1607), a Carmelite nun who was a Florentine mystic of noble birth. That a nun who adopted the name of Saint Mary Magdalene had been recently canonized and that she had been a member of the Carmelite Order, an order connected to Nancy, might also have persuaded a local patron to commission a work that referenced the newly canonized saint and her namesake. Another possible connection to the Magdalene comes in the form of a French soeur, or sister, who was one of three original, presumably Carmelite, nuns who arrived in Nancy in July of 1618 to establish its convent. That woman, Francoise de Jésus-

---

1328 Pfister, Histoire de Nancy, 1: 819, 840. Pfister relates that the cloister was first established on the rue de l’Église, but that site was abandoned for a new convent and the marshal Maillane and Duke Henry II both gave their consent for the relocation. Henry II must have given permission for the move between 1618, when the Discalced Carmelites first arrived, and his death in 1624. According to Pfister, the cloister was established to instruct the virgins of Nancy in their devotion to God, or “pur faire l'instruction des vierges de Nancy prête à se vouer à Dieu...”

1329 For instance, according to Wiener, in 1874 a banker named M. Richard was displaying a crucifix by Bagard in his home. Wiener, Attribuées a Bagard, 5.

Maria, had come from a convent in Tournai, Belgium that was dedicated to Saint Mary de la Croix, or Saint Mary of the Cross. The subject of the Greenlease sculpture relates to the name of the convent that she had left to come to Nancy. The inscription on the back of this devotional work states that it was donated to the nuns of Saint Mary in Lorraine. Those nuns could very well have been the Discalced Carmelites in Nancy. However, with no documentation this remains uncertain.

The inscription mentioned above also identifies the original patron as the dauphin of France, who, at the time of this work’s creation, was Louis of France (1661-1711), the son of Louis XIV. However, since the notation is of unknown date and origin, there is no evidence to support its claim. Moreover, the coat of arms belonging to the heir of the French throne does not match the shield displayed on this work, which is embellished with six pesans, a diagonal band, and a helm at its apex. Nevertheless, the presence of heraldry indicates that the original owner of this work was an aristocrat. Specifically, the placement of armor at the top of the shield is referred to as a Tiber of arms and symbolizes wisdom and valor and either designates noble birth or a reward for service. In France, the lowest rank of nobility allowed to display a shield of the type that the Greenlease exemplifies, was a knight, but the heraldic symbol could also have belonged to someone of a higher station.

The basket-like helm balanced at the top of the Greenlease shield is of a type that was worn during jousts, but by the eighteenth century, when this work was sculped, such tournaments

---

1332 I thank Peter Vogt for his help in deciphering the script.
1333 Le Grand Dauphin’s father, Louis XIV of France, outlived both him and his son, Louis de France (1682-1712), who was Duke of Burgundy and became the Dauphin of France upon his father’s death. The younger dauphin would have been too young to commission this work from Bagard at the end of the seventeenth century.
1334 Guillim, A Display of Heraldry, 344-45, 440-41.
1335 Ibid., 344-45.
had waned in popularity. Regardless, the helm lingered as a signifier of aristocratic identity, but its depiction was more symbolic than representative of something in its appearance.\textsuperscript{1336} Today this type of heraldry, showing a plumed helm atop a shield, remains highly visible in the cityscape of Nancy, affixed to building facades, for instance, at the ducal palace and as dedication plaques near church entrances. As is typical, the generous plumage speaks to pageantry and courtly splendor, rather than practical military service. However, the grill on the helm’s visor should lift up in one piece, but here instead it is split like a mouth.\textsuperscript{1337} For comparison, the profile of a similar helm appears as a watercolor in \textit{Le Livre des tournois}, a description of tournament practices in France and elsewhere that was written c. 1460. As Duke of Lorraine, the author of this text, René of Anjou (1409-1480), reigned from 1431 to 1453 in the region where this sculpture originated.\textsuperscript{1338} According to the \textit{Dictionnaire des figures heraldiques}, fourteen families have shields similar to the one on the Greenlease sculpture, which is divided in half, with six roundels, and a helm.\textsuperscript{1339} As a group, the six balls, or \textit{pesans}, that are shown on the shield represent “Things Artificial,” which were awarded to the bearer for accomplishments in civil life or military action.\textsuperscript{1340} Typically the band and balls were of different tones.\textsuperscript{1341} For instance, one of the aristocratic families associated with the pattern displayed on the Greenlease

\textsuperscript{1336} I thank Chassica Kirchhoff for sharing her observations regarding the historical inaccuracy of the depiction of this helm.

\textsuperscript{1337} For a profile view of a similar helm of circa 1485, see Thun-Hohenstein Album, fol. 78r, Augsburg, circa 1532-50, Prague, Uměleckoprůmyslové museum v Praze, Inv. GK11572-B.

\textsuperscript{1338} For reproduction of the watercolor drawing, which René’of Anjou’s court painter, Barthélemy d’Eyck (c. 1420-after 1470), likely created, see François Avril, \textit{Le livre des tournois du Roi René de la bibliothèque nationale} (ms. français 2695) (Paris: Editions Herscher, 1986), 43.

\textsuperscript{1339} Théodore de Renesse, \textit{Dictionnaire de figures heraldiques} (Brussels: Société Belge de Librairie, 1897), 3: 198. Families listed with crests that bear elements similar to those shown on the Greenlease shield include: Ardizoni, Barquin, Boissat, Capitain, Carondelet, Chandée, Giffart, Guyot de la Garde, Hullin, De la Loire, Du Monet, Portier, Saint-Géry, and Du Serf.

\textsuperscript{1340} According to a 1724 manual of heraldry, raised circles on a field represented “Wit, Art, and Endeavour of Man for the use of man; whether we consider such artificials as appertain to the use of civil life, as the ensigns of …military service. See Guillim, \textit{A Display of Heraldry}, 279.

\textsuperscript{1341} Ibid.
coat of arms is the Deloire family, whose *pesans* and band were silver and gold respectively and represented currency and metals of the highest order. However, since there is no polychromy evident on this sculpture, it is not possible to determine any coloration that would securely link this sculpture to a single family.

Context: The exemplary quality of technical execution of the Greenlease example indicates that a highly skilled sculptor was responsible for its carving. The sculpture’s fruitwood medium suggests that it was likely sculpted during the last decade of the seventeenth century, when many aristocrats turned to César Bagard’s workshop to carve replacements for works of metal that the King of France, Louis XIV confiscated to facilitate payment of France’s war debts. The Greenlease Crucifixion is rare because most of Bagard’s religious works were destroyed during the French Revolution. The portrayal of Mary Magdalene as the only witness to Christ’s Crucifixion is unusual, because, typically the Virgin Mary and Saint John the Evangelist would also be present. As we have seen above, this iconography suggests a possible link to the Discalced Carmelites of Nancy. Just a few decades prior to the creation of this work, on 28 April 1669, Pope Clement IX canonized a Carmelite nun, Maria Maddalena de’ Pazzi (1566-1607), a mystic Florentine of noble birth. That a nun who adopted the name of Saint Mary Magdalene had been recently canonized and that she had been a member of the Carmelite Order, an order connected to Nancy, might also have persuaded a local patron to commission a work that

---


referenced the newly canonized saint and her namesake. Additionally, the Discalced Carmelites’
convent housed the daughters of local aristocrats and the heraldic symbol at the sculpture’s base
indicates aristocratic patronage.
EHRGOTT BERNHARD BENDL
b. Pfarrkirchen, Germany, 1660 - d. Augsburg, 1738

Ehrgott Bernhard Bendl was born in Pfarrkirchen, Germany c. 1660 to sculptor Johann Christian Bendl (1624-1690) and his wife, Kunigunda. The Bendls, a family of well-established sculptors, were originally from the town of Waldsee, in South Tyrol. In 1636, because of the difficulties that the Thirty Years War (1618-48) created for Johann’s father, Jakob Bendl (1585-1655/60), the family was forced to move from there to Baumgarten, which is near Munich in Niederbayern, or Lower Bavaria. Jakob relocated once more to the neighboring village, Pfarrkirchen, where his grandson, Ehrgott, was eventually born. Following Bendl tradition, the boy joined his father’s workshop around the age of fourteen. Ehrgott’s brothers, Jakob Christoph (active mid-1670s) and Franz Ignazius (active mid 1680s-1700/08?), also

---

1344 Since the parish church in Pfarrkirchen has no baptismal registry records prior to 1669, Ehrgott’s exact date of birth is unknown. Scholars have calculated that he was likely born c. 1660, because he would have been sixteen to eighteen years old when he left his home town to begin his years as a journeyman in 1678. See Walter Fries, "Ehrgott Bernhard Bendel," Das Schwäbische Museum Zeitschrift für Bayerisch-Schwaben, seine Kultur, Kunst, und Geschichte 1 (1925): 100; Marita Stahlknecht, "Ehrgott Bernhard Bendl (1660-1738): Ein Augsburger Bildhauer des Spätbarock" (PhD diss., Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, 1978), 9. In the literature the sculptor’s first name appears as Ehregott, Ehrgott, or Ergott, and his surname as Bendl or Bendel. The Getty Research Institute’s Union List of Artist Names includes Ehregott and Ehrgott Bernhard Bendl. For the purpose of consistency, this essay will adhere to the latter, because this form was used earliest (1779) as well as most recently (2013), and Stahlknecht employed it in her aforementioned 1978 dissertation. See Paul von Stetten, Kunst-, Gewerb- und Handwerks Geschichte der Reichs Stadt Augsburg (Augsburg: Conr. Heinr. Stage, 1779), 454; Melanie Thierbach, Der Augsburger Dom in der Barockzeit (Augsburg: Diözesanmuseum St. Afra 2009), 12-17; Michael Andreas Schmid, Der hohe Dom zu Augsburg Mariä Heimsuchung (Lindenberg in Allgäu: Kunstverlag Josef Fink, 2013), 38-40.


1346 "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 7, 263-64.

became sculptors, and the latter sibling painted as well.\textsuperscript{1348} After apprenticing with his father for three years, Ehrgott left Pfarrkirchen to study abroad as a journeyman. Since the sculptor’s life is not well documented, his travels during this period, which lasted from 1678 to 1684, remain a point of speculation.\textsuperscript{1349} The Augsburg chronicler Paul von Stetten (1731-1808) wrote that Bendl visited Rome, Paris, and other culturally important destinations.\textsuperscript{1350} Other scholars have suggested Venice, Prague, and Vienna as locations in which the artist studied.\textsuperscript{1351} Of all the aforementioned places, however, the latter two cities appear to be the most probable locales where the sculptor honed his craft, because Ehrgott’s uncle, Johann Georg Bendel (1630-1680), and Johann’s son, Ignaz Johann Bendel (active 1682-1730), ran successful workshops in Prague and Vienna, respectively.\textsuperscript{1352} Therefore, it would have been relatively convenient for Ehrgott to visit those cities. Moreover, because his brother, Franz Ignazius, trained in Vienna and later established his career there, Ehrgott may simply have followed in his older sibling’s


\textsuperscript{1350} Stetten, \textit{Geschichte}, 454.

\textsuperscript{1351} Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 89-109; Theuerkauff, \textit{Die Bildwerke}, 40. Theuerkauff posits that Bendl also studied in Venice, noting specifically that a work on the high altar of the church of S. Maria della Salute by Venetian sculptor Guisto de Corte (1627-1679) may have influenced the German sculptor’s work.

\textsuperscript{1352} In 1712 Ignaz Bendl’s son, Innocent, left Vienna to serve as an apprentice in Ehrgott’s workshop, which further suggests that family members trained one another. Scholars have questioned von Stetten’s account that Bendl studied in Paris, Rome and other cities of artistic importance. Stahlknecht posits that, rather than traveling to Italy, Bendl was introduced to the Italian baroque style in Vienna, where there were plaster casts of statues by Italian Baroque sculptor Gianlorenzo Bernini (1598-1680) that Peter Strudel, another sculptor whose work is represented in the Van Ackeren collection, transported from Rome to Austria. Strudel used these copies as teaching tools for students in his academy. See entry for cat. no. 7. See also, Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 262-65; Wiench, "Bendl," 630-31.
footsteps.\textsuperscript{1353} In 1684, after working as a journeyman for six years, Ehrgott settled down in Augsburg, where he joined the workshop of Johann Jakob Rill (active 1664-1703).\textsuperscript{1354} The fledgling sculptor remained with Rill for three years. Then, within a span of three months, Ehrgott was granted his Augsburg citizenship and admitted as a master craftsman into the Augsburger Bildhauerzunft, or guild of sculptors. On 26 November 1687, Bendl received permission from the city to establish a workshop, and on 12 January 1688 he married Kunigunde Hölktin, the daughter of an Augsburg citizen.\textsuperscript{1355} Soon thereafter, Bendl’s workshop flourished, employing twelve assistants, which was the largest workshop in the city during that period.\textsuperscript{1356} By June 1691, he had achieved enough financial success to purchase a home at E. 175 Stephansplatz, which was located in the city’s center.\textsuperscript{1357} The next year his wife bore a son, who died at the age of six. Ten more children followed, six of whom survived.\textsuperscript{1358} On 10 November 1720, Ehrgott’s wife died, and within a year, he was remarried to a widow named Maria Magdalene.\textsuperscript{1359}

Bendl was an active participant in the local sculptors’ guild, serving two terms (1701-02

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{1353} In 1687, Ehrgott’s brother, Franz Ignaz, collaborated with Peter Strudel, mentioned above, to sculpt the Pestsaule, a large fountain that commemorated the plague’s cessation in Vienna. See Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 261-62.
\bibitem{1355} Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 12, 19, 22; Theuerkauff, Die Bildwerke in Elfenbein, 37. The official proclamation announcing the opening of his workshop was issued on 28 November 1687.
\bibitem{1356} Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 27-28, 118-19 n. 57. Guild records show that, between 1687 and 1735.
\bibitem{1357} Ibid., 28. Bendl’s residence was destroyed during a World War II bombing of the church of Saint Stephen and Stephansplatz, where his home was located.
\bibitem{1358} Ibid., 27-28. Aside from the eldest son, who died at the age of six, three of the couple’s other children died shortly after birth. City records show that, in 1714, one of Bendl’s daughters married an Augsburg painter, Johann Georg Bergmüller.
\end{thebibliography}
and 1706-07) as Vorstandsmitglied, or board member, and one term as president (1715). He worked in diverse media, including wood, ivory, stucco, stone, and metal, although apparently no works by him in the latter two media survive. Bendl sculpted a variety of objects, ranging from large ensembles for churches to devotional works for domestic interiors, such as ivory statuettes of the Madonna and nativity cribs, as well as secular works, including emblems and signs for pubs. To celebrate the birth of Archduke Leopold (b. and d. 1716) to the Habsburg Holy Roman Emperor, Karl VI (1685-1740), he also created two statues of unspecified subject that were displayed at the city hall.

Between 1695 and 1697, Ehrgott worked on his first important commissions in Augsburg. For the church of Saint Moritz, he created six life-size wood and polychrome sculptures of the Apostles, and for the Augustinian Chorherren-Stiftskirche, or monastic church, of Saint George, he completed a statue of Saint Paul, one of God the Father, and others of the four Evangelists. In addition, he worked on altarpieces for several local religious institutions, including at Heilig-Kreuz, the pilgrimage church dedicated to the Holy Cross in nearby Biberbach (1713), the city’s cathedral (1719-22), the aforementioned church of Saint George (1725-30), and for the Benedictine monastery at Holzen on the Danube (1725-30). The

---

1360 Wiench, "Bendl," 630. Bendl remarried on 9 September 1721. According to a public wedding announcement, his new wife was a “selige witwe,” or blessed widow, of a trumpeter named Johann Sebastian Schamberger.


1363 The figures are mentioned in a handwritten chronicle for the Augustinian monastery of Saint George by Pater Ferdinand Seida. Cited in Thon, Augsburger Barock, 78-79, figs. 71-75; Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 31-33. The Saint George statues, which measure from 182 to 188 cm, were initially set upon columns near the church chancel. In 1921, they were transported to the Germanisches Nationalmuseum in Nuremberg. In 1949, the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in Munich acquired the Saint Mark. Some sculptural fragments from Bendl’s work at Heilig-Kreuz in Biberbach (see below), also belong to the latter museum’s collection.

1364 "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 171, 190-92, 212, 231, 240-42, 250. For the commission in Biberbach, Bendl’s workshop sculpted figures for an altar dedicated to Maria de Victoria, the Madonna of Victory, and another to Saint Anne and the Virgin Mary (1713). Additionally, for the church of Saint George, he completed statues of Saint John, two female saints, and an Annaselbdritt, or Saint Anne Trinity, for the Benedictine cloister at Holzen on the Danube.
sculptural programs at Heilig-Kreuz and Augsburg Cathedral remain intact. For the cathedral’s late baroque Marienkapelle, which is an oval-shaped chapel on the nave’s north side, Bendl created nearly life-size statues of Joachim, Joseph, Elisabeth, Anna, King David, and Zacharias. These figures flank the Muttergottesaltar, an altar dedicated to the Mother of God, where a miracle-working statue of the Virgin of 1340 is displayed. Ehrcott’s workshop also specialized in stucco decorations, consisting of floral motifs, angels, medallions, and elegant picture frames for the ceilings and walls of the Benedictine abbey of Saints Ulrich and Afra, and the Wallfahrtskirche, or pilgrimage church, in Gartlberg (1713), among other religious institutions. An ivory crucifix in the cathedral treasury in Augsburg is considered to be Bendl’s masterpiece.

Since Ehrcott founded his atelier in a city renowned for its superior gold- and silversmiths, he was able to cultivate partnerships with some of the city’s leading artisans. For instance, for the silversmith Johann Heinrich Manlich (1660-1718), Bendl provided models for two silver statues, one an Assumption of the Virgin for a Marian confraternity at the cathedral of Saint Ursen in Solothurn, Switzerland (1697/98), and the other, a Saint Sebastian (1714-15) for the church of Saint Peter in Neuburg on the Danube. Only the wood model for the latter statue has survived. The sculptor also partnered with Johann Zeckel (d. 1728) on a silver crucifix for the Jesuit college of Saint Michel in Fribourg, Switzerland (1716), and with

1365 Thierbach, Der Augsburger Dom, 12-17; Schmid, Der hohe Dom, 38-40.
1367 Thon, Augsburger Barock, 79, , cat. 76, fig. 45; Theuerkauff, "Glesker oder Bendl," 64, fig. 23; Wiench, "Bendl," 631.
1368 For the close collaboration between Augsburg’s goldsmiths and sculptors, see “Augsburg as the European Capital of the Goldsmith’s Art” and “On the Techniques Used in the Goldsmith’s Art,” in Lorenz Seelig, Silver and Gold: Courtly Splendour from Augsburg (Munich and New York: Prestel, 1995), 9-14, 125. For the partnership between Manlich and Bendl, see Thon, Augsburger Barock, 346-68, cat. no. 503, fig. 236; Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 135-37, 176-78; Wiench, "Bendl," 630-31.
goldsmith Johann Jakob Vogelhund on a gilded copper sculpture of Jupiter (1720) that measures 340 x 170 cm (133 x 66.9 in.). The Markgräfin of Baden, Sibylle of Saxe-Lauenburg (1675-1733), commissioned the colossal work in honor of her deceased husband, the Markgraf, or Margrave, of Baden, Louis William (1655-1707). The statue remains in situ at the family’s castle, the Schloss Rastatt in Baden-Württemberg, Germany. Bendl started his last documented project in 1733 at another Augustinian monastic church in Diessen on the Ammersee, where he sculpted figures of the Evangelists, Apostles, and two allegorical figures, Glaube and Hoffnung, or Faith and Hope.

Two of Bendl’s commissions served specifically to support financially some of his female family members. In 1725, to pay for his daughter’s entry into the Benedictine Hochstiftskirche, or abbey church of Notre Dame, in Eichstätt, he created sculptures that embellished the church’s pulpit, side chapels, and high altar. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the convent was sold and these works were dismantled and dispersed to other churches. In 1730, Bendl stipulated that, should his wife outlive him, the salary he earned for a commission that he completed at the Benedictine cloister Holzen at Donauwörth in Schwabia, should go to her. According to the registry of the parish of Saint Stephan, Ehrgott Bernhard

---

1370 Stetten, Geschichte, 454; Thon, Augsburger Barock, 78-79, 347-48, 378-82, cat. nos. 503, 561, figs. 235-36; Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 194; Theueraufl. Die Bildwerke in Elfenbein, 38-39, cat. no. 1; Wiench, "Bendl," 630-32. The Jupiter statue was delivered to the castle on 10 March 1723. In 1902 a copy of this work was made and installed in the Staatliche Sammlungsgebäude in the neighboring city of Karlsruhe. The Saint Sebastian statue in Neuburg was melted down.

1371 Fries, "Eine Gruppe," 19. Fries identifies two more works by Bendl that are located in Munich, an ivory crucifix at the Frauenkirche and figures of three Magi in the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum. However, he expresses doubt about the authorship of the former and relates that in response to his inquiry about the latter, the museum’s staff stated that they were not aware of any such sculptures in the Munich collection. The ivory cross is attributed to Bendl in Felix Joseph Lipowsky, "Bernhard Bendel," in Bayerisches Künstler Lexicon (Munich: E. H. Fleischmann, 1810), 25.

1372 For excerpts from a letter of 8 January 1726, in which Notre Dame’s abbess, Anna Maria de Kenble, praised Bendl’s embellishment of the nuns’ church and noted that Bendl’s sculptures served as a dowry for his daughter, see Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 27, 210-11.

1373 Ibid., 220-21.
Bendl died on 31 January 1738. Soon thereafter, the nunnery’s abbess disbursed his stipend of 150 fl. to his widow, Frau Maria Magdalena.¹³⁷⁴

The earliest mentions of Ehrgott Bernhard Bendl come from the aforementioned Paul von Stetten (1765, 1779, and 1788), who names him as one of Augsburg’s best baroque sculptors.¹³⁷⁵ Short biographies of Bendl later appeared in the Bayerisches Künstlerlexicon (1810) and in the Thieme-Becker Künstlerlexicon (1909).¹³⁷⁶ After 1921, when four of the artist’s most important statues were moved from the church of Saint George in Augsburg to the German National Museum in Nuremberg, his work elicited more attention. The scholars who wrote about him were all German, including Walter Friess (1922/23, 1925), who completed a stylistic analysis of those relocated statues; Hertha Lünenschloss (1932, 1933), who wrote the first monograph on the artist, as well as additional essays that assessed his work in the cloister churches at Holzen in Donauwörth and at Diessen on the Ammersee; and Karl Feuchtmayer (1957), who furthered an understanding of the Bendl family’s history of craftsmanship.¹³⁷⁷ In 1968 an exhibition entitled *Augsburger Barock* featured the statues that Ehrgott had completed for the church of Saint George, along with masterworks by the city’s other baroque painters, sculptors, metalsmiths, and

---

¹³⁷⁴ Saint Stephen’s parish registry lists Bendl as “Honorius Bernardus Bentl,” [sic]. The document designating that Bendl’s widow, Maria Magdalene, should receive her husband’s salary is dated 19 September 1730. Both are cited in ibid., 28 n. 63, 120, 212-14.

¹³⁷⁵ Stetten, *Geschichte*, 454. Cited also in Thon, *Augsburger Barock*, 78. Von Stetten compares Bendl to his predecessor, George Petel (1601/02 – 1635), who is credited with initiating the German baroque period, and states that Bendl was “etwas mehr bekannt,” or somewhat more well-known, than the other two sculptors he mentions, Johann Leonhard Baur (1681-1760) and Bernhard Strauss. The Getty Research Institute’s Union List of Artist Names does not include Strauss.


¹³⁷⁷ Fries, “Eine Gruppe,” 8-24; "Ehrgott Bernhard Bendel," 99-104; Hertha Lünenschloss, "Ehrgott Bernhard Bendl, ein Augsburger Bildhauer des Spätbarocks (1660-1738),” *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* 10 (1933): 281; Feuchtmayer, "Der Fall Bendel," 329-35. Fries interprets Ehrgott’s stylistic approach to reflect the influence of the school of Prague, which led him to hypothesize that the sculptor likely studied with a relative there. Lünenschloss’ research provided a chronology for Ehrgott’s work, and expanded on aspects of his professional life, including his involvement with the local guild, the size of his workshop, and his esteemed position within the community.
Bendl’s sculpture of Saint John the Evangelist appears on the front cover of the thick exhibition catalog, which speaks to the esteem in which his work is held, at least in the region that surrounds his native city. In 1986, an ivory statuette by Bendl that portrays the Virgin Mary was included in a Berlin exhibition of exemplary works in ivory from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. The most comprehensive source to date on the artist and his work is Marita Stahlknecht’s 1978 dissertation *Ehrgott Bernhard Bendl (1660-1738): Ein Augsburger Bildhauer des Spätbarock.* Most recently, Ehrgott was mentioned in relation to the *Marienkapelle* in an Augsburg Cathedral tourist pamphlet (2008) and in a book (2013) that the Diözesanmuseum Saint Afra published and which discusses the cathedral’s baroque renovations.

Although Bendl is considered one of the best sculptors ever to come from Augsburg, he and his oeuvre remain largely unknown outside of Southern Germany and Switzerland. This is partially because he worked as a regional artist and did not develop an international reputation during his lifetime. Also, the sculptor’s artistic approach epitomizes the German baroque style, which, in and of itself, has not received much scholarly attention outside its country of origin. Further impeding any study of Bendl’s work is the fact that many of his sculptural

---

1381 Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer."
1382 Thierbach, *Der Augsburger Dom,* 12-17; Schmid, *Der hohe Dom,* 38-40.
1383 Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 23-30. Stahlknecht observes that the acceptance of Bendl into the inner circle of Augsburg artists speaks to the esteem with which he was held, since he was not native to the city and it would, therefore, have been especially hard for him to gain entry.
1384 Ibid., 23. Stahlknecht gives the general geographical boundaries for Bendl’s commissions to include, to the north, west, east, and south, respectively, the Danube and Iller rivers, the city of Lech, and the Alps.
ensembles were either dismantled or lost by the end of the nineteenth century, or destroyed during World War II.\textsuperscript{1386} This point alone makes an evaluation of the sculptor’s remaining works important. The following analysis of a statue attributed to Bendl that belongs to the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art will not only add the sculpture to the artist’s oeuvre, but will also constitute the first study in English of a work attributed to the preeminent baroque sculptor from Augsburg.\textsuperscript{1387}

\textbf{12. Ehrgott Bernhard Bendl}

\textit{Saint Cecilia}

c. 1700

Polychrome lindenwood

Height: 85.535 cm (35 ¼ in.)

Diameter [from Virgin’s robe to and including arm of angel supporting hand organ]: 142.24 cm (56 in.)

A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family


\textit{Description:} Saint Cecilia sits upon a cloud and plays a portable organ, or virginal, which an angel, who is positioned below and to her right, supports with its right shoulder and arm. Cecilia

\textsuperscript{1386} Fries, "Ehrgott Bernhard Bendel," 99-102; Thon, \textit{Augsburger Barock}, 79. For instance, Bendl’s statue of the Virgin of the Immaculate Conception was permanently damaged, when the church of Saint Moritz in Augsburg burned during World War II. Also, a sculpture by him at the monastic church of Maria Stern in Augsburg is missing and no photograph of the work exists. Stahlknecht lists some of the sculptor’s dismantled and missing works in her dissertation. See Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 210-44.

\textsuperscript{1387} The only English essay on Bendl is found in a \textit{Dictionary of Art} entry, Hägele, "Bendl," 3:704-05. For the first study of South German Baroque sculpture published in English, see Sacheverell Sitwell, \textit{German Baroque Art} (London: Duckworth, 1927). Stilwell does not mention Ehrgott and focuses much of his discussion on Austrian works. A later source is T. H. B. Burrough, \textit{South German Baroque: An Introduction Based on a Group of Ten Churches} (London: Alec Tiranti Ltd., 1956). In his introduction, Burrough laments the lack of scholarship on the subject of Germany baroque sculpture, stating, “[i]t is strange that we have accepted and enjoyed the music of Bach and Mozart for so long, while turning aside from the architecture that so perfectly mirrors it. We have enjoyed the Bavarian and Austrian mountains, yet turned our backs on the churches that match so adequately their excitement and grandeur.”
turns her head to the left and gazes upward. The saint’s right leg is tucked beneath her and mostly hidden, except for the foot, which presses against a swirling, pewter-colored cloud. Her left leg is bent and angled so that the knee and top of her pointed foot are displayed frontally. Enough of the original polychromy remains to indicate that the saint’s tiara, gown, and shoes were once completely covered in gold leaf and her cape had a metallic green hue. Both Saint Cecilia and the angel have brown hair and ivory flesh. The angel has a strong, square chin and its mid-length hair is wavy and parted on the left side.

At the apex of the saint’s tiara, a pair of S-shaped volutes slant downward and flank a floral motif that has evenly distributed petals surrounding its circular center. The crown’s surface is incised with a pattern of connected diamond shapes. Hanging from the diadem’s bottom edge and positioned at the center of the saint’s forehead is a gold, rhombus-shaped pendant that may once have been painted another color. Saint Cecilia’s hair is swept back evenly on each side of her face, just above her earlobes. Her tresses are arranged into a loose bun at the back of her head, with one escaped strand curling in front of her left shoulder. Her long and graceful neck shows a crease under the jawline. Cecilia’s expressive eyes squint at the corners, as she peers into the heavens. They have dark brown irises, thinly arched eyebrows, and puffy upper and lower lids. The central ridge of her long nose is narrow and flat, and finishes with a rounded tip and small nostrils. The space between the bottom edge of the saint’s nose and her thin upper lip is narrow. Saint Cecilia parts her lips slightly and lifts the corners of her mouth, as if simultaneously smiling and singing.

A cloak drapes over the saint’s shoulders and billows outwardly in the back, as if caught up in a powerful wind gust. Cecilia’s gold gown has a tightly fitted bodice. Following the V-shaped neckline of her dress is a diagonally folded and twisted handkerchief with knotted ends
that are pulled through a tear-shaped clasp at the sternum. A wide belt emphasizes her waist. Its central portion is stippled and a narrow band borders both the top and bottom. Volutes, similar to those that decorate the crown, are positioned in the middle of the belt’s top edge and along the bottom, near each hipbone. The gown’s sleeves flare at the elbow, where they expose Cecilia’s forearms, which accentuates her elegant gestures as she plays the dark brown, rectangular virginal. Saint Cecilia’s long fingers appear animated, as if dancing across the instrument’s six sets of alternating white and black keys. The keyboard is balanced upon a cloud that cushions the back of the angel who supports the instrument. The angel bends its arm at a ninety-degree angle and braces the keyboard with the inside edge of its right wrist. Its relaxed palm faces forward, making the task seem effortless.

Along the statue’s vertical axis, horizontally striated elements, such as the cloud and the hair of both figures, align. The sculpture conveys a sense of dynamism through its display of compositional *contrapposto*. For instance, the figures gaze upwards, but in opposite directions and their limbs bend at ninety-degree angles, but the saint’s legs dangle toward the earth, while the angel’s arms reach to the sky. The fingers of their right hands nearly touch, which creates a sense of tension that further enlivens the subject. On the right side of the sculpture, the cloud’s contour duplicates that of the saint’s garments as they billow in the wind. These replications of form unify the composition and also appropriately imbue the sculpture of Saint Cecilia, the patron saint of music, with a sense of rhythm.\textsuperscript{1388}

*Condition Description:* Red bole is evident throughout the gilded surface of this sculpture. Much of the gold appears to have been reapplied during an earlier intervention. Saint Cecilia’s

cape shows underlying traces of a silver-green paint and the cloud has traces of a shiny grey hue. The tip of the middle finger on Saint Cecilia’s left hand is missing, and the lower section that remains was reattached with animal glue.\(^{1389}\) The right arm was reattached with hide glue and sawdust.\(^{1390}\) At the back of the sculpture there are beetle holes, and in its upper central section there is a nail and a circular hook. Beneath the nail, at a distance measuring 19.685 cm (7 ¾ in.), there is a hole, perhaps for the sculpture’s original support. A paper label attached to the back bears the number “45.” The organ appears to have been completely repainted in a matte varnish and its back edge shows cleavage where it was reattached with animal glue.\(^{1391}\) In 1985, the sculpture underwent a conservation treatment, during which grime was removed and flaking of the gesso ground, paint surface, and gilding were consolidated.\(^{1392}\) Some minor in-painting was also done and a protective coat of varnish was applied to the entire sculpture.

**Attribution and Date:** Documents related to the sale of this sculpture to Virginia Greenlease show that Lubin attributed it to “Ergott Bendl [sic] of South Germany.” We shall see below that Lubin’s attribution is correct and that the work can be dated to c. 1700. Evidently, Bendl did not sign his works and his signature does not appear on this one. However, some sculptures have been securely attributed to him through documented commissions and therefore their style can be compared to the work in Kansas City.\(^{1393}\) Indeed, the figures of the four Evangelists that the

\[^{1389}\] The glue substance is identified in Bailey Conservation Report, 8 August 1985, Saint Cecilia: Acquisition file, GGA.

\[^{1390}\] Ibid.

\[^{1391}\] Ibid.

\[^{1392}\] Ibid. According to Bailey’s report, the grime and a beva residue were removed with benine 264. Pigments were dispersed in polyvinyl acetate (AYAF) and methanol for the areas of exposed gesso. To fill areas of the face and bodies of both figures, a mixture of beeswax and carnauba was used. A matte blend of Acryloid B-67 in benine 264 was applied as a protective coating.

\[^{1393}\] Fries, “Eine Gruppe,” 13; Theuerkauff, ”Glesker oder Bendl,” 61.
sculptor completed in 1697 for the church of Saint George in Augsburg present convincing stylistic counterparts to the Greenlease statue. For instance, Saint Cecilia’s graceful hands are rendered in a similarly communicative manner as those belonging to the figures of Saints Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul. Also, the capes of Cecilia, John the Evangelist, and Mark are all painted in the same silver hue. Most alike are the countenances of Saints Cecilia and John the Evangelist. Each figure parts his or her mouth slightly and gazes heavenward in a seeming state of spiritual ecstasy and has faintly traced eyebrows that arch over deep-set eyes with puffy under-lids that slant downwards in a squint. This technique of rendering the eyes is particular to the artist. Other qualities that German specialists have defined as representative of Bendl’s oeuvre that are evident in the Greenlease sculpture include the display of an expressive, spirited, and somewhat nervous sense of energy, which is demonstrated in the animated nature of the Greenlease Cecilia’s eyes as she peers upwards, and in her fingers that nimbly touch the keyboard. Also evident are a well-defined jaw line, precisely articulated nostrils, deep-set eyes, elegant hand gestures, and mantles that appear to be dramatically animated by gusts of wind.

With its mid-length curly brown hair parted on the side, square jawline, and lean, well-defined torso draped in a gold cloth that wraps just below the ribcage, the Greenlease angel matches in appearance a pair of angels that flanks the apex of the high altarpiece of Augsburg Cathedral. Furthermore, the Greenlease statue’s swirling grey cloud is duplicated in these

1395 Thon, *Augsburger Barock*, cat. no. 74, figs. 41-44.
1397 Fries, "Ehrgot Bernhard bendel," 100; Theuerkauff, "Glesker oder Bendl," 65.
1399 For an image, see Thierbach, *Der Augsburger Dom*, fig. 7.
altarpieces and finds a stylistic precedent in a *Coronation of the Virgin* altarpiece by Christopher Rodt at the parish church of Pfarrkirchen in Illertissen, Bendl’s hometown. \(^{1400}\) These stylistic and iconographic similarities confirm that, as Lubin thought, the sculpture is indeed by Bendl. The work’s stylistic resemblance to Ehrigott Bendl’s sculptures at the church of Saint George of c. 1695-1697, suggests that Lubin’s date for the Saint Cecilia sculpture of c. 1700 is likewise correct. \(^{1401}\)

**Provenance:** Virginia Greenlease purchased this statue of Saint Cecilia on 23 January 1975, a few months prior to the Van Ackeren Gallery’s opening in June of that year. She acquired the work from the New York dealer Edward R. Lubin and then donated it immediately to Rockhurst. \(^{1402}\) There is no prior provenance information pertaining to this work.

**Iconography:** Saint Cecilia is the patron saint of music whose feast day of 22 November was celebrated as early as 545 in Rome. \(^{1403}\) While modern scholarship challenges the historicity of this female martyr, a baroque audience would not have questioned this point. \(^{1404}\) Cecilia’s story is related in the *Passio sanctae Caecilae*, a Latin martyrology of c. 495, and in Jacobus de

---

\(^{1400}\) For the Augsburg Cathedral altarpieces, see ibid., 15, 19, figs. 2, 7; Schmid, *Der hohe Dom*, 38-40. For Rodt’s altarpiece at Pfarrkirchen, see Karl Feuchtmayr, "Christopher Rodt," *Das Schwäbische Museum: Zeitschrift für Bayerisch-Schwaben, seine Kultur, Kunst, und Geschichte* 1 (1925): 4-20; Adolf Feulner, *Die Deutsche Plastik des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Kurt Wolff Verlag, 1926), fig. 18.

\(^{1401}\) For more on the description of Bendl’s artistic approach, see Theuerkauff, "Glesker oder Bendl," 54-59.

\(^{1402}\) Receipt of Sale, 23 January 1975, Saint Cecilia: Acquisition file, GGA.


Voragine’s late medieval compilation of saints’ lives, *The Golden Legend*. According to both sources, Cecilia was born into an aristocratic family in Rome, where she was raised as a Christian and where she died as a virgin martyr, either during the reign of Emperor Marcus Aurelius in 220 or that of Emperor Alexander in 223. Although Cecilia had taken a vow of chastity, her parents betrothed her to a Roman nobleman named Valerian, and on her wedding day, she wore a gold dress. According to the *Passio*, musicians played (*cantantibus organis*) during the ceremony, as Cecilia “sang in her heart to God alone.” The use of the Latin word, “organis” linked Cecilia to one of her attributes, the organ, and likely led to her becoming the patron saint of music and musicians. After her wedding, Cecilia informed her pagan husband that a guardian angel protected her virginity and instructed her new spouse to consult her mentor, Pope Urban (r. 222-230), who was living clandestinely in the catacombs. During his meeting with the pope, Valerian converted to Christianity. When he arrived home, Cecilia’s angel presented the newlyweds with crowns of intertwined lilies and roses, as a symbol of the couple’s purity and chastity. While early representations of the saint show her wearing a flower circlet on her head, the Greenlease Cecilia wears a diadem, as was typical for German baroque

---


representations of her, as it was for virgin martyrs in general. Cecilia’s guardian angel and the crown serve as attributes for the saint. Both are, perhaps, signified in this work through the inclusion in its composition of an angel and a single, open bloom at the apex of Cecilia’s tiara. The angel may also simply imply the celestial nature of the saint’s music, as seen in paintings of Saint Cecilia in which she is depicted with at least one instrument and one or more angels. Orazio Gentileschi (1563-1639) and Antiveduto Grammatica (1571-1626) are among the artists who have portrayed her in this manner.

The Roman prefect, Almachius, executed both Cecilia’s husband and her brother-in-law, Tibertius, for being Christians. Then, greedily wanting to confiscate her husband’s estate, he sought to expose Cecilia’s faith by ordering her to make a sacrifice to a pagan god. Instead, she preached and converted four hundred pagans to Christianity, which gave Almachius a reason to condemn her to death and seize the family’s property. Like most early Christian martyrs, she endured torture prior to death. First, the Roman prefect, Turcius Almachius, condemned her to suffocate in a steam bath, but when this method proved unsuccessful, he ordered her decapitation. However, Cecilia survived the executioner’s three attempts to behead her, and instead bled to death from her neck wounds over the course of three days. The extension to her life allowed her to distribute her wealth to the poor Christians in Rome before she died. To reference the mode of her death, Saint Cecilia is often depicted with her neck partially severed,

---

1412 For an example of a depiction of Cecilia wearing a floral crown, see the painting by Bernardo Strozzi 1581-1644 in Eliot W. Rowlands, The Collections of the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art: Italian Paintings 1300-1800 (Kansas City: The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, 1996), 261-67, cat. no. 30. See also Braun, Tracht und Attributen, 159-62; Ferguson, Signs and Symbols, 197; Festa, "Representations," 10, 27, figs. 1.6 a,1.6 b.

1413 Orazio Gentileschi’s painting, Saint Cecilia with an Angel of 1618-21, belongs to the collection of the National Gallery of Art in Washington, DC, and Antiveduto Grammatica’s work, Saint Cecilia with Two Angels of 1620-25, to the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. Gentileschi portrayed Cecilia playing an organ while an angel next to her holds her sheet music and Grammatica showed Cecilia holding a hymnal as she sings and with two angels flanking her. Set upon the table in front of her are a harp, lute, flute, violin, and tambourine.

1414 Festa, "Representations," 15mod

1415 Ferguson, Signs and Symbols, 197; Costelloe, "Saint Cecilia," 315; Festa, "Representations " 17-18.
as it is in the recumbent marble effigy of her by Stefano Maderno (1576-1636), located under the high altar at the church of S. Cecilia in Trastevere in Rome, which houses her relics.\footnote{Rowlands, The Collections of the Nelson-Atkins, 262, 264. Cardinal Paolo Sfondrato (1560-1618) commissioned Maderno to sculpt Saint Cecilia’s effigy.}

However, in the Greenlease example her skin appears unblemished because, unlike Maderno’s sculpture, which marks her burial site, this statue emphasizes her role as the patron saint of music and musicians. In any case, her crown already symbolizes her martyrdom.\footnote{Festa, "Representations," 1-2.} After the discovery on 20 October 1599 of Cecilia’s miraculously incorrupt body in a sarcophagus at the Roman church dedicated to her, the saint’s cult became even more popular than before and images of her likewise became increasingly common.\footnote{Apostolos-Cappadona, Women in Religious Art, 70; Costelloe, "Saint Cecilia," 315; Festa, "Representations," iii, 6, 22-23, 207-30.} For example, the aforementioned Grammatica, Gentileschi, and Strozzi, who all painted images of the saint in the decades following the discovery of her body, Domenichino (1581-1641) frescoed scenes of her life in the Polet Chapel in the Roman church of S. Luigi de’ Franches (1612-1615).

One of the earliest depictions of Saint Cecilia in Germany is a relief at the cathedral in Cologne that shows her wearing a veil and with no musical instrument.\footnote{Braun, Tracht und Attribute, 159-62.} Indeed, early images of Cecilia did not distinguish her from other virgin martyrs, whose attributes typically were a palm, crown, and/or a sword. Although it was not original to the saint’s iconography, the organ became the symbol with which she was most closely associated. As we have seen above above, the linking of this keyboard instrument to her may have come from the Passio, which states that, during her wedding, she “sang in her heart to God alone” as musicians played (\textit{cantantibus organis}).\footnote{Ibid.; Connolly, "Saint Cecilia," 330-32.} Although the Latin word, “\textit{organis}” references all instruments, its usage likely led
to the idea that Cecilia played the organ.¹⁴²¹ The same is true for the portable keyboard, which in German is known as an Orgelklavier, or organ-piano. A German-speaking audience would have simultaneously correlated this symbol to the patron saint of music as her attribute and to the much larger organ after which it was named.

The earliest known sculpture of the saint holding a portable organ dates from the second quarter of the fourteenth century. The statue, which is made of tufa and attributed to the Saint Anastasia Master, was likely created for the church of S. Cecilia in Verona.¹⁴²² The first depiction of Saint Cecilia with instruments and looking skyward, as she is portrayed in the Greenlease example, appears in a famous 1513 altarpiece, entitled The Ecstasy of Saint Cecilia with Saints Paul, John the Evangelist, Augustine, and Mary Magdalene that Raphael (1483-1520) painted for the chapel of Saint Cecilia in the church of S. Giovanni in Monte in Bologna. Raphael portrays Cecilia standing centrally and peering up at a break in the clouds, where a chorus of celestial angels appears.¹⁴²³ The portable organ she holds has pipes. Strewn before her on the ground are a cello, flute, triangle, tambourine, and cymbals. As scholars Thomas Connolly and Lisa Festa both convincingly argue, this portrayal of the saint marked a major turning point in Cecilian iconography, because thereafter she was typically depicted with instruments.¹⁴²⁴ Bendl was not necessarily familiar with Raphael’s painting, but he may have encountered it reproduced in prints. Nevertheless, the iconography for his sculpture follows in the same spirit, showing Cecilia looking to the heavens in a state of spiritual ecstasy as she plays her instrument, hence symbolizing that her music is of the celestial, rather than secular, realm.¹⁴²⁵

¹⁴²¹ Connolly, Mourning into Joy, 186-88, 193.
¹⁴²² Ibid., 186-88, 193; Festa, "Representations " 29-30.
¹⁴²³ Tom Henry and Paul Joannides, eds., Late Raphael (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2013), 103-09.
¹⁴²⁴ Ibid.
¹⁴²⁵ Connolly, Mourning into Joy, 186-88; Festa, "Representations " 2-4, 41, 55-60. Raphael’s Cecilia wears a turban with a topknot at the front of her forehead, which was likely inspired from an older fresco in S. Agnese.
Format and Function: Since there are no known records related to this work or its commission, the original location in which it was displayed is uncertain. Nevertheless, the sculpture’s physical form can provide potential clues regarding its original placement. First, the figures are carved almost fully in the round, which means that the audience was meant to view the statue from the front and/or side. Secondly, the hook and various holes at the back of the sculpture indicate that it was initially affixed to another surface, perhaps a wall, pillar, niche, altarpiece, or organ. Also, the facts that Cecilia’s torso appears disproportionately longer than her legs and the underside of the sculpture is fully carved and painted, specifies that the viewer was meant to see the figures from below. Additionally, the inclusion of clouds would have complemented the visual effect of a sculpture that was placed high, as in the instance of the billowing clouds that appear near the apexes of Bendl’s Augsburg Cathedral altarpieces. Moreover, the upward gazes of Saint Cecilia and the angel, would have encouraged the viewer to likewise gaze toward heaven or another image above.

A study of the extant works by Bendl that remain in situ suggests that there is a strong possibility that this statue may have been part of an altarpiece. During the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, a plethora of Bavarian monasteries and churches were being either constructed or renovated in the baroque style, which created a high demand for the elaborately gilded, multi-figured altarpieces of the type that Ehrgott’s workshop created. ¹⁴²⁶ A comparison between the Greenlease sculpture’s figures and those of Bendl’s altarpieces at Biberbach and in the Marienkapelle at Augsburg Cathedral show distinct similarities, in that figures from both are enveloped in windswept garments, float on clouds, twist their torsos, show elegant, expressive

¹⁴²⁶ For examples of altarpieces by Bendl’s contemporaries in the region, see Burrough, South German Baroque.
hands, and look skyward. As the baroque style fell out of fashion, many of these works were dismantled. For instance, decorations for a pulpit and altar that Ehrgott completed for the Jesuit church in Augsburg (1706) were taken down during the nineteenth century and their whereabouts are unknown. Also, in the early 1800s, the abbey of Notre Dame (1725), where Ehrgott’s daughter had lived in Eichstätt, was purchased and Bendl’s works were then dispersed to various locations. While the pulpit and side altars were transferred to Pfünz and Arnsberg, respectively, where they remain, the embellishment for the high altar was shipped to Pölling (Oberpfalz), but has been missing since 1848, when it was taken apart during a church renovation. Aside from these examples, Ehrgott must have completed numerous such works for the region’s parish and monastic churches, and the Greenlease sculpture could have been made for any of a number of them. Certainly, the subject of Saint Cecilia was apropos for an altarpiece, as exemplified in a Coronation of the Virgin at the high altar in Pfarkirchen, which displays in its lower right corner a sculpture of Saint Cecilia, seated before an organ. The depiction of Cecilia playing her instrument in unison with a celestial chorus of music-making angels that surrounds Mary as she ascends into heaven may have enhanced the sculpture’s effect on a viewer, who might have simultaneously listened to the sonorous sounds of a church organ.

1428 Stetten, Geschichte, 2, 454; Joseph Braun, Die Kirchenbauten der deutschen Jesuiten (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung, 1910), 2: 43; Fries, "Ehrgott Bernhard Bendel," 102; Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 244.
1430 Ibid., 211.
1431 Feuchtmayr, "Christopher Rodt," 4-20.
1432 Feulner, Die Deutsche Plastik des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts, fig. 18. However, the Pfarrkirchen sculpture shows Saint Cecilia playing a large organ with a small set of extended vertical pipes, rather than a small portable one with none, as in the Greenlease work.
Another distinct possibility is that this sculpture was once attached to an organ, the instrument Cecilia’s *Orgelklavier* references. During the baroque era, this massive keyboard instrument became the most favored one for making sacred music, replacing Gregorian chants, which had been sung in Bavaria since the tenth and eleventh centuries.\(^{1433}\) Organs of the period in Germany typically were embellished with gilded, sculptural decorations which often consisted of music-making angels and saints.\(^{1434}\) Thus, the Greenlease sculpture would have been a particularly appropriate addition to an organ, since it depicts the patron saint of music playing the same type of instrument. Moreover, the inclusion of the *Orgelklavier* would have added another layer of meaning to the sculpture by referencing the instrument to which it might have been attached.\(^{1435}\) Meeting the same fate as baroque altarpieces, organs fell out of fashion. Many were dismantled, especially during the nineteenth century, as in the case of the decoration that Bendl completed for the Augsburg Cathedral organ, which was replaced during the late 1800s with the neo-gothic style of decoration that had become popular in Germany.\(^{1436}\) Additionally, many organs were destroyed during World War II.\(^{1437}\) However, when these instruments were popular during the baroque period, they inspired competition between German cities to see which could install the grandest of all.\(^{1438}\) Bendl’s workshop responded to this demand, completing embellishment for at least three organs, including two in the church of Saint George.

---


\(^{1437}\) Meet, "Musikinstrumentenmacher in Augsburg," 64.

formerly the Augstinerchorherrn-Stiftskirche (1692/93, 1696), and one in the city’s cathedral (1721). It is likely that he rendered numerous other examples of organ decorations, for there was an abundance of churches in the vicinity to house them.

Nevertheless, some of these majestic instruments did survive. Baroque examples that remain in situ can offer a glimpse of how the Cecilia sculpture might have functioned in its original setting. For instance, at the Benedictine Arbeitskirche in Corvey there exists an organ that dates from the time that Bendl was active. The instrument, which is situated in the choir balcony in the church’s west end, is decorated with putti that play flutes and trumpets, along with larger angels that strum harps and lutes. The latter wear gold garments and, like the Greenlease Cecilia, are seated with their legs tucked beneath them. The music-making figures serve as visual enhancements for the accompanying organ music, and remind the viewer of the celestial nature of the church music.

Supporting the organ’s balcony is a row of four angelic figures that closely resemble the one depicted in the Greenlease sculpture. They appear as adolescent males with shoulder-length brown hair that is parted on the side and bare torsos that emerge from below the balcony. Just as the Greenlease angel supports the portable keyboard on its back, the Corvey angels bend their elbows at ninety-degree angles to sustain the entire balcony. Around the neck of each is a length of fabric that gathers at the sternum with a medallion, which mirrors

\[\text{References:}\]

1439 Stahlknecht, "Ein Augsburger Bildhauer," 241-42, 250. Cathedral documents dating from 7 March 1721 show that Bendl was compensated 154 fl for his work on the organ decoration. Stahlknecht cites records at the Allgemeines Bayerisches Staatsarchiv Munich, Hochstift Augsburg, Neuburger Ausgabe, Akten Nr. 5624.

1440 Von Stetten, identifies “Orgelbautkunst,” or the art of organ building, as one of the outstanding areas of craftsmanship for which the city is known. He relates that, at the end of the fifteenth century, a Netherlandish organ builder, Jhan von Doubrow, installed the first organ, one with wood pipes, in the Saint Anne Chapel in the church of Saint Ulrich, after which time their popularity spread. See “Orgelbautkunst,” in Stetten, Geschichte, 158-60.

1441 Examples of these massive sculptural ensembles are published in Reuter, "Zeugnisse der Musikpflege in westfälischen Klöstern," 527-40.

1442 Ibid., 528, fig. 1.

the neckline of Cecilia’s garment. With its gilded surface and depiction of a holy person in spiritual ecstasy, the sculpture of Saint Cecilia exemplifies the flamboyant taste of the German baroque period. Certainly, the statue was well suited during that era to embellish any of a number of Bavarian churches or monasteries.

Context: In her portrayal in the Greenlease sculpture as a woman who wears contemporary fashion, sings, and plays a keyboard instrument, Saint Cecilia reflected societal expectations for upper-class women in Augsburg around 1700. Indeed, Cecilia’s attire mirrors the city’s haute couture as depicted in period fashion plates. Like the stylish women in these drawings, Cecilia wears a gown with an ample skirt, tightly fitted bodice with a cinched belt at the waist, a kerchief draped and tied at the neckline, and sleeves that flare at the elbow.\(^{1444}\) Her pointed shoes with their squared vamps, the leather that forms the top of the shoe, made a similarly chic statement for the time.\(^{1445}\)

Besides her dress, Cecilia’s singing and music-making also reflect contemporary expectations regarding comportment and schooling for aristocratic and bourgeois women. As part of their formal education, ladies of the middle and upper classes were trained to excel at singing and playing an instrument.\(^{1446}\) On the occasion of a private social gathering, a genteel woman might showcase her talents by playing a portable keyboard of the type depicted in this sculpture. Since these instruments had no legs, they were placed on tables, although in this


\(^{1445}\) Ibid.

\(^{1446}\) Festa, "Representations," 2-4, 10, 27-29, 192-97. From the fourteenth century into the Renaissance, Saint Cecilia was depicted with an organ that had attached pipes. Later examples show her with stringed instruments and/or, as is the case here, a portable keyboard.
example the angel’s back and shoulders support the organ. As such, Cecilia’s fashionable
dress, graceful singing pose, and elegant hand gestures, convey the essence of a young, well-
educated female of the period.

While the Orgelklavier that Cecilia holds was a popular instrument during the early
eighteenth century when this sculpture was created, by the end of that century, the majority of
them were destroyed, as pianos rose in prominence and the smaller, portable keyboards became
unfashionable. As a result, many were disassembled and their lids were often mounted on
walls to display their painted undersides as domestic decorations. Nevertheless, some did
survive and one such example of 1702 at the Deutsches Museum in Munich compares nicely to
the appearance of Bendl’s carving. Like the Munich keyboard, the Greenlease instrument has
a beveled edge and dark, painted surface with a recessed keyboard and black and beige keys.
These represent the ebony accidentals, which on the actual instruments were covered in
tortoiseshell, and lighter, boxwood naturals, which were faced with ivory or mother of pearl.
The darker accidentals were raised and shorter in length than the beige accidentals and made a
sharp or flat tone that is one-half step up or down to the sound of the adjacent natural key. The
key arrangement in the Greenlease sculpture is, however, rendered inaccurately, since it shows
only six pairs of alternating black and white keys of equal length, rather than thirty-six keys with
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1447 See the description for fig. 82 in Russell, *The Harpsichord and Clavichord*.
1450 An image of the Munich example is published in Russell, *The Harpsichord and Clavichord*, fig. 83. For painted
and intarsia decoration, see Wraight, "Virginal," 780-88.
1451 James, *Early Keyboard Instruments*, 2, 3, 28; Russell, *The Harpsichord and Clavichord*, 21, 94, 110, plate 13;
Wraight, "Virginal," 780-88. The recessed keyboard was a modification of the extended keyboard that probably was
introduced in Italy around 1570.
1452 Russell, *The Harpsichord and Clavichord*, 110. Sometimes the materials were reversed so that the naturals were
dark and the accidentals were light in color.
patterns of two and three shorter, darkly colored accidentals. This may be because the keyboard seems to have been fully repainted. So, it is not possible to know whether or not the keys appeared initially as they now do. Nonetheless, since the statue presumably was meant to be seen from below, complete accuracy in the depiction of the keys was not necessary.

The inclusion of the *Orgelklavier* in the Greenlease sculpture is also relevant to contemporary manufacturing practices in Augsburg, since it was one of the main European centers for keyboard production. The city was especially known for its high-quality production of organs and virginals, both of which are referenced in this sculpture in the depiction of the portable *Orgelklavier*. Therefore, while this work of art held sacred importance in its portrayal of Saint Cecilia, it also perhaps referenced an industry that was economically important to the city. If so, as a sculpture of the patron saint of music that was created in a city known for its manufacture of instruments, the statue of Saint Cecilia seems to have a multivalent significance for viewers.

**Conclusion:** Perhaps one day documentation will surface that will tie this sculpture to a specific site. Until then, the statue’s original location remains a point of conjecture. However, evidence related to the sculpture’s subject, style, composition, and iconography, as compared with other examples by Bendl that remain in situ, suggest a few prospects regarding its original placement and intended function as a religious work. The most likely possibilities are that the Greenlease Saint Cecilia was once attached either to an altarpiece at the front of a church or in a side chapel, or to an organ located at the back, or side, of a nave. In either case, the sculpture of *Saint Cecilia*
playing celestial music as she sings would have provided a devotee with visual enhancement to
the sonorous sounds of an organ and any accompanying voices from a congregation or choir.\textsuperscript{1455}
Thus, for the contemporary viewer, this sculpture would have enriched the church-going
experience, and probably quite effectively since the patron saint of music appears in the guise of
a modern woman of culture.

\textsuperscript{1455} Apostolos-Cappadona, \textit{Women in Religious Art}, 70.
The sculptor and painter, Peter Strudel von Strudendorff, was born in Cles, a South Tyrolian village that is located in the picturesque Val di Non (Non Valley), near the base of the Brenta Dolomites in the Italian province of Trentino. Peter came from a family of artists and was the middle of three sons born to Jakob Strudel, also known as Strobl, who was a sculptor. During their careers, Peter and his two siblings, Paul (1648-1708) and Dominik (1667-1715), were appointed court artists by the Habsburg Emperor, Leopold I (1640-1705). Peter received training first from his father and later from the baroque, tenebrist painter, Johann Carl Loths (active in Venice from 1663 to 1698). In 1685 Strudel registered with the Collegio dei Pittori (Guild of Painters) in Venice. The earliest extant examples of his work are oil on canvas paintings of secular subjects that were executed for the Elector Palatine of Neuburg, Johann Wilhelm von der Pfalz (1690-1716). While the nobleman offered Strudel a position as a court painter in Düsseldorf, the artist instead moved to Vienna. Nevertheless, he continued to paint works for the Elector Palatine’s collection through 1707.
Since Strudel’s life immediately prior to his move to Vienna is not well documented, it is unclear what influenced his decision to move there.\textsuperscript{1463} Two forces may have been at play. First, Johann Wilhelm’s sister, Eleonore Magdalene Teresa of Pfalz-Neuburg, the third wife of Emperor Leopold I, lived in Vienna.\textsuperscript{1464} Another draw may have been his older brother Paul, who was already engaged there as an imperial court artist. By moving to Vienna, not only was Peter in closer proximity to a family member, but also to the court, where he subsequently obtained a position alongside his brother at the Hofburg (Imperial Palace) in 1689.\textsuperscript{1465} That same year, he opened a private drawing school, and, three years later with the emperor’s help, Strudel established Vienna’s first official academy for “Painting, Sculpture, Fortification, and the Art of Perspective and Architecture.”\textsuperscript{1466} Even before a location for the school was secured, Peter was so enthused about the prospect of its establishment that he ordered, for instructive purposes, twenty-eight plaster casts from Rome and Venice that included copies of classical Greek and Roman statues, as well as replicas of more recent works by baroque sculptors Gianlorenzo Bernini (1598-1680) and Alessandro Algardi (1598-1654).\textsuperscript{1467}

As an imperial court artist, Peter was obliged to work at the Hofburg eight months

\textsuperscript{1463} Spitzmüller, "Strudel, Tiroler Künstlerfamilia," 213.
\textsuperscript{1464} Ibid.; Koetschau and Adriani, Die Rapparini-Handschrift, 14.
\textsuperscript{1467} Koller, "Peter Strudel," 789. Some of the plaster casts that Strudel had transported to Vienna for his academy, which was officially known as the “Academia der Malerey, Bildthauerey, Fortifikation, Prospectiv und Architecetur,” included the Greek Laocoon, Roman relief sculptures from Trajan’s column, Bernini’s Apollo and Daphne, and sculptures of children, possibly putti, by Algardi. For more on the subject, see Walter Wagner, Die Geschichte der Akademie der Bildenden Künste in Wien (Vienna: Verlag Brüder Rosenbaum, 1967), 13-21; Manfred Koller, "Die Akademie Peter Strudels in Wien (1688-1714)," Mitteleitung Österreich Gallerie 14 (1970): 5-70; Die Brüder Strudel, 92-106.
annually. For this, he received a stipend of 3,000 gulden, a salary, which, because it was higher than those other court painters earned, reflects his esteemed status. In 1699, on the occasion of the marriage of the emperor’s son, Joseph I (1678-1711) to Amalia Wilhelmina of Brunswick-Lüneberg (1673-1742), Strudel painted 148 canvases of varying sizes, fifty-four of which survive and belong to the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. Strudel also completed ephemeral decorations for festivities held at court. For instance, in 1707 he created a gondola to celebrate the Venetian ambassador’s visit to Vienna. Commissions Strudel received for religious works include the decoration of an altar in the imperial burial crypt of the church of the Capuchins in Vienna and two altarpieces and two overdoor sculptures for the Augustinian mendicant church of Saint Florian in Oberösterreich (1686). He also worked on commissions for the Stiftskirche (convent) in Garsten (1688), for an Augustinian church in Vienna, today known as the Rochuskirche (1690), for the monastic church of Klosterneuburg (1692), and for the emperor’s private chapel.

After the Habsburg army pushed the Turks back from the walls of Vienna in 1683, Strudel’s career flourished. During the ensuing peace, aristocratic families, such as the

---

1470 Spitzmüller, "Strudel, Tiroler Künstlerfamilia," 213; Koller, "Peter Strudel," 789. Many of the paintings were placed in the newlyweds' apartments.
Liechtensteins, Mansfelds, Starhembergs, Dauns, and Schönborns, hired him to embellish their newly constructed palaces and to redecorate older ones.\footnote{Barber, "Peter Strudel's Drawing," 126-27; Gertraut Schikola, "Plastik der Renaissance und des Barocks," in Geschichte der bildenden Kunst in Wien: Plastik in Wien (Vienna: Verein für Geschichte der Stadt Wien, 1970), 102.} For this profitable venture, Strudel partnered with the renowned architect Lukas von Hildebrandt (1668-1745).\footnote{Ibid., "Peter Strudel's Drawing," 126.} One of the duo’s patrons was Eugene, the prince of Savoy (1663-1736), who commissioned Strudel to paint the ceiling in his town palace.\footnote{Ibid.; Thomas Karl, "Zur Malerei des Hochbarocks in Österreich," in Prinz Eugen und das barocke Österreich (Salzburg and Vienna: Residenz Verlag, 1985), 319-28. Strudel worked on the project for Prince Eugene in 1705, but these paintings have since been dismantled and the building now serves as the Austrian Finance Ministry. The rest of the commissions for aristocratic residences were finished by 1708.} Due to his successful career, Strudel was able to purchase land on the northern edge of Vienna.\footnote{In 1686 Peter purchased his property in an area now known as the Alsergrund, or ninth district. His palace, which he built five years later, is pictured in a painting of c. 1760 by Bernardo Bellotto entitled Liechtenstein Palace in the Rossau (Liechtenstein Gemäldegalerie). See Spitzmüller, "Strudel, Tiroler Künstlerfamilia," 213; Koller, "Peter Strudel," 789.} There he built his own palace, the Strudelhoff, which later became home to the official imperial art school (Kaiserliche Akademie), which Joseph I established in 1705.\footnote{Spitzmüller, "Strudel, Tiroler Künstlerfamilia," 214; Wagner, Die Geschichte der Akademie, 18; Koller, "Peter Strudel," 789.} While Strudel’s residence no longer stands, the street where it was once located is now named the Strudlhofgasse, in honor of the artist, who once resided there.

Not only was Strudel an accomplished artist, but he also designed weapons and fought against the Turks in the siege of Buda (1686).\footnote{Bartolomeo Pozzo, Le vite de' pittori degli scultori et architetti veronesi, (Bologna: Forni, 1718), 209, at https://babel.hathitrust.org (accessed 13 January 2017); Spitzmüller, "Strudel, Tiroler Künstlerfamilia," 213; Wagner, Die Geschichte der Akademie, 18 n. 4; Barber, "Peter Strudel's Drawing," 126 n. 39.} In 1701, the emperor awarded him the noble title of Baron von Strudendorff.\footnote{Paul and Dominik also became barons and were each awarded the title, Freiherr von Strudel u. Vochburg. See Tietze, Peter Strudel von Strudendorff; Spitzmüller, "Strudel, Tiroler Künstlerfamilia," 213.} When Leopold I died, the Strudel brothers and their large atelier were retained in the court of the deceased monarch’s son, Joseph I. In 1708, Paul Strudel died, leaving the workshop and position of chief imperial court artist to his brother. Soon
thereafter, the new emperor admitted Peter Strudel to his court as a cup-bearer, a rare privilege for an artist.1481 After his brother’s death, Peter oversaw the important project of sculpting the statues of Habsburg ancestors, completing fifteen of them before his own death on 4 October 1714.1482

Perhaps because of his position as a court artist for Leopold I, Strudel was able to command high salaries from his other patrons. For instance, for the altarpiece that he painted for the church of Saint Florian, Strudel was paid three and one-half times the wages of other artists, who did comparable work on the same project.1483 In letters dated 20 February 1708 and April 1709 that the Vice-Chancellor of the Austrian Empire, Friedrich Karl von Schönborn, wrote to his uncle, the Imperial Chancellor, Lothar Franz, Friedrich explained that Strudel’s work was worth the higher price, because the artist was “peut-être le plus digne ouvrier de l’Europe” (perhaps the worthiest worker in Europe) and an “incomperable peinter” (incomparable painter).1484 Considering the esteemed professional and social positions at the Habsburg court that Peter Strudel attained, the prestigious clientele that he attracted, and the high prices that he commanded for his work, he clearly was held in high regard by his contemporaries. Yet, despite his impressive and lucrative career in Vienna, Peter Strudel and his art are now largely forgotten.1485 One scholar who commented on this fact is P. M. Barber, who posits that the removal of many of Strudel’s paintings and sculptures from their original locations have lessened their intended effects, which has caused critics to underestimate their importance.1486 Another

1481 Barber, "Peter Strudel's Drawing," 126.
1482 To see how the Habsburg statues were originally displayed, see Koller, Die Brüder Strudel, fig. 297.
1483 For instance, documents show that Johann Andreas Wolff (1652-1716) and Johann Michael Rottmayr (1656-1730) were each created a side altarpiece for which each was paid 1,000 gulden, whereas Strudel was paid 3,550 gulden for a comparable amount of work. See Altmann, "St. Florian in Gilching," 309.
1485 "Peter Strudel's Drawing," 125.
1486 Ibid.
reason for the scholarly neglect of Strudel’s work might stem from the artist’s affiliation with the court of Leopold I, who, as John Spielman, author of the emperor’s biography, notes, many historians dismiss as an ineffectual ruler. Even in instances when Leopold I is the subject of scholarly study, Peter Strudel’s contributions as court artist are often overlooked. For instance, in her book on the glorification of the emperor through images, Maria Goloubeva described the Strudel brothers as “not particularly distinguished from craftsmen.” However, as noted above, the artist’s generous stipend, which was higher than those of his contemporaries, proves otherwise. Whatever the reason, the scholarship on German and Austrian Baroque sculpture in general, and on Peter Strudel in particular, is not extensive and merits more attention.

The earliest biography of this artist appeared in *Le vite de’ pittori degli scultori et architetti veronesi*, which Bartolomeo Pozzo (b. 1647) published in 1718. During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries his work was only discussed in the general context of Baroque sculpture, but in 1926 Anna Spitzmüller produced the first concentrated study of the Strudel brothers in her dissertation, entitled *Die Brüder Strudel als Plastiker*. Unfortunately, the dissertation is unpublished and difficult to access. A few articles on Peter Strudel were published during the 1960s and through the 1980s. The scholar who has focused the most attention on the artist is Manfred Koller, who in 1972 wrote the first, and only, dissertation
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1488 Goloubeva, *The Glorification of Emperor Leopold I*, 45-47. Goloubeva focused on Leopold’s passion for music, which she believed outshone his patronage of paintings and sculptures. Although Goloubeva described the court artists as “not particularly distinguished from craftsmen,” she nevertheless acknowledged that they deserve further study.
1490 Anna Spitzmüller, “Die Brüder Strudel als Plastiker” (PhD diss., University of Vienna, 1926).
dedicated solely to the artist. Additionally, Koller authored an article that pertained to Strudel’s involvement in the Academy in Vienna (1970), expanded his discussion of the topic for a subsequent publication (1993), and then wrote the entry for the artist in The Dictionary of Art (1996). Art historian Francesca d’Arcais views Koller’s scholarship as important, because it recuperated a forgotten history of Peter Strudel’s significant contribution to late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century art in Vienna. More recently, Anna Bürgler (2001) assessed the aforementioned Habsburg sculptures, now on display in the Prunksaal of the National Library in the Imperial Palace in Vienna and at the Habsburgersaal in the Franzensburg castle in Laxenburg. Her purpose was to attribute each sculpture to either Paul, Peter, or Dominik. In 2011 German art historian Lothar Altmann discovered a painting by Peter Strudel that was thought to have been lost after its removal during a mid-nineteenth-century renovation of the church of Saint Florian. Strudel’s work was featured in a 1971 exhibition in Düsseldorf, entitled Europäische Barockplastik, which primarily focused on the oeuvre of the Flemish sculptor Gabriel Grupello (1644-1730). Grupello worked as a court artist for the Elector Palatine of the Wittelsbach dynasty, Johann Wilhelm von der Pfalz (1690-1716), which was the position that Strudel was offered, but declined in favor of moving to Vienna. Some works by Grupello have been attributed to Strudel and vice versa, a confusion that arose perhaps because

1492 Manfred Koller, "Peter Strudel, 1660-1714" (PhD diss., University of Vienna, 1972).
1493 "Die Akademie Peter Strudels in Wien (1688-1714)," 5-70; "Peter Strudel, 1660-1714."; Die Brüder Strudel; "Peter Strudel," 788-90.
1497 Wend von Klanein, Europäische Barockplastik am Niederrhein: Grupello und seine Zeit (Düsseldorf: Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf, 1971).
the sculptors were active during the same period and moved within similar circles. This is precisely the case with a statue of the Immaculate Conception in the Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art at Rockhurst University in Kansas City, Missouri, which, as the present study will show, has been attributed to Gabriel Grupello, but should instead be ascribed to Peter Strudel.

13. Peter Strudel

*Immaculate Conception*

c. 1700

Marble

Height: 170.18 cm (67 in.)

A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family


*Description:* This nearly life-sized marble sculpture presents the Virgin Mary standing on top of an inverted crescent moon and a sphere that three winged putti struggle to hold aloft over a bank of clouds. Mary is in an apparent state of spiritual ecstasy, with her mouth partially open and her back arched slightly, as she gazes upwards and to her left. Near her feet, a snake slithers across the orb’s surface and clamps its jaws around an apple. Angling her elbows outward, the Virgin presses her hands to her chest. Her fingers are long and elegant, although a little plump, with meticulously incised nail beds. There are subtle folds of flesh at her wrists, under her chin, on her neck, and near her collarbone, and a row of dimples forms across the tops of the hands at the knuckles. The Virgin’s hair is parted in the middle and pulled back from her oval face in tresses

---

that are loosely gathered just above her ear lobes and then follow the curve of her neck. Her brow bone flows seamlessly into the sides of her nose. The area below her eye is puffy, which emphasizes the three-dimensionality of her eyeball. Her eyelids, tear ducts, and nostrils are fully chiseled, but the irises are not incised.

The sleeves of the Virgin’s gown cling to her arms and fold back at the wrists. The bodice portion of her garment conforms to the shape of her breasts and doubles over at the waist, which an invisible belt cinches. The skirt follows the curve of her ample hips and reacts to gravity’s pull as it gathers in heavy pools on the globe beneath. Mary is enveloped in a thick mantle that wraps around the left side of her waist and drapes over her right shoulder. The fabric then falls under her right forearm and spirals around her back, before whipping dramatically out to the right, as if caught up in a strong gust of wind.

The Virgin shifts her weight into her right hip to effect a contrapposto stance. With her left knee bent, she presses the ball of her left foot into the globe as if to stabilize herself. The right foot is placed slightly in front of the left one and emerges from underneath the thick folds of her gown. A sandal strap extends down the length of her right foot and connects with another strap that stretches horizontally across the foot’s width. The straps’ intersection creates the shape of an inverted arrow. While the smallest toe is rendered as no more than a nub, the first three toes are relatively comparable in size, but the second one is a bit longer.

The head of the snake that slithers at Mary’s feet is featured in profile from the left, showing a square, upper jaw that culminates in a set of bumps, simulating nostrils [Cat. no. 13.1]. The serpent’s brow is pronounced and its left eye appears as a deeply chiseled, horizontally placed, tear-shaped slit. Along the snake’s top mandible, two prominent fangs protrude at the front of the jaw, while two smaller, triangular-shaped incisors appear along the
side. To bite into the apple, the serpent overextends its lower mandible. Skin wrinkles to form parallel bands around its mouth, making the snake’s strain evident. The fruit’s surface is smooth, except for an indentation at its base. Three oval-shaped leaves with pointed ends are attached to a twig and fan beneath the fruit. Veins bisect the leaves and branch off to the sides.

The upper torsos of the three putti at the base of the statue emerge from the clouds, which are rendered in bas-relief upon the globe’s surface. The angels’ feathered wings extend from their scapulae. The cherubs’ concerted effort in supporting the Virgin is evident in their lifted shoulders, the position of which makes their necks barely discernible and pushes their biceps into the cheeks of their rounded faces. The putto on the lower right appears to bear the most strain of the globe’s weight. As the angel struggles, it presses its lips together and cocks its head back awkwardly as it flattens its right cheek against the spherical surface. Similar to the style of the Virgin’s facial features, the nostrils of the putti’s button noses are fully sculpted; their eyelids and brows are clearly defined, but their irises are not delineated. Also, they have plump cheeks and ample bodies with extra folds of skin appearing as two creases on the inside edges of their elbows and at their wrists and dimples at their elbows and across the tops on each of the hands. Their curly hair is parted on the left, which exposes a triangular expanse of their foreheads. The two putti on the viewer’s right open their mouths, perhaps in song or an exclamation of awe. Between their faces, the snake’s tail dangles into an S-curve. The putto on the left looks forward at the viewer, while the one on the far right mirrors the tilted angle of the Virgin’s head [Cat. no. 13.2]. This leads the audience to look up at Mary and then to follow her skyward gaze.

*Condition Description:* Except for the addition of the two sections of the crescent moon, this statue was sculpted from a single block of white marble. The surface shows a tan discoloration,
with dust and/or grime build-up in its crevices. Both tips of the crescent moon have broken off and have been repaired. On the right the horizontal break is located 20.3 cm (8 in.) below the tip. Two breaks appear on the other half of the crescent moon. One slices downward to the left at a forty-five-degree angle and originates 2.5 cm (1 in.) below the tip. The other break is horizontal and located 20.3 cm (8 in.) from the tip. No other breaks or repairs to the sculpture are evident.

On the back of the sculpture, remnants of a metal support, perhaps iron, that was likely once used to attach this sculpture to a wall remains imbedded in the marble in a hole that measures 5.1 cm (2 in.) in diameter and is located in the middle of the back of Mary’s torso. A cut in the marble that measures 8.89 x 5.08 x 5.08 cm (3 x 2 x 2 in.) is located near the statue’s base, at the middle of the hemline of the Virgin’s garment, where the fabric touches the globe’s surface. Two holes measuring 2.54 cm x 2.54 cm (1 x 1 in.) in diameter and depth are found near the nape of her neck. Another hole measuring 2.54 cm (1 in.) in diameter that is positioned in the middle of the figure’s right scapula is plugged with metal that runs flush with the marble’s surface. Areas of the statue are blackened, presumably from a fire, including along the back of the sculpture as well as within the folds of the garment on the figure’s left side.

**Attribution and Date:** In the aforementioned catalogs that the Archiepiscopal Palace Museum published of its collection during the mid- to late-1930s, this work is identified as an *Unbefleckte Empfängnis Mariä*, or Immaculate Conception of Mary, of c. 1700 and attributed to Peter Strudel. Edward Lubin changed the attribution to Gabriel Grupello based on a comparison of

\[1500\] In his assessment of this work, Burton Dunbar suggested that material not original to this work was used to replace the broken crescent on the sculpture’s left side. See Immaculata file, GGA.

\[1501\] Dworschaf, Göhler, and Schmidt, *Diözesanmuseum in Wien*: 41, cat. no. 10, fig. 124.
the sculpture to catalog images of some statues by Grupello that had recently been exhibited in a show that German scholar Udo Kultermann had curated in Düsseldorf in 1968. The art dealer observed that the Pfarrkirche Keppln Madonna and Child (1710) and the Duisburg-Rahm (1720-1730) and Düsseldorf (1716-1717) Madonnas showed styles of the hands and facial features that were similar to those of this statue. However, the images only show the sculptures frontally. When seen in person and, particularly, from the sides, the Grupello statues exhibit an entirely different physiognomy than that of this sculpture. Grupello’s Madonna figures pose in more elegant S-curve stances and gaze down and to their right sides, rather than up and to the left like the Greenlease Mary. Also, they have longer necks and lengthened oval faces that display differently stylized features, such as thinner, pointed noses, receding chins, and eyelids that droop at the corners. Because Grupello’s and Strudel’s sculptures of the Immaculate Conception were made around the same time they exhibit a similar iconography. Nevertheless, formal aspects rendered in the two sculptors’ works are entirely different. These considerations indicate that, contrary to Lubin’s attribution, Gabriel Grupello did not sculpt the Greenlease Immaculate Conception and the statue therefore should be reattributed to Peter Strudel and his workshop.

A comparison between the Greenlease sculpture and two drawings of the Virgin by Peter Strudel that belong to the collection of the Albertina Museum in Vienna further supports this attribution. In the first drawing, entitled Begegnung Mariae und Elisabeths an der goldenen Pforte, (the Meeting of Mary and Elizabeth at the Golden Gate), Mary’s coiffure and garments closely resemble those of the Greenlease Virgin. In both the sculpted and drawn portrayals of the Virgin, her hair is gathered into a large, layered bun at the back of her head, with long, wavy
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1502 Lubin marked the points of comparison on the photocopied images of the Grupello sculptures with arrows and sent his notes to Father Van Ackeren. Immaculata: Accession file, GGA; Udo Kultermann, Gabriel Grupello (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 1968), figs. 87, 92, 94.
tresses that fall loosely past her shoulders. In addition, in each image her dress has a roll of fabric at the collar, sleeves that slacken along the length of the arm to the wrist, and a cloak that twists and wraps around her hip, albeit on the opposite side in each.\footnote{The Albertina Museum drawing (inventory no. 25699) measures 27.3 x 21.9 cm (10.75 x 8.62 in.) and is rendered on grey-brown paper with white highlights and light brown ink that may have originally been black in hue.} Also, both renderings show her wearing inverted t-strap sandals that expose a larger, second toe and with the right foot pointing directly at the viewer. This stance is inconsistent with Grupello’s sculptures, which consistently display the right foot positioned off center and pointing outward at a forty-five-degree angle.

The second drawing by Strudel, a scene of the \textit{Annunciation} (1680), depicts the Virgin in the lower left corner inclining her head in the same manner as the Greenlease Mary. Also comparable is the articulation of the outer corner of her right eye, triangular indentation at the throat, puffiness under the chin, and pose of her pudgy hands, which are expressively pressed into the cloth at her sternum.\footnote{The Annunciation scene (inventory no. 3878) measures 37.2 x 25 cm (14.6 x 9.8 in.) and is rendered in red chalk, pen, and bistre or dark gray, ink wash drawing. Images of this drawing are accessible online at the Albertina Museum’s website and are also available in the artist’s file at the Frick Art Reference Library.} The allegorical figure of Truth that Peter Strudel drew in a \textit{bozzetto} of \textit{Time Revealing Truth and Confounding Fraudulence} at the British Library also matches the incline of the Greenlease Mary’s head and the putti are likewise depicted in the drawing with feathered wings attached at the scapula, as they are in this sculpture.\footnote{Barber, "Peter Strudel's Drawing," 136, fig. b.}

As we have seen above, during Strudel’s 1695 residency in Rome, Gian Lorenzo Bernini’s work inspired him greatly, so much so that he shipped plaster copies of some of the Italian master’s statues back to Vienna for use in his academy.\footnote{For Strudel’s use of Bernini’s style in his drawings, see ibid., 120.} Indeed, late baroque style in Vienna is based primarily on Bernini’s stylistic approach, which is evident in the execution of
For example, the Greenlease sculpture emulates the head tilt, facial type, and hairstyle of Bernini’s *Santa Bibiana* (1624-26) at the church of S. Bibiana; the pose of his famed *Saint Theresa in Ecstasy* (1642-57) at the Cornaro Chapel in the church of S. Maria della Vittoria; and, in terms of the fleshy hands pressed to the sternum, the recumbent sculpture of the *Blessed Ludovica Albertoni* (1671-74) at the church of S. Francesco a Ripa, all of which are in Rome.

The connection between the Strudel workshop and this statue is relatively longstanding. Not only do the Archiepiscopal Palace Museum catalogs of the 1930s and 1940s attribute this sculpture to Peter Strudel, but in 1938, Spitzmüller also posited that Paul Strudel created the statue, an attribution that Manfred Koller refuted in 1972, although he did not offer an alternative one. In the meantime, Gertraut Shikola (1970) proposed that someone from the inner circle of Paul Strudel sculpted this work. Certainly there was no one closer to Paul in this regard than his own brother Peter, although Schikola did not mention him by name. Since the brothers often collaborated, aspects of their sculptures do resemble one another. For instance, the Greenlease Mary mirrors the countenance, facial profile, and hairstyle of the female allegorical figure of *Glaube* (Hope) that Paul sculpted for the *Pestsäule* (plague column) in Vienna’s city center. Nevertheless, the brothers’ artistic expressions were undeniably distinct from one another, as seen in the sculptures of the Habsburg ancestors that they completed for Leopold I. Whereas Paul’s figures are frontally oriented with gestures that appear somewhat frozen, Peter’s

---

1508 Koller, "Peter Strudel, 1660-1714," 209, fig. 8.
1509 Schikola, "Plastik der Renaissance und des Barocks," 108. Schikola noted that the Immaculata lacked physiognomic details and ornamental frills that were typical of Paul’s work.
1510 For images of these works, see ibid., figs. 160-61; Arno Schönberger, *Deutsche Plastik des Barock* (Munich: F. Bruckman, 1963), 28-29.
sculptures are more active, with inclined heads, hands that gesticulate demonstratively, and bodies that twist along the spinal axis.\(^{1511}\) Because of its theatrical pose, the Greenlease sculpture is indicative of Peter’s work, rather than Paul’s.

Another, previously overlooked, point of comparison concerns the artist’s rendering of fabric. In Strudel’s treatment of textiles, the body’s shape beneath, particularly in the area of the leg, is not fully conveyed. Typically, while Peter’s figures show a knee pressing against the cloth, the thigh’s shape is obscured by a span of flattened and recessed polygonal planes. One shape that appears repeatedly in his work is a concave tetrahedron. For instance, this form is distinctly delineated on the bottom of Mary’s cape in the *Annunciation* drawing, and on the Greenlease Virgin’s left hip, where it is juxtaposed next to a squared recess in the fabric. This same pairing of shapes also appears on an area of a belted cloak that is wrapped around the right hip of the sculpture of Herzog (Duke) Rudolf III (r. 1298-1307).\(^{1512}\) Another point of comparison between the sculptures of the Greenlease Immaculate Conception and Rudolf III are the figures’ hand positions. Each bends the wrist of one hand upward, while the middle and fourth fingers of the other hand touch, as the index and little fingers on the same hand stretch outward to form two triangles of negative space. As demonstrated in the figures of Rudolf IV (r. 1358-1365) and Maximillian III (1558-1618) in the Habsburg sculptures on display in the Prunksaal at the Hofburg in Vienna, Strudel meticulously sculpted details such as buttons, lapels, and military regalia, sharply contrasting the rulers’ capes, which appear blocky and somewhat unfinished. Perhaps Peter assigned the task of sculpting bulky cloth to his assistants, which

---

\(^{1511}\) For comparison, see Paul’s sculptures of Kings Albrecht II, Friedrich III, and Ferdinand V (figs. 60, 62, 65) versus Peter’s of Kings Rudolf I and Albrecht I and Duke Sigismund (figs. 51, 55, 64) in Bürgler, "Zur Identifizierung der Marmorstatuen der Brüder Strudel," 47-51; Schikola, "Plastik der Renaissance und des Barocks," figs. 181-83.

might explain the seemingly lower level of skill evident in this area. This would not have been an unusual practice for any master who, like Strudel, needed to be productive, particularly after the 1683 defeat of the Turks at Vienna’s gates, when the artist was inundated with a plethora of commissions to embellish local aristocratic residences.\textsuperscript{1513} While eight months of his year were dedicated to working at the imperial court, outside of that time, his workshop completed numerous projects for private patrons and religious institutions, either of which could also have commissioned this work. Considering the similarities in the stylistic and technical approaches between this sculpture and the drawings and sculptures mentioned above that are securely attributed to Peter Strudel, it seems clear that the attribution for this sculpture should rightfully be changed back to Strudel. Lubin’s date of c. 1700 seems appropriate, not only because the statue’s style conforms to the artist’s works dating from this period, but also because, as we shall see below, the sculpture’s subject was extremely popular at the turn of the eighteenth century in Vienna.

\textit{Provenance:} By 1936 the sculpture of the \textit{Immaculate Conception} was on display in Vienna at the Erzbischöfliches Dom- und Diözesan-Museum (Archiepiscopal Cathedral and Diocesan Museum).\textsuperscript{1514} The museum’s building, located adjacent to the Stephansdom Cathedral, was once the residence of the archbishop of Vienna, but now it houses the city’s diocesan offices. The

\textsuperscript{1513} Barber, "Peter Strudel's Drawing," 126. Barber notes that Strudel “habitually worked with speed and assistance he received from academy pupils.”

\textsuperscript{1514} Fritz Dworschaf, Hermann Göhler, and Justus Schmidt, \textit{Führer durch das Erzbischöfliche Dom- und Diözesanmuseum in Wien} (Vienna: Verlag des das Erzbischöfliche Dom- und Diözesanmuseum, 1936), 41, cat. no. 10, fig. 124. In 1973, the gallery moved to a building across from the cathedral. That site is presently undergoing renovation and will reopen in the fall of 2016.
gallery opened to the public in 1933, on the occasion of the cathedral’s 500th anniversary.\textsuperscript{1515} So, it is possible that the statue was exhibited there earlier. A wealthy Viennese banking family, the Neumanns, loaned the statue for display at the archbishop’s palace.\textsuperscript{1516} Thereafter, the sculpture was featured in several editions of the museum’s catalog (1936, 1939, 1941), as well as in a few publications that highlighted some of Vienna’s prized works of art.\textsuperscript{1517} Evidently, the Neumann family, which was Jewish, was forced to flee Nazi-occupied Vienna and the sculpture was left behind, remaining at the museum for the next four decades. In the mid-1970s, a “Mr. Neumann” approached New York art dealer Edward R. Lubin and showed him a photograph of the sculpture. Speaking on behalf of his family, Neumann explained that they intended to sell the marble statue to an American museum, so that it could serve as a “dramatic indication of Austria’s great baroque culture.”\textsuperscript{1518} In a letter dated 1 May 1976 to Father Van Ackeren of Rockhurst University, Lubin related the circumstances of this encounter and what transpired afterward. He stated that, after “somewhat complicated negotiations,” Mr. Neumann obtained export rights for the sculpture. Although Lubin did not cite whether the museum, the Austrian

\textsuperscript{1515} Die Museen Österreichs: Verzeichnis aller Österreichischen Museen (Vienna: Der Österreichischen Landeskommision, 1935), 52; Führer durch das Erzbischöfliche Dom- und Diözesanmuseum in Wien (Vienna: Verlag des das Erzbischöfliche Dom- und Diözesanmuseum 1941), 3-5, 17. The Archbishop’s Palace and Diocesan Museum was opened through the efforts of Monsignor J[osef?] Popp and the archbishop, Cardinal Dr. Theodor Innitzer. The 1935 city guide lists the contents of the collection as paintings, reliquaries, Islamic glassware, stained glass, and sculpture.

\textsuperscript{1516} Lubin to Van Ackeren, 1 March 1976, Immaculata: Accession file, GGA; Koller, "Peter Strudel, 1660-1714," 213.

\textsuperscript{1517} Dworschaf, Göhler, and Schmidt, Diözesanmuseum in Wien, 41, cat. 10, fig. 124; Führer durch das Erzbischöfliche Dom- und Diözesanmuseum in Wien (Vienna: Verlag des das Erzbischöfliche Dom- und Diözesanmuseum 1939), 41, cat. 10, fig. 124; Diözesanmuseum in Wien: 41, cat. 10, fig. 124; Paul Becker, "Die Hohe Schutzfrau des Barocks," in Das Bild der Madonna: Skulpturen von der Romanik bis zum Barock (Salzburg: Residenz Verlag, 1965), 161-69, fig. 181; Schikola, "Plastik der Renaissance und des Barocks," 108, fig. 178, plate 45. Becker lists the sculpture as “Privat besitz, als Leihgabe im Erzbischöflichen Diözesanmuseum,” (private collection, as a loan to the Archbishop’s Diocesan Museum). However, the Neumann family name is not mentioned.

\textsuperscript{1518} Lubin did not indicate the family representative’s first name, only that he was “a gentleman in the employ of Acquascutum, Canada, LTD,” which is a high-fashion clothier, founded in London in 1851, that also manufactured military uniforms during World War II. See Lubin to Van Ackeren, 1 March 1976, Immaculata: Accession file, GGA.
government, or both granted permission, he did indicate that the concession to release the sculpture “might have [had] something to do with partial compensations,” for how “grievously they had suffered during the war.”

Thus far, the determination of whether documents relating to this exchange survive has proved inconclusive and the identities of which Neumann family member[s] initially lent the work to the archbishop’s palace museum in the 1930s, and who later served as their representative and retrieved the sculpture remains a mystery. Both issues require further investigation. In any case, the result of these negotiations was that the sculpture was shipped to New York, probably in the spring of 1975. Upon its arrival, the statue was displayed in an exhibition entitled “Le cabinet de l’amateur” that another New York art dealer, Knoedler and Company, Inc., sponsored. It is not clear whether the work was ever part of Knoedler’s inventory, or if the firm displayed the work on behalf of Lubin’s company. The following year, Virginia Greenlease purchased the *Immaculate Conception* from Lubin and immediately donated the work to Rockhurst University.

*Iconography:* It has never been noted that the Greenlease *Immaculate Conception* belongs to a

---

1519 Ibid. An account that relates to the period when the Neumann family had to flee the city and leave this sculpture behind was written by a Viennese-born Jew named Dr. Otto Newman (1922-2015), who anglicized his name after moving to England, by escaping on the last *Kindertransport* (children’s train transport) out of Vienna in 1938. It is not clear whether Newman, who was a professor at San Diego State University, was related to the family that donated this sculpture to the Archbishop Palace’s Museum. Nevertheless, his autobiographical account relates to the circumstances under which the owner[s] of this sculpture fled Vienna. See Otto Newman, *Escape and Adventures: A 20th-Century Odyssey* (Raleigh, NC: Lulu Publishing, 2008).

1520 Part of the difficulty in searching for pertinent documents for the loan of this sculpture to the museum and its subsequent release is due to the major renovation the institution is presently undergoing, which has made its archives inaccessible. I intend to pursue the subject in the future.

category of work known in German as a *Hausmadonna*. This type of sculpture depicted the Virgin with the Christ Child or, as here, alone. Typically, such works were affixed to an exterior wall of a private home, church, hospital, or convent, and were usually placed over an entrance or within a niche carved into a building’s façade or into one of its corners. Patrons had these statues installed not only to honor Mary, but also to invoke her protection over the places in which they lived, worked, and prayed. For centuries *Hausmadonna* sculptures have been integral to sacred expression within the urban settings of Austria and Germany, nevertheless scholars have largely overlooked these works.

This statue visually expresses the tenet of the Immaculate Conception, or the Catholic belief that the Virgin was conceived without sin. Mary’s state of grace at the time of her conception is not referenced directly in the scriptures, but theologians pondered it as early as the Council of Ephesus of 431, when the Mother of Christ was proclaimed holy, but not sinless. Saint Anselm was the first in the Latin West to promote the theological concept that Mary was born without the stain of original sin in his *De conceptu virginali* of 1099. At the cathedral of Lyons in 1140, Saint Bernard of Clairvaux expressed a different view on the issue, reasoning that Mary obtained her state of grace from her virginity, and not from being conceived without sin. A long-standing and sometimes rancorous debate ensued between opposing factions, like

---

1522 Wolfgang Medding, "Peter van den Branden, der Schöpfer einer Speyerer Hausmadonna," *Pfälzer Heimat* 3, no. (1952): 77-82; Michael Baxandall, *The Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1980), 38, fig. 39. Numerous examples remain in situ, for instance, the city of Augsburg is presently conducting a study of the thirty-four examples that remain in situ. In Düsseldorf examples are found on the façade of the Maxkirche and on the entryway to the Theresienhospital.


1524 For a concise explanation of the development of this theology, see O'Connor, "Immaculate Conception," 331-33.


the Franciscans, who supported the concept, and the Dominicans, who did not.1527 In 1482, the Franciscan pope Sixtus IV (1414-84) granted permission for a liturgical office of the Immaculate Conception to be celebrated and prohibited supporters of the practice from being accused of heresy.1528 Thereafter, devotees were able to express their beliefs more openly and images such as this one proliferated in Europe.1529

With its iconography of the Virgin poised atop a crescent moon and globe with a curling snake trapped between her feet, this sculpture incorporates imagery that is typical for this type of Marian representation. The depiction references the Woman of the Apocalypse, who is introduced in Revelation 12:1 as “a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars.”1530 Although presently the Greenlease sculpture has no corona of stars, it is very likely that one was originally attached at the back of the statue, where there are two holes drilled into the base of Mary’s neck. A halo’s metallic ends could have been easily inserted there for support. Similar extant representations of the Virgin confirm this hypothesis. For instance, Grupello’s sculptures of Mary at the Maxkirche and Lambertuskirche in Düsseldorf display the Virgin with a halo of twelve stars hovering behind her head and a crown affixed to the back of the sculpture at the base of her neck.1531 The inclusion of such a corona would have completed this sculpture’s iconography.1532

Another celestial symbol included in this work’s iconography is the crescent moon, a

---

1527 Warner, Alone of All Her Sex, 240-42.
1528 Ibid., 236-54; O’Connor, “Immaculate Conception,” 7: 334; Gnocchi, “Immacolata Concezione,” 776-77. The issue of the Immaculate Conception remained contentious for Catholics until 1854, when Pope Pius IX (r. 1846-78) established the concept as church dogma. For more information on the Immaculate Conception, see cat. nos 5, 9.
1529 For comparable examples of iconography, see Kultermann, Gabriel Grupello, figs. 87, 92-95.
1531 Kultermann, Gabriel Grupello, 273, 278; figs. 143, 148.
1532 For examples of statues with coronas of twelve stars that remain intact, see intact, see Schönberger, Deutsche Plastik des Barock, 49; Kultermann, Gabriel Grupello, 273, 278, figs. 143, 148; Ludwig Döry, "European Baroque Sculpture on the Lower Rhine: Grupello and his Times," The Burlington Magazine 114, no. 826 (1972): 46, fig. 36.
symbol derived from pagan tradition. Since antiquity the moon has had feminine associations, perhaps originating in part from the lunar cycle, which coincides with the timing of a woman’s menstrual period.\(^\text{1533}\) The crescent moon, which was also an attribute of the Greek goddess Diana, was introduced into Marian iconography to signify the Virgin during the Council of Ephesus in 431.\(^\text{1534}\) An additional point to consider is the moon’s orbit between the sun and the earth. This position equates the Virgin’s role as a spiritual intermediary between the celestial and terrestrial worlds. The latter is represented by the statue’s globe.\(^\text{1535}\)

Slithering across the earth’s surface is the snake. Because it is depicted with an apple, the serpent clearly references the temptation of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, as well as Mary’s role as the “Second Eve.”\(^\text{1536}\) This imagery evokes the idea of Christ as the New Adam and the Virgin as the “New Eve.” Whereas Eve’s disobedience introduced sin into the world, Mary obeyed God’s will and, by giving birth to Christ, made salvation possible for humankind.\(^\text{1537}\) It is also relevant to this sculpture’s meaning that in his papal bull Pius IX incorporated a description of this symbolism into the definition of the Immaculate Conception.\(^\text{1538}\) Thus, as imagery that connotes the origin of sin, the snake is appropriately portrayed in this sculpture of the *Immaculate Conception*, which illustrates the theological concept that Mary was conceived without the stain of original sin.\(^\text{1539}\) The Virgin’s stance further


\(^{1534}\) Ibid., 255-69; Apostolos-Cappadonna, *Dictionary of Christian Art*, 182.

\(^{1535}\) Warner, *Alone of All Her Sex*, 258.

\(^{1536}\) Ibid., 245.

\(^{1537}\) Second-century, early Christian writers, Tertullian and Saints Justin and Iermaeius were among the first to refer to the Blessed Virgin as the New Eve and to Christ as the New Adam. See Donald Attwater, *A Dictionary of Mary* (New York: P J. Kennedy and Sons, 1956), 203-05.


signifies her power over evil, while her lack of direct contact with the snake attests to her purity.\textsuperscript{1540}

Mary’s action of trampling the snake also symbolizes the Christian conquest of paganism. In Vienna, this point would have resonated especially well after 1683, when the Austrians defeated the Ottoman Turks at the city’s gates.\textsuperscript{1541} That victory adds an additional layer of meaning to this sculpture’s iconography because the crescent moon also appears on the Turkish flag. Thus, for a contemporary viewer in Vienna, Mary’s stance over the partial moon evoked that recent triumph.\textsuperscript{1542} The military defense of 1683 was so important that Pope Innocent XI (r. 1676-1689) inaugurated the feast of Maria Victoria on 7 October of that year to commemorate the event.\textsuperscript{1543} The pope’s action symbolically associated Mary’s intercessory power with the triumph, a subject that this sculpture’s iconography represents.

Like many other European cities, Vienna was dedicated to the Virgin. The Habsburg rulers had specifically chosen her as their patron saint during the Thirty-Year War (1618-48). Indeed, to honor his troops’ victory over the Swedes in that conflict, Emperor Ferdinand III (1608-1657) commissioned a Mariensäule, or Marian column (1642), which was placed in the city’s center.\textsuperscript{1544} Like the Immaculate Conception statue at the Greenlease Gallery, this Viennese monument’s iconography is based upon that of the Woman of the Apocalypse. Situated at the column’s apex is a sculpture of a cloaked Virgin standing upon a dragon. Her hands are pressed together in prayer as she gazes skyward. The Mariensäule figure wears a gold corona of twelve

\textsuperscript{1540} Warner, \textit{Alone of All Her Sex}, 268-69.
\textsuperscript{1542} Becker, "Schutzfrau des Barocks," 163.
\textsuperscript{1543} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1544} Ibid., 163-67; Schikola, "Plastik der Renaissance und des Barocks," fig. 150. At a time of war, the adoption of the Virgin Mary as a city’s patron saint was rather common and, therefore, not peculiar to Vienna. A well-known instance occurred in 1260 in Siena, when the Sienese dedicated their city to the Virgin for her help in their defeat of the Florentines at the Battle of Montaperti.
stars, presumably like the halo that once was probably attached to this sculpture. The 
*Mariensäule*, which reflects Mary’s important status in Vienna, is a prominent landmark with 
which the city’s residents were very familiar. It is, therefore, conceivable that the Marian 
column may have inspired the citizens of Vienna to commission similar works for their religious 
institutions and private residences. Indeed, during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth 
centuries, the most popular portrayal of Mary in Vienna was the Immaculate Conception.\(^{1545}\) So, 
this sculpture would have formed part of a cohesive civic and devotional urban iconography. 

*Format and Function:* Around 1700 in Austria and Germany, sculptures of the Immaculate 
Conception were often displayed outdoors. Interior examples were, and still are, found primarily 
in churches, where they stood upon pedestals attached either to a column in the nave or a wall in 
a side aisle. They were also placed in side chapels and on high altars.\(^{1546}\) However, the black 
grime that remains imbedded in the deepest crevices of this sculpture and a linear rust stain that 
runs along a horizontal line near the base’s bottom edge suggest that this work was exposed to 
the elements and therefore displayed in an outdoor setting. Indeed, we shall see below that the 
sculpture’s subject, iconography, and physical structure indicate that it was displayed outside as 
a *Hausmadonna.* 

Formal evidence indicates that viewers were meant to see this sculpture frontally from 
below. For example, the back of the statue is flattened and roughly hewn. Also, the rendering of 
the clouds, putti, Virgin’s hair, and snake’s scales on both sides of the sculpture is considerably 
less detailed than the articulation of those same details toward the front of the statue. 
Undoubtedly, the holes drilled into the base and Mary’s torso at the back would have provided a

\(^{1546}\) Koller, *Die Brüder Strudel*, figs. 27, 28. For example, the Strudel brothers’ workshop completed nine statues of 
saints that are comparable in size to this sculpture for the high altars of the Rochuskirche in Vienna.
means to attach the object securely to a wall.¹⁵⁴⁷ Most likely the statue was elevated and viewed from below, a vantage point that provides an optimal perspective and can be approximated from viewing the work at floor level. For instance, the angel’s wings are angled slightly downward, so that the individually articulated feathers are most legible when seen from below. When the cherubs are viewed from this position, the effort they exert as they struggle to support the hefty globe and nearly life-sized Virgin on their shoulders is more apparent. Viewing the statue from below also allows the Virgin’s billowing cape to achieve its full, dramatic effect of movement. The serpent’s clamping down on the apple is also best seen from a lower point of view, because from there the three leaves upon which the fruit sits fan out in a way that draws the viewer’s focus toward this important symbol. Finally, Mary’s torso hinges from her knees at a forty-five-degree slant that presents, from beneath, an uninterrupted view of the swelling mantle, expressively placed hands, and head tilted toward the sky.

During the Austrian baroque period, a Hausmadonna of the Greenlease statue’s type, was typically situated in a niche. Often, such a niche was part of a building’s original design, but sometimes niches made to contain statues were added to existing structures.¹⁵⁴⁸ Numerous baroque examples remain in situ, which attests to the popularity of this type of sculpture during the era in which the Greenlease Immaculate Conception was created. However, many statues, such as this one, have not remained in their original locations. Some have been incorporated into other structures, such as a fountain or, like this sculpture, were moved indoors for display in a

¹⁵⁴⁷ See the condition report for this object.
By examining the *Hausmadonna* sculptures that remain in situ, one can gain a sense of how the Greenlease example might have been displayed. Niches for these statues vary in their appearance, from simple, concave ovals to ones adorned with more elaborate scallop shell motifs. Niches that were placed at the corners of buildings were usually rectangles with pointed arches. Sometimes a stone or metal awning was installed above the niche to protect and honor the statue. The canopy’s shape might echo that of the niche below or it might resemble a semi-circular baldachin, as in the example of a *Hausmadonna* on the façade of the Haus Saint Ambrosius, formerly Augsburg Cathedral’s refectory. The ledges upon which the Marian sculptures were situated varied in their format. Bases varied in their shapes from simple rectangles to multi-layered octagonal pedestals and realistic rock outcroppings. Examples of the latter two are displayed on the facades of residences in Speyer, Germany at Johannestrasse 10 and Domplatz 4. Clouds depicted at the bases of such sculptures were occasionally rendered to seem as if they were spilling over a niche’s edge, as in the Immaculata sculpture on the front of the Savoyischen Damenstift (Convent) in Vienna. This probably was not the case with the statue now in Kansas City, in which the clouds are all on the same level and create a soft buffer of support for the globe. The existence of a rust-colored line along this sculpture’s base is

---

1549 For example, a *Hausmadonna* on display at the Kornmarkt in Heidelberg was removed from its location in 1830 and attached to a fountain in that city, and in Augsburg, a *Hausmadonna* that was located in a niche across the street from the cathedral at 30 Hoher Weg was removed for display at the cathedral’s diocesan museum and a copy was put in its place. See ibid., 77-82; "Den Heiligen auf der Spur, Hausmadonnen und Hausheilige in Augsburg, Forschung, Dokumentation, Vermittlung, and Pflege." (Augsburg: Gesellschaft zur Erhaltung Augsburger Kulterdenkmale u. Gemeinschaftsstiftung Mein Augsburg, 2015), no. 28.

1550 For examples of *Hausmadonna* niches set into the corner of a building, see "Speyerer Hausmadonna," 77.

1551 The building is now home to the Augsburger Domsingknaben, or the cathedral’s boys’ choir.

1552 For images of niches with a cliff and octagonal pedestal for a Hausmadonna, see Medding, "Speyerer Hausmadonna," 77-78.

1553 Adolf Feulner, *Die Deutsche Plastik des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Kurt Wolff Verlag, 1926), 43, fig. 28.
.635 cm (1/4 in.) wide suggests that a piece of metal kept the statue in place. The original location of this work is unknown, but, considering works of similar material and iconography in Augsburg, Düsseldorf, and Vienna, it may have stood in a niche on the exterior of a church, convent, hospital, or private residence. The sculpture might have once decorated the Neumanns’ palace, but was likely taken down since a Virgin Mary statue would not have been suitable embellishment for the façade of a Jewish family’s home. That could explain why the family had possession of the sculpture, which they loaned to the Diocesan Museum in Venice.

As stated above, by 1936 the Neumanns, a Jewish banking family in Vienna, had loaned this sculpture to the city’s Erzbischöfliche Dom- und Diözesanmuseum. Within a few years, they fled Austria, leaving the sculpture behind. Then, in 1938 Vienna’s archbishop and founder of the archiepiscopal museum, Cardinal Theodor Innitzer (1875-1955), delivered a sermon in which he spoke out against the German Socialist Party. As a reaction against Innitzer’s political message, the Hitlerjugend, a Nazi youth organization, stormed the archbishop’s palace and demolished its interior. Then on 11 April 1945, marauders who were looting nearby shops, set a fire that damaged the cathedral complex and caused its roof to collapse. The following day, with Russians at the city’s gates, American forces deployed a twenty-two-ton bomb that exploded on the cathedral’s floor. Remarkably, the sculpture emerged virtually unscathed. Whether the sculpture’s crescent moon tips were broken off during one of these attacks is unknown, but the collapse of the archiepiscopal palace’s roof left black traces of melted tar on its back.

---

1554 Innitzer’s political stance vacillated, because, initially, he supported the Nazi regime. For a recounting of the Hitlerjugend raid on the archbishop’s palace and pictures of the resulting destruction, see Viktor Reimann, *Innitzer: Kardinal zwischen Hitler und Rom* (Vienna and Munich: Amalthea, 1988), 20-26, fig. 9.
1555 Lubin to Van Ackeren, 1 March 1976, Immaculata: Accession, file, GGA.
Conclusion: We have seen above that this sculpture, which was attributed to Gabriel Grupello, should instead be ascribed to Peter Strudel, who was a court artist in Vienna for the Holy Roman Emperor, Leopold I. The Greenlease sculpture’s iconography is typical for this type of Marian representation, including the globe, crescent moon, snake, and, in all likelihood, a crown of twelve stars that has been lost. In Vienna at the time that this sculpture was created, the sliver of moon at the bottom of the statue may also have signified the defeat of the Muslim Turks at the city’s gates. The sculpture has sustained weathering that indicates that it was exposed and displayed outdoors and certain aspects of its design and composition strongly suggest that it was meant to be viewed from below. In its original location, the Greenlease sculpture likely functioned as a Hausmadonna and was displayed in a niche on the outside wall of a private residence, convent, church, or hospital in Vienna. Today a plethora of Hausmadonna statues survive in Austria and Germany, both in situ and in museums. As with this sculpture, there is little to no literature on the subject of this category of sculpture which merits further scholarly exploration.1556

1556 For example, the city of Augsburg is currently conducting a study of the Hausmadonnas, forty-four of which remain in situ, along with empty niches and those that contain figures of other saints. See n. 1572. For another such study, see V. V. Stech, Die Barockskulptur in Böhmen (Czechoslovakia: Artia, 1959), figs. 98, 138, 161a, 161b, 183.
FELIX PLANNER  
Active Munich, 1698 - 1707

Felix Planner was a member of the goldsmith’s guild in Munich, Germany. The scant sources that mention Planner are published in German, including Marc Rosenberg’s compendia of German goldsmiths and their associated stamps (1911, 1923), a history of the bishopric of Münster and Freising (1915), and the Thieme-Becker Künstler Lexikon (1933).1557 Rosenberg identifies Planner as one of seventy gold- and silversmiths who were active in Munich during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.1558 Metalsmithing was a well-established profession in that Bavarian city, with the earliest workshop there dating from 1310.1559 Beginning in the mid-sixteenth century, Munich, along with Augsburg, Nuremburg, Hamburg, and Dresden, emerged as important centers for the German production of objects made from precious metals.1560 During the baroque era, the quality crafting of silver in Germany peaked and master artisans like Planner were kept very busy producing fine examples of workmanship that embodied the German baroque aesthetic.1561

Although Augsburg and Munich goldsmiths employed similar techniques and styles in their working methods, those who worked in the former city have received far more scholarly

1558 Rosenberg, Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen (1911), 476; Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen (1923), 337.
1559 Rosenberg, Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen (1923), 312. By 1365, quality control laws were enacted in Munich that mandated goldsmiths to submit their wares to the office of weights and measures, Fronwägers, to weigh any gold and silver that was used in the making of an object.
1560 Reinhold Baumstark and Helmut Seling, Silber und Gold: Augsburger Goldschmiedekunst für die höfe Europas (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 1994), 1: 110.
attention for their production during the Renaissance and Baroque periods. A contributing reason as to why Augsburg has received more attention than Munich, is that there was a greater concentration of workshops there, which resulted in a larger inventory of surviving objects to study. Further, Augsburg’s artisans exported their goods abroad to countries, such as Denmark, Russia, and Sweden, which generated for the city a reputation of international renown. In contrast, Munich’s goldsmiths worked primarily for patrons who resided in the city and surrounding Bavarian provinces. Thus, the majority of objects of precious metal created in Munich remained local, as did the reputations of their makers.

Despite a lack of documentation pertaining to Planner, we can ascertain certain facts about his career by considering what was typical for the period’s metalsmiths. At a young age, Planner would likely have been apprenticed to a workshop. After completing his apprenticeship, he would have spent three years traveling abroad as a journeyman. During this period, known as the Wanderjahre, he would have furthered his training in various workshops and gathered sketches and patterns, which would later serve as a guide for his future designs.

---

1562 The attention that Augsburg has attracted for its goldsmith production is evident in the following collection of essays, in which over half are dedicated to topics pertaining to that city, while the remainder cover venues in all the rest of Europe: Renate Eikelmann, Annette Schommers, and Lorenz Seelig, eds., Studien zur europäischen Goldschmiedekunst des 14. bis 20. Jahrhunderts: Festsschrift für Helmut Seling zum 80. Geburtstag am 12. Februar 2001 (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 2001).

1563 Rosenberg lists 204 goldsmiths in Augsburg, compared to seventy in Munich. Rosenberg, Der Goldschmied Merkzeichen (1923); Philippa Glanville, ed. Silver (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1996), 34; Henmarck, The Art of the European Silversmith, 1: 52.

1564 Redslob, Deutsche Goldschmiedeplastik, 25. Redslob mentions, that aside from Franz Oxner and his successor, Franz Kessler (active 1664 to 1717), the remainder of Munich’s goldsmiths have been overlooked. For example, whereas Kessler’s entry in Thieme-Becker is a full page in length, only five lines are dedicated to Planner. Much like Planner, Kessler rendered gold and silver chalices with “Akanthus, Blumen u. Engelsköpfchen” (“acanthus, flowers, and cherub’s heads”). See "Franz Kessler," in Thieme-Becker Künstler Lexikon, ed. Hans Vollmer (Leipzig: E. A. Seemann, 1933), 212-13.

1565 For an essay in English on the training of silver- and goldsmiths in Germany, see Glanville, Silver, 82-101. For a reproduction of a woodblock print of 1576 showing the interior of a goldsmith workshop in Augsburg, see Ralf Schürer, "Ein erbar handwerckh von goldscmiden," in Silber und Gold: Augsburger Goldschmiedekunst für die höfe Europas, ed. Lorenz Seelig (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 1994), figs. 18-19.

1566 Glanville, Silver, 83.
Upon returning to Munich, the fledgling artisan would have sought admittance into the city’s Goldschmiede Gilde (goldsmith guild). To demonstrate that he was worthy of acceptance into this prestigious organization, Planner would have had to create a Meisterstück, or masterpiece, as part of his examination. To prevent any cheating during the testing process, he would have been required to place the object in a locked and protected room between the intervals during which he worked on his project. That his name appears in the Munich guild’s registry, clearly demonstrates that his colleagues ranked Felix Planner in the upper tier of Bavarian artists.

What little remains of Planner’s oeuvre indicates that he created both religious and secular works. Rosenberg mentions three of the metalsmith’s objects in his 1911 compendium cited above, and a fourth, in his subsequent 1923 publication. The secular works he names include a Trinkbecher, or drinking cup, in the shape of a woman that had belonged to Baron Karl v. Rothschild of Frankfurt am Main, until the baron’s death in 1886, and a “vergoldetes Besteckfutteral” or gold-plated cutlery case, that belongs to the Kunstgewerbe Museum in Berlin. The extant objects of liturgical function include a monstrance that was sold from the collection of Christian Hammer at the Heberle auction in 1893 and a “vergoldetes ciborium, mit aufgelegten durchbrochenen silherversörungen,” or gold-plated ciborium with silver, decorative overlay of 1720 to 1730 that belonged to the treasury of a Catholic church in Pielenhofen.

---

1568 Glanville, Silver, 83.
1569 Rosenberg cites that Planner is listed in guild registry.
1570 Rosenberg, Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen (1911), 476; Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen (1923), 337. Heights of some objects attributed to Planner that Rosenberg mentions measure as follows: Rothschild drinking cup (20.7 cm), Christian Hammer monstrance (30 cm), and cutlery case (22 cm wide). Only the 1923 publication mentions the ciborium attributed to Planner.
1571 For an example of a drinking cup in the shape of a woman by a Nuremberg goldsmith that may have been of a type similar to that Rosenberg describes for Planner, see Redslob, Deutsche Goldschmiedeplastik, 40, cat. no. 47.
Germany. Although this number of surviving objects might seem small, in comparison to extant examples that Rosenberg lists for Planner’s known contemporaries in Munich, the count is actually one of the largest.\textsuperscript{1572} The lack of works related to specific baroque goldsmiths from Munich may stem from the fact that objects of precious metal were often melted down, particularly in times of war.\textsuperscript{1573} Additionally, the makers’ marks of some objects may no longer be legible enough to associate specific works with particular goldsmiths. Another possibility for the seeming lack of surviving works is that other, anonymous ones do exist in church treasuries or in private collections. Such has been the case with the baroque chalice that belongs to Rockhurst University’s Van Ackeren Collection of Religious Art. Rosenberg did not include the vessel in his inventory lists for Planner, nor, has it been, until now, the subject of a close analysis.

In 2001, Günther Schiedlausky, formerly of the Germanisches Nationalmuseum in Nuremberg, released a state of the research on the study of German goldsmiths and their art.\textsuperscript{1574} In his essay, Schiedlausky argued that the subject lagged behind other art historical studies, likely because of its traditional status as a decorative art, but that the topic was deserving of far more scholarly attention than it had thus far received.\textsuperscript{1575} Indeed, with the exception of Nuremberg’s renowned Wenzel Jamnitzer (d. 1585), the majority of German goldsmiths, like

\textsuperscript{1572} Like Planner, a few goldsmiths, such as Christoph Steinbacher (1719-1746), have four objects attributed to them. However, the majority have less. See Rosenberg, \textit{Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen (1911)}, 476-77.
\textsuperscript{1575} Schiedlausky observed that museum curators, archivists, and private collectors, rather than scholars, were primarily responsible for leading research efforts on the subject of German goldsmiths and their works. During the 1990s topics of regional interest were explored, as museums featured exhibitions of locally produced works in precious metals. Ibid., 380, 389.
Felix Planner, have been overlooked in the literature. Schiedlausky noted that a period of goldsmith production most in need of research was that which took place during the eighteenth-century, particularly in venues, such as Munich, that scholars have overlooked. As an object that a Munich goldsmith made during the early eighteenth-century, this chalice presents an intersection of two areas that require more study. Therefore, the close assessment of this work offers an opportunity to contribute to its place in the scholarly discourse, while also adding a previously unknown object to the goldsmith’s corpus. Further, this essay will constitute a rare example in English on the subject of German baroque metalwork.

14. Felix Planner

*Baroque Chalice*

1707

Gold and silver with gilding

Height: 25.4 cm (10 7/8 in.)
Rim diam.: 10 cm (3 15/16 in.); Base diam.: 17.78 cm (7 in.)

A gift of the Robert C. Greenlease Family

Provenance: Collection of Charles Bolles Rogers, to Robert C. Greenlease family, between 1967

---


1577 After Munich, Schiedlausky cited the following cities as deserving of attention: Dresden, Leipzig, Halle, Ulm, Freiburg, Regensburg, Aachen, Stuttgart, Constance, as well as the topic of goldsmiths from Hamburg and Bremen, who were active in Vienna. See Schiedlausky, "Betrachtungen zur Geschichte," 391.

1578 Rosenberg, *Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen* (1911), 476; *Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen* (1923), 337.
and 1971.

Description: This German baroque chalice is decorated with cavorting putti, fluttering banderoles, arabesque foliage, fruit, floral bouquets, and six oval medallions that are filled with bust reliefs of holy figures.\footnote{Braun, Der christliche Altar, 3: 17, 127-40, 189; Henmarck, The Art of the European Silversmith, 1: 313-16.} The vessel is comprised of a cup, stem, and foot, or base, with openwork silver sheathing forming a basket that covers the lower two-thirds of the gold cup. A 3.175 cm (1 1/4-inch) band of gold remains exposed at the cup’s flared rim.\footnote{German Jesuit scholar Joseph Braun (1857-1947) uses the term korb, or basket, to describe the decorative metalwork that covers the outside surface of the chalice’s cup. See Braun, Der Christliche Altar, 3: 133; Henmarck, The Art of the European Silversmith, 1, 306-13.} The juxtaposition of the decorative silver overlay against a gold background creates contrast and texture that lends a sumptuous effect exemplary of the German baroque period during which this chalice was produced.

Of the six framed medallions, three depicting Mary, Joseph, and the young Christ appear on the cup, with the remainder showing the prophetess Anna, Simeon the Elder, and the young Saint John the Baptist, on the base. The middle of the stem is articulated with an inverted pear-shaped knop cast in silver and incised with three cherubic faces. Below the knop, the rest of the chalice is rendered in repoussé, a technique in which a sheet of metal is hammered and shaped from the reverse to create relief images that protrude from the surface.\footnote{Glanville, Silver, 87-89.} The raised areas are then cold-chased, or worked with tools, to render more precisely the figural and decorative detailing. A one-half inch rim extends from the chalice’s hexagonal base and mirrors the contour of its six scalloped edges.\footnote{For a description of chalice footprints, ranging in shape from circular to polyfoil, or many-lobed, see Henmarck, The Art of the European Silversmith, 1: 307.} This shape, also known as a hexafoil, is decorated with a sparse S-scroll pattern that differs markedly in its simplicity from the remainder of the vessel’s more elaborate decoration.
The equal number of figures presented on the cup and the chalice’s foot creates a sense of visual and numerical symmetry, with each trio pairing a boy, woman, and man. However, the physical juxtaposition that originally existed between the figures above and those below remains a question, since the oval images on the cup shift in relation to those on the base according to how tightly, or loosely, the screw that connects the top and bottom is turned. Therefore, one can only hypothesize how the figures were originally aligned. The juncture where the upper and lower portions of the chalice are joined is located at a horizontal platform of silver acanthus leaves that extends from the stem just below the central knop and measures 4.7625 cm (1 7/8 inch) in diameter. The screw that joins the segments is visible from within the hollow stem, when viewed from underneath.

The three-quarter bust reliefs are unified compositionally. Each figure is posed frontally in a classicizing medallion frame comprised of four banded sections of fifteen to twenty laurel leaves, each of which is distinctively incised with a variegated pattern. At the apex of each frame, a tulip bloom appears in profile. The figures all have similarly patterned haloes that symbolize an individual’s sanctity. The coronas are rendered as dotted segments that form single wavy lines, interspersed between a set of straight, parallel extensions that radiate outwards from the heads. Each figure wears a gown that gathers in folds at the neckline, except for the young Saint John the Baptist, who dons a cloak that drapes over his right shoulder and leaves his arms and chest exposed. Excluding their borders, the medallions each measure approximately 4.1275 x 3.4925 cm (1 5/8 x 1 3/8 in.) and alternate with putti that are 5.715 cm (2 1/4 in.) in height. Carefully articulated groupings of leaves, grapes, pomegranates, oranges, and, perhaps, apples are arranged between the putti’s cherubic faces. With three medallions on the cup, three on the base, and three putti interspersed in between each, as well as three more cherubic faces on the
stem, the figures’ placement is carefully balanced. The repetition of the number three also references the Holy Trinity.

The cup features three members of the Holy Family. Jesus appears as a five- or six-year-old child, with bangs that hang unevenly across his forehead and hair that falls below his shoulders in abundant waves [Cat. no. 14]. Over his gown, he wears a thick, undecorated cloak with lapels and wide, oval cuffs. With his right middle and index fingers, Jesus forms a blessing gesture. His right hand is awkwardly rendered, appearing disproportionately large for his immature physique. Perhaps, the artist intended for his hand to be larger, in order to be more legible, since Christ’s gesture is of a special significance. With his left forearm positioned horizontally in front of him, Jesus uses his left hand to balance a small cross, which symbolizes his eventual sacrifice. The Virgin Mary gazes downwards as she touches her fingertips together near her sternum, perhaps as a sign of prayer and contemplation over her son’s fate [Cat. no. 14.1]. Like the Christ figure, Mary’s right hand appears more clumsily rendered than her left, with the palm looking bulbous from the side. Thick, twisted tendrils of hair fall to her shoulders from underneath her mantle. With no clear-cut part on the scalp, Mary’s tresses sweep across her forehead in one continuous segment. The Virgin wears the most elaborate cloak of all of the figures, which signifies her importance as the Mother of God. With its intertwining vegetal forms, her mantle is ornately decorated to mimic a pomegranate textile design. However, the tiny pattern is not easily perceived with the naked eye, in part because it has been worn away with handling. The third figure on the cup is Saint Joseph, who has a thick, curly beard and long hair. With his right hand, he grasps a blooming staff, an attribute that identifies him as the Virgin Mary’s husband [Cat. no. 14.2]. Joseph’s body is enveloped in a thick mantle that folds back on itself to create lapels. The cloth is embellished with clusters of five small, solid dots that
encircle a central punch mark to form rosettes.

Just as the three figures portrayed on the cup are united thematically, so, too, are those on the base, as each holy figure represented there recognized Christ as the Messiah. Saint John the Baptist’s youthful appearance serves as a juvenile counterpart to his cousin’s depiction on the cup [Cat. no. 14.3]. The fabric of John’s cape is articulated with a repeating pattern of clustered circles, perhaps grapes that reference the wine that this chalice was intended to hold. A leather-like strap crosses his chest diagonally, defining the edge of a triangular segment of fur that partially covers his left torso. With his left arm pressed to his side, the young Baptist holds the narrow, vertical pole of a cross between the thumb and index finger of his left hand. A banner hangs over the cross’s horizontal beam. With his right index finger, Saint John points to his left in the direction of Simeon, which might be considered unusual, since he typically uses this gesture to single out Christ. The aged prophet Simeon acts as the figural counterpart to Joseph and also shares with him a similar appearance, having a beard and long hair and using his right hand to grasp a staff, albeit not one that blossoms [Cat. no. 14.4]. Simeon’s forehead is deeply grooved and his cheeks are slightly sunken, to indicate that he is older than Mary’s husband. The lapel and sleeves of Simeon’s cloak are punched with dots that form loosely arranged and overlapping, inverted semi-circles. With his left hand, he presses a thick, closed book against his chest. The tome’s pages are fully articulated and its leather-like cover has a plain, rectangular border. However, its inclusion is anachronistic, since the codex had not yet been invented during Simeon’s life. Of the chalice’s six bust reliefs, the artist seems to have struggled most with fitting Simeon and his two attributes in the oval frame. The third figure depicted on the stem is the prophetess Anna, whose sagging eyelids and gaunt cheeks make her the most aged of all the biblical figures represented [Cat. no. 14.5]. As is appropriate for a matron, Anna wears a wimple
that covers her neck and frames her face in a tight swath of fabric. The pattern that embellishes the outside of her mantle is no longer distinguishable, but the inside lining is decorated with parallel, diagonal lines of dots.

While the aged Anna serves as a visual foil to the youthful Mary, she also presents a counterbalance to Simeon. Each holds a book; but, while Simeon’s is closed and pressed against his chest to his left, Anna’s is open and held in front of her torso, and to her right side. Since Anna’s book is open, the viewer can see that it is inscribed with text, specifically, the alphabet. The female prophet points with her right index finger to the left page, where the letters ‘A’ through ‘G’, are shown, with the exception of ‘F’, which her left thumb seemingly covers, as she supports the book with her left arm. On the book’s opposite page only the letter ‘M’ appears.

Centered between each set of medallions is a pudgy, winged cherub. Windswept locks of hair top their expressive faces and a navel punctuates each portly belly. The putti have plump cheeks, pronounced chins, and skin that creases into folds at the neck, wrist, torso, and hip. The cherub’s genitals are cleverly covered, either by a thigh, garland, or acanthus tendril. With feathered wings spread at full span and arms outstretched, the angelic figures intertwine their chubby arms through the surrounding leafy tendrils and touch their fingertips to the adjacent medallion borders. With torsos twisting, heads inclining, and limbs bending differently, the putti’s varied poses lend visual interest to this chalice. On the base, the three cherubic figures stabilize themselves by stretching their arms and straddling a garland that is suspended from acanthus leaves that sprout from the top of the relief medallions. The three cherubic faces on the stem’s knop are positioned frontally and depicted with less variation than their full-figured counterparts. A fabric bib drapes below each putto’s chin and the tips of spread wings fan out behind their leonine tresses.
Near the gold cup’s rim, the letter ‘G’ is imprinted within a set of concentric diamond shapes, and on the vessel’s base appear the letters ‘F’ and ‘P’ [Cat. 14.6]. The former, called the hallmark, shows that the local guild certified the metal’s quality, and the latter is a maker’s mark, which is the creator’s signature stamp. Located 2.8575 cm (1 1/8 in.) to the left of the author’s initials is a third stamp showing a geometricized figure of a monk, or Münch, which associates the object with the city of München, or Munich [Cat. no. 14.7]. Two concentric circles form the monk’s head and hood, although the latter looks more like a halo. The figure’s rectangular, ankle-length, dolman-sleeved gown tapers outward at the hem and his feet appear in profile, with toes pointing outward in opposite directions. The monk stands in an orant position, with both arms bent at the elbow, forearms parallel to the head, and fingertips pointed upward. The words “Simon Erhardt Ver[eh]rt Seinem Sohn P. Theo[uaia?] disen Kelch Zu der Prim[?] A. 1707” are engraved along the circumference underneath the chalice’s base [Cat.nos. 14.8]. The spelling of “disen” is an antiquated form of German for diesen, or this. Thus the phrase translates to: “Simon Erhardt bestows upon his son P. Theo[uaia?] this chalice for the first [?] A. 1707.”

*Condition Description:* With the exception of its few smooth surfaces, all areas of the chalice show superficial wear. The faces of the three members of the Holy Family depicted in the medallions appear darker in color around their chins, noses, and brows. The textile patterns on

---

1583 For an explanation of the hallmark and maker’s mark, see Helmut Seleng and Helga Domdey-Knodler, *Europäische Stadtmarken die Sie nicht verwechseln sollten: Typologie alter Goldschmiedemarken* (Munich: Beck, 1984), 11-12; Glanville, *Silver*, 86.

1584 Images of the city inspection marks that were used in Munich from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries appear in Rosenberg, *Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen (1911)*, 469, esp. fig. 2253; *Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen (1923)*, 317; Howard Pitcher Okie, *Old Silver and Old Sheffield Plate* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., 1928), 342.
the saintly figures’ clothing are somewhat worn, although their varied designs are still
discernible with magnification. The chalice’s stem and base appear to have been inexpertly re-
gilded in the spaces surrounding the repoussé figures. The base was cut unevenly along a score
line that defines the circumference and the rim has buckled to form a wavy profile. There are
two round, small punctures in the rim that, perhaps were made by nails. One is located under the
medallion of Anna and measures .47625 cm (3/16 inch). The other is positioned on the opposite
side of the stem underneath a putto and is .125 cm (1/8 inch wide).

Underneath the base, *vert de gris* has settled into the engraved letters and the date stamp.
A fissure separates the artist’s initials ‘F P’. Prior repairs interrupt the incised inscription.
Specifically, there is a lighter-colored metallic mend (possibly pewter) to a crack in the middle of
the word “Verhert,” where the letters “h” and part of “e” are blocked out, and another blemish
that covers the “1” in the date 1707. Additionally, the upper portion of the “E” in Erhardt, “S” in
Sohn, and the last three to four letters of the son’s name are cut out. The remainder of the
inscription remains legible.

*Attribution and Date:* This chalice stands out as the only object in the Van Ackeren collection
that bears secure, physical proof of its temporal, geographical, and artistic origin.\(^{1585}\) On the
underside of the vessel’s base appear a maker’s mark, an inscribed date, and a *Beschauzeichen*,
or city inspection stamp; each affirms the other in terms of date and location. The maker’s mark

---

\(^{1585}\) The assay system was strictly supervised and connected to a duty that was paid for an object of precious metal
that weighed thirty-five grams or more. As art historian and German goldsmith expert Helmut Seling points out,
since, from the sixteenth century onward in Germany, the system was under strict guild regulation and enforced by
political agents, the stamps used in the process provide information regarding the object’s place of origin and author,
that is generally more secure than dates and signatures inscribed on most every other form of art. See Seling and
comprises the initials “F.P.”, which are rendered in a stylized script that flares at the vertical and horizontal tips of each letter. The darkened oval shapes that encase each letter are conjoined at their inside middle edges and subtly pointed at each peak. This design matches the stamp that Rosenberg (1911, 1923) associates with the goldsmith Felix Planner, who, as we have seen above, was active in Munich, Germany from 1698 to 1738.\(^{1586}\) The inscribed date of 1707 falls within this time frame and correlates with the city inspection mark of an abstractly configured monk, or München, which as described above, associates the object with München, or Munich, where Planner worked.\(^{1587}\) The particular design of the inspection mark varied subtly over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In this instance, the “X” shape of the monk’s arms and sleeves corresponds precisely with the type that was used only in the first decade of the eighteenth century, which further validates the inscribed date.\(^{1588}\)

The chalice also stands out as the only object in the collection that provides information regarding its patron, as well as the person for whom the object was made. An inscription in German that appears underneath the base identifies the former as Simon Erhardt, and the latter as his son, whose full name is not legible. A preliminary search into the identity of these two individuals has not proven fruitful, but perhaps further investigation on the subject in the future will uncover more biographical information pertaining to them. This study has, for the first time, interpreted and correlated the stamps and inscriptions on the chalice to indicate that, in 1707,

\(^{1586}\) Rosenberg, Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen (1911), 476, 981, fig. 2291.
\(^{1587}\) Images of the city inspection marks that were used in Munich from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries appear in ibid., 469, esp. fig. 2253; Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen (1923), 317; Okie, Old Silver and Old Sheffield Plate, 342.
\(^{1588}\) The monk figure that is considered to be Munich’s trademark first appeared on a document of 28 May 1239. Typically, he is depicted wearing a black, hooded garment with long, pointed sleeves and red shoes and holding a red book in his left hand. The stamps were too small to include the detail of a book, but the garment and body position appear similar to this original figure. Images of Munich’s inspection marks from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries appear in Rosenberg, Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen (1911), 469; Der Goldschmiede Merkzeichen (1923), 317; Okie, Old Silver and Old Sheffield Plate, 342.
Simon Erhardt commissioned Munich goldsmith, Felix Planner, to create this work for Erhardt’s son, Theo[?], who presumably was a priest.

**Iconography:** The chalice is one of the most important liturgical objects used during the celebration of the Eucharist. Its purpose is to hold wine that, according to Catholic belief, changes into the blood of Christ as a result of the miracle of transubstantiation. The Catholic Mass in part commemorates the Last Supper, when Jesus shared a meal with his apostles the night before he was arrested. It also honors Christ’s death on the cross. Appropriately, this chalice’s iconography complements its ritual and liturgical function. For instance, the *vinum de vite*, or sacramental wine made from grapes that the cup held during the celebration of the Eucharist, is symbolized in the form of miniature grape bunches that are articulated on the stem below the acanthus ledge and on the knop, where they appear in between the putti’s heads. The Crucifixion is also alluded to through the crosses that Jesus and Saint John the Baptist each hold and from the Virgin’s contemplative demeanor, as she intuits her son’s destiny.

The grouping together of images of Mary, Jesus, and Joseph on the cup unites them symbolically as members of the Holy Family. Each is portrayed in a pose or with an attribute that makes them easily identifiable. The young Christ balances an orb on his left palm and raises his right hand in a gesture of blessing known as the *Majestas Domini*. Christians adopted the former symbol, which was associated with Christian monarchs, for depictions of Christ to denote

---

his divinity, power, and sovereignty over the world.\footnote{1591} Joseph holds his attribute, a flowering staff, which recalls the moment of his miraculous selection as Mary’s husband. This story is narrated in the Apocrypha and was popularized, beginning in the Middle Ages, through its recounting in the thirteenth-century \textit{Golden Legend} by Jacobus Voragine.\footnote{1592} The pairing of Joseph and Mary reflects their married status and role as Christ’s earthly guardians. The Virgin’s elaborate gown demonstrates her importance as a holy figure. The swirling vegetal motifs that make up the garment’s pomegranate textile pattern are the most elaborate of all designs rendered on the chalice.

Three, previously unidentified, figures depicted on the base can now be identified for the first time as the young Saint John the Baptist, and the prophets Anna and Simeon.\footnote{1593} Just as the cup’s three figures are linked together as members of Holy Family, those depicted on the base share a common purpose. Each recognized Christ’s divinity, and thus, presaged his role as the Messiah. Of the trio, Saint John the Baptist was the first to recognize Jesus as the Savior. According to the Evangelist Luke, John stirred in his mother, Elizabeth’s womb, when she met her cousin the Virgin Mary, who was pregnant with Christ (Luke 1:39-45).\footnote{1594} During another

\footnote{1591}Although not depicted on the Greenlease chalice, a cross often surmounted the orb. A sixteenth-century example of this object appears in Eikelmann, Schommers, and Seelig, \textit{Studien zur europäischen Goldschmiedekunst}, 16-17, cat. nos. 1-2. Images of Christ in all stages of his life incorporated this symbol, and, as the Greenlease depiction of Christ exemplifies, the globe is always held in the left hand. See Schiller, \textit{Iconography of Christian Art}, 1: 93; Diane Apostolos-Cappadonna, \textit{Dictionary of Christian Art} (New York: Continuum, 1994), 262.


\footnote{1593}Until now, the figures depicted on the base have been referred to on the gallery label and elsewhere as Saint John the Baptist and “two unidentified saints.”

\footnote{1594}Luke 1: 41-44 states, “When Elizabeth heard Mary’s greeting, the infant [John the Baptist] leaped in her womb, and Elizabeth, filled with the Holy Spirit, cried out in a loud voice and said, “Most blessed are you among women and blessed is the fruit of your womb…For at the moment the sound of your greeting reached my ears, the infant in my womb leaped for joy….”
encounter, when Saint John and his cousin met as adults along the river Jordan in Bethany, the Baptist proclaimed, “Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world…Now I have seen and testified that he is the Son of God” (John 1: 29, 34).\footnote{1595}

Anna and Simeon, who are often paired together as they are here, also witnessed Christ’s divinity when he was presented at the temple (Luke 2:22-40), as they are in Ambrogio Lorenzetti’s 1342 painting of the subject for Siena Cathedral.\footnote{1596} Luke’s gospel relates that the eighty-four-year-old Anna, the daughter of Phanuel from the tribe of Asher, was a widow who lived in the temple, where she fasted and prayed continuously after the death of her husband of seven years (Luke 2:37-38). Luke narrates her encounter with the infant Christ stating, “And coming forward at that very time, [Anna] gave thanks to God and spoke about the child to all who were awaiting the redemption of Jerusalem” (Luke 2: 37-8). Luke describes the aged Simeon as a devout man from Jerusalem, who would “not see death before he had seen the Messiah” (Luke 2:26). When the Holy Family arrived at the temple, Simeon took the child into his arms, blessed him, and, recognizing the infant as the Savior, announced that he was now prepared to die.\footnote{1597} This specific combination of images lends iconographic depth, with Anna, Simeon, and Saint John the Baptist, who all recognized Christ’s divinity, serving as

\footnote{1595} The previous day, John had been performing baptisms in the river Jordan, at which time he predicted the arrival of “[o]ne mightier” (Matthew 3:11, Mark 1:7). This event also foretold Christ’s arrival.\footnote{1596} Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, 1: 90-94; Apostolos-Cappadonna, *Dictionary of Christian Art*, 81-82, 281-82; Toni Craven, “Anna 2,” in *Women in Scripture*, ed. Carol Meyers, Toni Craven, and Ross S. Kraemer (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2000), 50-51.\footnote{1597} At encountering the infant Christ, Simeon proclaims, “Now, Master, you may let your servant go in peace, according to your word, for my eyes have seen your salvation…” (Luke 2: 27-32), and then, predicting the child’s greatness, the old prophet proclaimed to Mary, “Behold, this child is destined for the fall and rise of many in Israel…” (Luke 2: 34).
counterpoints respectively to Mary, Joseph, and Jesus, all members of the Holy Family. In addition, with the exception of John the Baptist, who played no role in the story, the other figures make up a deconstructed “Presentation in the Temple.” Further, in its placement near the inscribed name of the object’s donor, the prophet’s repoussé image shows an onomastic connection between Simeon and the chalice’s patron, Simon Erhardt.

Although they took place on separate occasions, the rituals of the presentation of a male child, which, according to Jewish practice, took place forty days after birth, and his circumcision, which occurred eight days after birth, were often conflated in works of Christian art. In the case of this chalice, this point is significant, because the portrayal of Simeon and Anna would also reference the circumcision, which, since it symbolized the first shedding of Christ’s blood, Christians believed initiated Christ’s Passion. As a vessel that was intended to commemorate Christ’s sacrifice on the cross, by holding his blood, this aspect of the chalice’s iconography fully complements its liturgical function.

Each figure on the chalice’s base is depicted with an attribute that confirms his or her identity. As has been traditional since the tenth century, Simeon appears as a Jewish priest, holding a staff that references the rod of Moses’ brother Aaron, the first priest to the Hebrews. While the books that Simeon and Anna hold probably were meant to symbolize their roles as prophets, the depiction of these tomes, which Michelangelo also included in his

1598 Braun, Der Christliche Altar, 3: 187. Braun relates that Old Testament themes were often rendered on the chalice base. Although Anna, Simeon, and Saint John the Baptist are not Old Testament figures, they nevertheless serve a similar function, just as in the Sistine chapel’s wall frescoes, which juxtapose an Old Testament pictorial cycle across from one of the New Testament, in order to demonstrate how one foretold the other.

1599 Apostolos-Cappadonna, Dictionary of Christian Art, 81-82, 281-82.


1601 Schiller, Iconography of Christian Art, 1: 92.
depiction of prophets on the Sistine Chapel’s ceiling, are anachronistic, not to mention unorthodox. Instead, scrolls, or *volumen*, would have been used in the temple at the time of Christ’s presentation and prophets nearly always are depicted holding scrolls.\textsuperscript{1602}

We have seen that on the chalice, John the Baptist is portrayed as a youthful counterpart to Jesus. The young Saint John wears a hair shirt and leather belt, attire that the gospels (Matthew 3:4 and Mark 1:6) associate with him. However, instead of wrapping around the waist as the Evangelists describe, on the German chalice, the belt extends from his right shoulder and down across his chest. Saint John is also depicted with his attribute, a staff that is shaped like a cross and draped with a banner. Typically, the band of cloth would be inscribed with the Latin phrase “Ecce Agnus Dei,” or “Behold the Lamb of God,” the words that the Baptist spoke at the river Jordan when he recognized his cousin’s divinity, but Planner’s banner was likely too narrow for him to include the phrase.\textsuperscript{1603} Besides, the script would have been too small to be legible. Nevertheless, with or without the biblical inscription, the banner stands as a reference to the Baptist’s recognition of Christ as the Son of God. Another important element that identifies the Baptist is his pose. His forearm is positioned horizontally across his torso and his index finger points to the side. In Crucifixion scenes, such as in the Isenheim Altarpiece by Matthias Grünwald (1470-1528) the Baptist is portrayed pointing at the Crucifixion in order to direct the viewer’s attention.\textsuperscript{1604} Since the Baptist was dead at the time of the Christ’s death, his inclusion in the scene is symbolic of when, from his mother’s womb, Saint John identified Christ, who was in Mary’s womb, as the Savior. In the Greenlease example, however, the Baptist points instead toward Simeon the Elder, whose image occupies the adjacent medallion. While this


\textsuperscript{1603} Apostolos-Cappadonna, *Dictionary of Christian Art*, 185-86.

\textsuperscript{1604} A well-known example that depicts Saint John the Baptist pointing at Christ as he hangs on the cross is found in Mathias Grünwald’s Isenheim Altarpiece of 1515 (Musée d’Unterlinden, Colmar).
juxtaposition may seem unusual, there are similar instances in which artists have depicted the Baptist pointing at someone other than Christ, also while holding a reed cross with a banderole. One example is found on the domed ceiling over the high altar in the church of S. Zaccaria in Venice, where Andrea del Castagno’s fresco of 1442 shows Saint John the Baptist pointing his right index finger at Saint Matthew, who is depicted in the neighboring ceiling partition. Considering these examples, it seems probable that the pose itself served as one of his identifying attributes, and one that a viewer would associate with him singling Christ out as the Savior. In contrast to Christ, whose figure appears most often on chalices, Saint John the Baptist was not a common element in the decoration of this type of liturgical implement. Therefore, the portrayal of the Baptist on the Greenlease example seems to be rare.

Format and Function: This early eighteenth-century chalice by Felix Planner adheres to the Roman Missal’s guideline, which stipulates that the only appropriate materials for such a sacred liturgical object are gold and silver, the two mediums of which this vessel is made. The synod of Ypern (1629) determined that gold was the only appropriate material for the chalice’s cup, because the inside comes into direct contact with consecrated wine and, therefore, should be

---

1605 Castagno’s figure also holds a reed cross with a banderole inscribed with the aforementioned phrase, “Ecce Agnus Dei.”
1606 Braun, Der Christliche Altar, 3: 179.
1607 Ibid., 187. Braun mentions only one chalice of which he is aware that depicts Saint John the Baptist. The vessel belongs to the cathedral in Plock, located in central Poland. Perhaps the Baptist’s portrayal on this chalice relates to the increased importance of the sacrament of baptism for southern Germans during the baroque period. For instance, contemporary church records show a heightened concern on the part of parishioners to have their newborn children quickly baptized. However, there is no way of knowing whether or not this point factored into the decision to include Saint John in the iconographic program. See Marc R. Forster, Catholic Revival in the Age of the Baroque: Religious Identity in Southwest Germany 1550-1750 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 109; Frank Matthias Kammel, "Sinnlichkeit und Reglement: Kunst nach den Reformen der katolischen Kirche," in Renaissance Barock Aufklärung: Kunst und Kultur vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert, ed. Daniel Hess and Dagmar Hirschfelder (Nuremberg: Verlag des Germanischen Nationalmuseum, 2010), 124-37.
1608 Braun, Der Christliche Altar, 3:18.
made of the most precious material available.\textsuperscript{1609} However, it was stipulated that the cup’s exterior could be decorated with other materials, such as ivory, crystal, gems, or, as in the case of the Greenlease vessel, silver.\textsuperscript{1610} During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, numerous synods addressed the topic of chalice materials and decoration. The issue arose from the instance of poorer parishes in the countryside using glass or wooden chalices. It was determined that, due to its fragility, glass was insufficient, and wood was inappropriate because of the impossibility of keeping a vessel made of this medium properly cleaned. Pewter, copper, bronze, and brass were also deemed unacceptable materials in the subsequent synods of Bresslau (1580), Ermland (1610), Ossnerbruck (1629), and Cologne (1651). Fines were charged to those who did not comply, although the synod of Paderborn (1688) resulted in an accommodation that allowed poor parishes to use less expensive materials until they were able to afford a proper replacement.\textsuperscript{1611} Even in 1707, the year that Felix Planner fashioned this work, members of a synod held in Bresçon continued to ponder the topic of materials suitable for chalices.

During Mass, the chalice was always used in conjunction with a paten, a shallow dish for the bread that is blessed alongside the wine that becomes the consecrated Host, or body of Christ.\textsuperscript{1612} Since the chalice and paten are united in their liturgical function, they are usually designed in pairs. However, patens had a lower survival rate than chalices, possibly because the dish was easier to pilfer. This circumstance has resulted in mismatched sets, in which newer patens are paired with older chalices and vice versa.\textsuperscript{1613} Although there is no known paten with which the Van Ackeren vessel can be associated, it is reasonable to assume that the

\textsuperscript{1609} Ibid. The synod determined that it was also acceptable for a cup to be gold plated. Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1610} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1611} Ibid., 47.
\textsuperscript{1612} Henmarck, \textit{The Art of the European Silversmith}, 1; Braun, \textit{Der Christliche Altar}, 3:17.
\textsuperscript{1613} Henmarck, \textit{The Art of the European Silversmith}, 1:313-15.
corresponding paten’s decoration complemented that of the chalice. Parishioners usually received Holy Communion only once a year at Easter, at which time the sacramental wine would have been offered in a cup much more modest than the one in the Van Ackeren Collection. Only the lips of a priest or an aristocrat would have touched the rim of such a cup. Therefore, the average congregant’s experience of this chalice, would have been one of viewing the object from afar and seen best when the celebrant elevated the cup during the consecration of the wine.

Chalice shapes have changed over time. Early vessels were squat, with a short stem and wide brim and had handles. By the gothic period, the grips disappeared and the ratio in measurement between the respective heights of the cup and stem changed, which lengthened proportions. Beginning in the seventeenth century, the cup’s diameter decreased as the chalice’s height increased to create a more elegant profile that today remains the traditional form, and one that church strictures prohibit artists from altering. Whether the goldsmith was Catholic or Protestant, he would have followed strict guidelines set forth by the Catholic Church. From the seventeenth century onwards, the chalice’s height was doubled to measure twenty to twenty-five centimeters. At 25.4 cm (10 7/8 in.) in height, the example by Planner falls in the taller spectrum of this scale.

With its flared rim, this chalice’s silhouette is distinctive of German baroque taste. Because it resembles a blooming tulip, the shape is referred to as a tulip cup, a type that became

---

1614 Braun, Der christliche Altar, 3:552.
1615 Ibid.; Forster, Catholic Revival, 111.
1616 Braun, Der christliche Altar, 3, 127-32.
1617 Ibid., 18.
1618 The destitute state in which parishes were left instigated a building boom which encouraged a refurbishing of interior spaces, by local benefactors. The period therefore saw an increased production of liturgical works such as the Greenlease chalice. The quantity and quality of interior furnishings and accoutrement mirrored the growth in sacral landscape building. See ibid., 132 n. 84.
1619 Ibid., 33. The ratio between the rim’s diameter and the chalice’s height measure in proportions ranging from 1:2 ¼ to 1: 3 ¼.
especially popular toward the end of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{1620} The design received its inspiration from the arrival in Europe of tulips from Turkey during the mid-sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{1621} While the tulip had no scent or medicinal purpose, the flower was treasured for its beautiful form and exotic origin.\textsuperscript{1622} Being imported from afar, this floral species was costly to obtain, and thus considered precious and exclusive to the wealthy.\textsuperscript{1623} Munich, where this chalice was made, had a particular regional connection to this select flower, because nearby Augsburg was renowned for having some of the earliest tulip gardens in Europe.\textsuperscript{1624} Clearly, the tulip inspired Planner’s design, not only in the cup’s shape, but also in the rendering of the bloom that appears in profile at the apex of each oval frame. The tulip’s arrival in Europe coincided with a heightened interest in gardening and floral decoration among the social elite. The popularity of this hobby impacted the designs of German goldsmiths, who, responding to their patron’s interests, began to create compositions laden with more fruit and flora, acanthus leaves in particular.\textsuperscript{1625} All of these elements are evident in the Greenlease chalice’s embellishment, which shows that Planner’s design clearly adhered to contemporary preferences.\textsuperscript{1626}

Another aspect of this vessel that is indicative of the German baroque style is the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{1620}] Braun, \textit{Der christliche Altar}, 3: 133.
\item[\textsuperscript{1621}] Henmarck, \textit{The Art of the European Silversmith}, 1: 57. For the history of the tulip’s introduction into Europe and the popularity of gardening during the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries, and effect of compositional preferences for works of art, see Anne Goldgar, \textit{Tulipmania: Money, Honor, and Knowledge in the Dutch Golden Age}. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007; Hochstrasser, \textit{Still Life}, 2007. As an indicator for the heightened interest in gardening during this era, Goldgar estimates that, over twenty times more plants were imported into Europe during the sixteenth century, than had been introduced in the prior 2000 years.
\item[\textsuperscript{1622}] Goldgar, \textit{Tulipmania}, 28-61. An indication of the tulip’s expense and precious nature, gardens had to be protected because tulip bulbs were often stolen from them.
\item[\textsuperscript{1623}] Ibid., 50-52. Botanist Conrad Gesner reported in April 1559 that Augsburg magistrate Johann Heinrich Herwart had a “red lily” in his garden. The Fuggers, Augsburg bankers to European royalty, also grew tulips.
\item[\textsuperscript{1624}] Ibid., 32-36.
\item[\textsuperscript{1625}] For a synopsis of the trend, see Henmarck, \textit{The Art of the European Silversmith}, 1: 53-58. For a more comprehensive overview, see Goldgar, \textit{Tulipmania}.
\item[\textsuperscript{1626}] A description of silver and gold chalices by Franz Kessler, a contemporary of Planner’s in Munich, include elements similar to those found in the Greenlease example, such as “Akanthus, Blumen u. Engelsköpchen,” or acanthus, flowers, and cherub’s heads. See "Franz Kessler," 213.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
inverted, pear-shaped knop, or node, located on the stem. This component was incorporated into the chalice’s structure during the second half of the seventeenth and into the early eighteenth centuries. Additional baroque elements include the bell-shaped base; the hexafoil, or six-scalloped edge, foot; the inclusion of putti; and the portrayal of holy figures in an oval-framed, three-quarter bust format. The depiction of saints in medallions reflected the period’s popular format for secular portraiture. The cup’s gilding and silver openwork sheathing, or “basket,” which overlays the gold cup, are also indicative of the period, with the use of contrasting gold and silver on the vessel reflecting the baroque preference for sumptuous decoration.

Context: After the culmination in 1648 of the Thirty Years War, which took place on German soil and involved in its campaigns Austria, Spain, France, and Sweden, Germany’s parishes were left destitute as rulers had confiscated and soldiers had plundered liturgical objects, which were melted down for their precious metals. The dire situation left church treasuries barren and requiring replenishment, a need often answered through the beneficence of local patrons.

---

1627 The knop has taken on a variety of shapes over time. For examples of baroque German chalices with a pear-shaped knop and basketwork similar to that of the Greenlease chalice see Helmut Seling, *Die Kunst der Augsburger Goldschmiede 1529-1868* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1980), fig. 290; Peter Elias H. Füllenbach and Pater Antonin Walter, eds., *St. Andreas in Düsseldorf Die Hofkirche und ihre Schätze zum 350. Geburtstag des Kurfürsten Johann Wilhelm von der Pfalz* (Düsseldorf: Grupello Verlag, 2008), 2: cat. nos. 61-63, 66.


1631 The Thirty Years War started when the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II of Bohemia tried to limit the religious activities of his subjects, which led to a Protestant rebellion. Ultimately, the domains of the European landscape were reconfigured. Peter H. Wilson, *The Thirty Years War: Europe’s Tragedy* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009). For the effects of the war on metalwork production, see Braun, *Der christliche Altar*, 2:396, 3:64, 76-78; Forster, *Catholic Revival*, 48, 76-79; Henmarck, *The Art of the European Silversmith*, 1: 305.

Replacing what was lost took a long time and extended into the period when Felix Planner worked as a goldsmith in Munich, a city that remained staunchly Catholic.\textsuperscript{1633}

German art historian Edwin Redslob refers to this tendency toward elaborate adornment that was displayed in German church interiors during the eighteenth century as the “cult of implements.”\textsuperscript{1634} To address this interest in the ornate, goldsmiths were commissioned to create enlarged crosses, monstrances shaped like bursts of sun rays, and chalices, rendered as this one is, with lavish silver and gold embellishment. Viewed in combination with the era’s sumptuous clerical vestments and altar frontals, the assemblage of liturgical objects created a spectacular effect for the devotee. The extravagance was amplified in baroque church interiors, with their undulating walls, dappled with light and shadow, and punctuated with glittering gold.\textsuperscript{1635} Whether this description is relative to the setting within which this object was originally viewed may never be known. However, what is clear is that, wherever this chalice by Felix Planner was used in celebration of the Eucharist, the silver and gold with which it was embellished added visual splendor to the ritual of Mass.

\textsuperscript{1633} Henmarck, The Art of the European Silversmith, 1: 306, 311.
\textsuperscript{1634} Redslob, Deutsche Goldschmiedeplastik, 23-25; Henmarck, The Art of the European Silversmith, 1: 52.
\textsuperscript{1635} White, Roman Catholic Worship: Trent to Today, 25-28, 37-83; Henmarck, The Art of the European Silversmith, 1: 306. For an image of a chalice that resembles the Van Ackeren example, see Kammel, “Sinnlichkeit un Reglement: Kunst nach den Reformen der katolischen Kirche,” 128, fig. 96.

5.1 Detail: Bartolomé Esteban Murillo, *The Virgin of the Immaculate Conception.*
5.2 Detail: Bartolomé Esteban Murillo, *The Virgin of the Immaculate Conception*, three putti.
8.1 With frame, Giambattista Tiepolo, *Saint Mark the Evangelist*, c. 1732-33.
9.1 Atelier of Gil de Siloé, *Saint Anne Trinity*, back.
Anonymous, *Madonna [?], Saint Barbara [?], or Saint Catherine [?], c. 1500
Anonymous, *Madonna [?], Saint Barbara [?], or Saint Catherine [?], c. 1500.

10.5. Back, right side.

10.6. Right Side.

10.7. Right, front corner
11.1. Detail: César Bagard *Crucifixion with Mary Magdalene*, Mary Magdalene and helm.
12. Ehrgott
Bernhard Bendl,
Saint Cecilia
Playing an
Organ, c. 1700.


14.4 Detail: Medallion of Simeon.

14.5 Detail: Medallion of Anna.
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