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Tapestry in the Baroque
New Aspects of Production and Patronage
An Introduction to the Exhibition

The exhibition “Tapestry in the Baroque: Threads of Splendor” was shown at The Metropolitan Museum of Art from October 17, 2007, to January 6, 2008, and then at the Palacio Real in Madrid from March 6 to June 1, 2008. Soon after it opened at the Metropolitan Museum, we held a two-day symposium (October 20–21, 2007). We are pleased now to publish the papers that were delivered at the symposium.

“Tapestry in the Baroque” was conceived as a sequel to the exhibition we presented in 2002 of late medieval and Renaissance tapestries titled “Tapestry in the Renaissance: Art and Magnificence.” The main theme of the 2002 exhibition was the central role that tapestry played in the art, culture, and propaganda of the great European courts in the late fifteenth century through the sixteenth, with patrons like Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, King Francis I of France, and King Henry VIII of England spending enormous sums of money on tapestry as a way of aggrandizing themselves and presenting their goals. The second principal theme was the stylistic development of the tapestry medium during that period as great Flemish artists such as Bernaert van Orley, Pieter Coecke van Aelst, and Michiel Coxie responded to the stimulus and the example of Italian artists like Raphael and Giulio Romano, whose tapestries were also examined in that exhibition. The style that resulted from these diverse strands, with the northern tradition borrowing from the Roman High Renaissance, created a new tapestry aesthetic (fig. 1).

In the 2002 show we took the story up to the 1560s, which was a logical breaking off point because it was then, when Philip II dispatched the Duke of Alba to the Low Countries with the Spanish army in 1567 to assert the Counter-Reformation, that things started going downhill for the Flemish tapestry industry. Many of the weavers and artists were Protestants, and they left early—some had already left. As the Duke of Alba’s actions precipitated a reaction and eventually a civil war that rolled back and forth through the Low Countries during the 1570s and the 1580s, the delicate balance of the tapestry economy was devastated. It was a large industry that depended on the interaction among merchants, weavers, artists, and patrons. The circumstances of the civil war were disastrous for these relationships, both in a long-term general sense and also because of specific desperate events such as the sack of Antwerp in 1576, when mutinous Spanish troops overran the town, burning hundreds of houses, killing thousands of people, and looting the Antwerp depots, including the tapestry Pand, of all the merchandise that had been traded through Antwerp, the main center of shipping in northern Europe at the time.

The consequence of this period of devastation was that many of the weavers and the artists who worked with them migrated to the Germanic states, to the northern Netherlands, to England, or farther afield. As they traveled they took their skills with them, and they either strengthened existing workshops or helped set up new ones. Thus, while the story of high-quality tapestry up to that point was a linear progression, at least for the most recent eighty or so years of it, and very much focused on Brussels, in the ensuing period it became a story of
parallel developments, of competing workshops in Brussels, Delft, Paris, Mortlake on the outskirts of London, Munich, Rome, and other centers. Some workshops were long lasting, some short-lived, some had a large commercial market, some were simply created for the satisfaction of a rich individual patron. And it is this period, about 1580 to 1720, that we examined in “Tapestry in the Baroque.”

The exhibition was divided into nine sections. In the first gallery were products of the early diaspora—tapestries made by Flemish weavers in new centers in the 1580s and 1590s. The object that greeted viewers as they entered that gallery was a throne canopy that was made for the king of Denmark, Frederick II, in the mid-1580s by Flemish weavers whom he had persuaded to relocate to Helsingør in Denmark (fig. 2). The centerpiece of a forty-piece dynastic series illustrating the genealogy of the Danish kings that decorated the royal audience hall, the throne baldachin depicts the coat of arms of the king and queen flanked by allegorical figures of Justice, Temperance, and Fortitude on a ground that combines symbolic and heraldic components with a tour de force of grotesque decoration reflecting the contemporary influence of Hans Vredeman de Vries, Cornelis Bos, and other such designers. The skill and ingenuity demonstrated in this extraordinary piece show that, when well funded, Flemish
weavers in new centers were capable of producing tapestries of a quality equal to those made in Brussels in the years before.

Two other tapestries in the first gallery were made in the new workshop set up in Delft by a master merchant-weaver formerly of Antwerp named François Spiering: one was the Liberation of Oriane (Metropolitan Museum) from a set of the Story of Amadis of Gaule and the other was a panel from a set of Garden Scenes with Mythological Fountains (fig. 2). Spiering enjoyed great success selling tapestries to the Protestant courts of northern Europe that could no longer—at least for the time being—easily obtain tapestries from Brussels. Many of Spiering’s designs were produced by the artist Karel van Mander. Known to many as the author of Het Schilder-boeck, an equivalent of Vasari’s Lives of the Artists that focused on northern artists, he was also an extremely gifted painter in the Mannerist style and a tapestry designer. The grand tapestries of mid-sixteenth-century Brussels had typically featured large dramatic figures in clearly defined spatial settings. But such designs were very time-consuming to produce and required very skilled weavers to create the large figures. The Spiering manufactory, without royal funding, could not call on such resources, and so many of the products of the Spiering workshop and of others of the start-up workshops in the 1580s and 1590s typically featured multiple scenes of

Fig. 2. View of the “Flemish Diaspora, 1570–1600” gallery showing the throne baldachin (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm) in the center; at left, the Siege of Zierikzee from the Zeeland Tapestries (Zeeuws Museum, Middelburg); at right, François Spiering’s Garden with Diana Fountain (Warwick Castle). In the background, in the next gallery, The Battle of Vesuris and the Death of Decius Mus (Patrimonio Nacional, Madrid). Photograph: The Photograph Studio, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
small figures. These were well suited to the complex narratives of the day—think of the meandering narratives of Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene* and Sidney’s *Arcadia*—in which all sorts of complex little incidents could be beautifully narrated in tapestry design. These works also had the virtue that by featuring small figures with decorative costumes and highly stylized landscapes, they did not require that the weavers produce too many challenging volumetric effects. Whereas a painter can blend colors on the surface of the canvas to suggest volume, a weaver must build up lots of small triangles of color—hatchings or *hachiers*—to create the dark to light to dark tones that suggest volume. It is a very time-consuming process, and this explains the constant interplay between areas of patterning and areas of illusionism that are the kinds of compromises or the balance that the artists found in order to deal with this issue. As the scale of the figures in tapestries decreased, so too did the need for large areas of hatchings.

In the next gallery we had tapestries made in the opening years of the seventeenth century by a number of different manufacturers, including a glorious panel, *Night*, from an eighteen-piece set of the *Months, Seasons, and Times of the Day* that was made in Munich, one of a number of tapestries made there by Flemish weavers for the Duke of Bavaria (fig. 3). The designs were provided by an artist called Peter Candid (Pieter de Witte or Pietro Candido), who had grown up in Florence, trained alongside artists like Alessandro Allori, and then moved in the 1580s to the court of Munich, where he became the principal court artist. From 1604, tapestry design became his main function. For the very skilled weavers working in Munich, he looked back to the designs of artists like Michiel Coxcie and introduced big dramatic figures and complex landscape designs, but ones that also reflected contemporary artistic developments. In the allegory *Night*, the figure of a wizened woman approaches a sleeping man, light flaring from her forehead and from her fingers, which provides the light source within the design, reminiscent of Caravaggio and reminding us of his...
influence on northern artists. Candid was pushing the margins of tapestry design in various ways, and in the borders, by having more illusionistic architectural components instead of typical decorative borders, he was anticipating developments that would take place in Flemish tapestry design in succeeding years.

One panel, Leopard over a Pond, belonging to the Knights of Malta in Rome, which we were ultimately not able to borrow for the exhibition but which has an excellent entry by Nello Forti Grazzini in the catalogue, demonstrates how, during the early seventeenth century, the Brussels workshops had a continuing market for older designs. Now we are so accustomed to thinking of the importance of originality in painting, but in the case of tapestry the importance of original design did not necessarily apply. There was a continuing demand by all the leading cognoscenti and collectors for the great old designs. Leopard over a Pond was one of a series depicting wild animals in fantastic landscapes that embodies an allegory of the humors of man and the struggle between good and evil. The design was conceived about 1550, probably by one of the great sixteenth-century masters, Pieter Coecke, and his workshop. But the tapestry itself is from a set that was made soon after 1610 for the Roman patron Cardinal Montalto, an interesting reflection also of the market for tapestries in Rome.

In the mid-1610s, new drama and verve were introduced to Brussels tapestry design with the work of Peter Paul Rubens, who in 1616 produced a series of designs of the Story of Decius Mus, with scenes from the life of the classical hero who sacrificed his life in battle in order to ensure the victory of his troops—a hero for neo-Stoic philosophers. The designs were created for a Genoese patron. Traditionally, cartoons were painted in watercolor on paper, but Rubens painted the large-scale cartoons for this series in oil on canvas, conceiving them as large paintings, pushing the weavers to develop a palette that would reproduce this painterly concept on the woven surface. It is a remarkable testament to the recovery of the Brussels workshops in the early seventeenth century that they were so successful in reproducing these designs in high-quality weavings such as the Battle of Veseris and the Death of Decius Mus from the Spanish Royal Collection (fig. 2). Rubens's designs were very challenging for the weavers because he was rejecting the decorative patterning of so much contemporary design, looking back to the monumental figures of Raphael and other Roman High Renaissance artists, and that may have been one of the reasons why Rubens did not receive any more commercial commissions for tapestry designs for some years.

We then turned to Paris. Henry IV, king of France at the turn of the seventeenth century, seeing the disarray of the Flemish tapestry industry, persuaded large numbers of Flemish weavers to relocate to Paris as part of his attempts to stimulate the French economy after France had undergone its own ravaging by religious wars. He ennobled some of the leading weavers, he provided them with financial subsidies, and he introduced bans on the importation of Flemish tapestries with a view to establishing a large-scale industry. We showed a range of tapestries from the first thirty years of the seventeenth century that reflected contemporary developments, such as a panel from the Story of Diana after designs by Toussaint Dubreuil, Diana and Apollo Slaying the Children of Niobe, who had insulted their mother, Latona (fig. 4). In the great dramatic forms and the large sculptural borders, we see the heavier, grander style that was emerging in tapestry design in this period.

The search for new designs led the Paris workshops to turn to Rubens, and in 1622 he produced a series of the Story of Constantine, with scenes from the life of the first Christian emperor, and a resonant figure for the then king of France, Louis XIII, who was styling himself as a new Constantine. The Battle of the Milvian Bridge that we borrowed (fig. 4) came from an early weaving,
particularly nice in this context because there is a description of the cartoon for this tapestry arriving in Paris in November 1622 and being displayed to the French courtiers. They loved the historical accuracy of the design—we can see the nails in the soles of the leather sandals worn by the soldier who is about to plummet off the bridge to his death—and they loved the figures hanging off the edge of the bridge. At the same time they criticized the proportions: they were not quite sure that the proportions of the leg of one of the figures was right, but, realizing that this was probably because the passage was painted by Rubens’s assistants, “they wish that Your Lordship had retouched [it] with your own hand.” This is an interesting two-edged sort of praise, but I think it may go to the heart of the difficulty that these Rubens cartoons presented to the weavers. It is certainly notable that, again in this case, Rubens got no more tapestry commissions from the French court. Instead, Louis XIV called Simon Vouet back to Paris from Rome to undertake decorative schemes and tapestry designs.

Vouet was a brilliant, versatile artist who had become head of the painting academy in Rome. In returning to France he introduced a kind of elegant Italianate style to French painting and French tapestry design, as we see in the panel Moses Rescued from the Nile, with its gracious figures shown in a deep landscape with classical ruins and with rich, wide architectural borders (fig. 5). Vouet, like many of the outstanding sixteenth-century tapestry designers, seems to have worked with a team of artists who executed his full-scale cartoons, some specializing in landscapes, others in the elaborate borders, thus guaranteeing the visual richness and the linear quality of the whole

*Introduction to the Exhibition*
surface of the design. His style was to become extremely influential in Parisian tapestry design during the 1630s, 1640s, and 1650s.

In the following gallery we turned to beautiful pieces made in Mortlake, on the outskirts of London, for the British kings. In 1619, the English court, seeing what was going on in France, persuaded James I to set up his own manufactory. About fifty Flemish weavers and their families went to Mortlake in great secrecy, evading the Archdukes Albert and Isabella, who were trying to prevent further migration at this time. They set up a workshop in Mortlake, where they wove what are some of the finest tapestries of the first half of the seventeenth century. Initially the weavers were dependent on copying old master tapestry designs in the English Royal Collection. Then in 1623, Charles, Prince of Wales, had the great coup of purchasing from their Genoese owner seven of Raphael's original cartoons for the Acts of the Apostles to have them executed at his own workshop. New border designs were commissioned from Francis Klein (Frans Kleyn), an artist who had been working in Denmark and had come to London to seek his fortune. The original cartoons had been created for Pope Leo X in 1515 as a celebration of the way the papacy and Leo were the descendants of Saint Peter and Saint Paul. The iconography of Klein's complex allegorical borders in a way appropriated the papal iconography to the English king as head of the English church (fig. 6). This very elaborate series, as Wendy Hefford has discovered with her research, was woven between the late 1620s and the early 1640s at enormous expense. Charles I, who became king in 1625, is well known to art historians as a collector.

Fig. 5. View of the "Rise of Paris, 1590–1640" gallery showing Moses Rescued from the Nile (Mobilier National, Paris). Photograph: The Photograph Studio, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
of paintings, old masters and also ones by Rubens and Van Dyck, but what is less widely recognized is the fact that he spent equivalent sums on tapestry. It was very much a traditional art form that he saw as part of his personal splendor and magnificence.

The success of the Klein borders led to Klein’s appointment as the head designer at Mortlake, and in the late 1620s and 1630s he produced a number of exquisite new design series such as Hero and Leander, of which we showed the panel Meeting at the Temple of Venus, in the Swedish Royal Collection (fig. 7). This panel gives a beautiful idea of the quality of those early Mortlake tapestries, with Klein's graceful figures that reflect the influence of Inigo Jones and with painterly distant landscapes with their very subtle atmospheric effects.

We returned to Brussels in a gallery that concentrated on a single set of tapestries designed by Rubens from about 1626 to 1628 for the Archduchess Isabella. Isabella had hoped to retire to the convent of the Descalzas Reales in Madrid after the death of her husband, Albert, in 1621, but affairs of state kept her in Brussels. Instead, she turned to Rubens to create a gift for the convent: a twenty-piece set of tapestries to be hung in the chapel on feast days. Rubens conceived an all-surrounding trompe l’oeil illusionistic ensemble, which included two tiers of tapestries, one above the other. The subject was the triumph of the Catholic Church. The lower scenes show prefigurations of the Eucharist in Old Testament scenes, and then above, triumphal chariots celebrate an allegory of the triumph of the Church. Perhaps the iconographic linchpin of the series is the scene of Ecclesia, dressed in splendid papal robes, riding in triumph on a chariot drawn by magnificent horses.

Fig. 6. View of the “Mortlake Tapestry Works, 1619–49” gallery showing The Miraculous Draught of Fishes from the Acts of the Apostles (Mobilier National, Paris). Photograph: The Photograph Studio, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
crushing the enemies of the Church beneath its wheels. The Spanish Royal Collection very generously lent us two key pieces of the set that had not been to America before—the scene of Ecclesia (The Triumph of the Church over Ignorance and Blindness, fig. 8) and The Secular Hierarchy in Adoration—as well as Rubens’s modello for The Triumph of the Church, which is now in the Prado. This series takes us to the threshold of the grand Baroque manner in tapestry, because Rubens conceived each scene as a tapestry within a tapestry. He abandoned traditional decorative or symbolic borders and, instead, had each panel flanked by illusionistic architectural columns holding up an entablature, on to which flying putti are hanging tapestries. It is on these faux tapestries that the images of the scenes appear.

This is a masterful concept, and it anticipates the blending of architecture, painting, and stuccowork that was to become such a notable feature of European Baroque style in the following twenty years.

We also had examples of tapestries designed by Rubens’s contemporaries and followers: such figures as Jacob Jordaens, who saw what Rubens was doing with the Triumph of the Eucharist but who reinterpreted those innovations into a more commercial formula. For example, in Jordaens’s Scenes of Country Life, it is as though we are catching people by chance in little vignettes set in trompe l’oeil architectural settings (fig. 9). There is a wonderful spontaneity about these scenes, but of course with their large, relatively simple architectural components, they were also relatively easier for
the weavers to create. Brussels workshops essentially lacked the centralized funding that some of the Paris workshops had, or that Mortlake had, and were having to think in very commercial terms. We also had an example of the sort of bedcovers that were being made for the rich merchant class in the northern Netherlands (fig. 8).  

The next gallery in the exhibition featured tapestries made in Florence and Rome in the first three-quarters of the seventeenth century, to demonstrate again the fact that while so much tapestry production took place in northern Europe, it was an art form that was greatly prized in southern Europe—in Spain and in Italy. The Chariot of the Sun, a fabulous piece that is part of a thirteen-piece set of Seasons and Hours made in Florence for the Palazzo Pitti in the 1640s, has wide sculptural borders that were probably related to the carvings and the stuccowork in the room for which it was intended (fig. 10). From Rome, Francesco Barberini visited Paris in 1625 as a papal legate and was presented by Louis XIII with the first partial set of the Story of Constantine, the Rubens design. When he returned to Rome he set up his own manufactory, bringing

Fig. 8. View of the “Brussels, 1625–60” gallery showing The Triumph of the Church over Ignorance and Blindness from the Triumph of the Eucharist (Patrimonio Nacional, Madrid) and, in the next gallery, the bedcover with scenes from the Story of Tobias (Royal Collections, Stockholm). Photograph: The Photograph Studio, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
together a number of workshops that already existed there, and commissioned designs from artists like Pietro da Cortona, in the case of *Constantine Fighting the Lion* (fig. 12), to complete his *Constantine* set and to elaborate its significance as an allegory pertinent to his own family and his uncle Pope Urban VIII.\(^7\)

In a gallery that was perhaps the highlight of the show for many visitors, we brought together some stunning tapestries made at the Gobelins manufactory during the 1660s and 1670s for Louis XIV, the young French king who had taken control of France into his own hands in the early 1660s. And as part of the efforts that were made by First Minister Jean-Baptiste Colbert to create a suitably magnificent setting for this young king, Colbert amalgamated existing workshops at a site that has become famous as the Gobelins and produced designs by Charles Le Brun, who was a very gifted designer of large-scale figurative compositions—allegories, mythological scenes, classical histories, all intended to aggrandize the young king. The *Battle of the Granicus* from an early weaving of the *Story of Alexander* gives a wonderful idea of the drama and the glory of these great, great products (fig. 11).\(^8\) We also showed drawings by Charles Le Brun and his assistants, plus two tapestries from the famous series known as the *Story of the King*, which depicts notable events in the life of Louis XIV.\(^9\) One was the *Audience with Cardinal Chigi*, in which Louis is shown receiving papal ambassador Cardinal Chigi, who is making an abject apology for an incident that had developed into great tension between France and Rome (fig. 12). In scenes like this, it is as though we are peer-
ing over Louis’s shoulder and the shoulders of his courtiers—a vivid depiction of the grandeur of the French court.

We also looked at tapestries made at Beauvais in the late seventeenth century. Beauvais had been set up in 1664 to provide tapestries for the commercial market for the French aristocracy. Smaller and often more decorative than the grand style of the tapestries produced at Gobelins, Beauvais tapestries displayed the lighter decorative manner that was to become so much stronger in the early eighteenth century in France, which eventually led into the rococo. We included an example of the beautiful Bérain Grotesques woven from designs by Jean-Baptiste Monnoyer, the Camel (fig. 13).20

And finally, we returned again to Brussels. With the Gobelins manufactory in operation and with the French court continuing to use tapestry as a central component of its art, spectacle, and magnificence, tapestry remained in the forefront at

---

Fig. 10. View of the “Italian Workshops, 1590–1660” gallery showing, at left, the Chariot of the Sun (Palazzo Pitti, Florence); in the foreground, the cope from the vestments and altar furnishings of Pope Clement VIII (Vatican Museums); and to the right, The Protection of Rome from Plague and Famine from the Life of Pope Urban VIII (Vatican Museums). Behind the cope, in the next gallery, part of The Audience with Cardinal Chigi from the History of the King (Mobilier National, Paris). Photograph: The Photograph Studio, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
Fig. 11. View of the “Gobelins, 1662–94” gallery showing The Battle of the Granicus (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) at left, and at right, Water from the Four Elements (Palazzo Pitti, Florence). In the background, in the previous gallery, part of Apollo and Daphne from the Stories of Apollo (Fondation Toms Pauli, Lausanne). Photograph: The Photograph Studio, The Metropolitan Museum of Art

Fig. 12. View of the “Gobelins, 1662–94” gallery showing The Audience with Cardinal Chigi (Mobilier National, Paris) at right, and in the center, Water (Palazzo Pitti, Florence). In the background, in the previous gallery, Constantine Fighting the Lion (Philadelphia Museum of Art) at left, and at right, part of the Chariot of the Sun (Palazzo Pitti, Florence). Photograph: The Photograph Studio, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
all the European courts throughout this period, and the other courts turned to Brussels for their great tapestries. Brussels underwent a second renaissance between the 1660s and the 1730s, and we have tapestries made for figures such as the Duke of Marlborough, whose *Victories of the Duke of Marlborough* still hang in Blenheim Palace. These were woven in the 1710s and commemorated Marlborough’s outstanding victories in the War of the Spanish Succession, including the *Seige of Bouchain III*, which the current Duke of Marlborough so generously lent for the exhibition (fig. 14).³¹

I would like to finish with this note. Traditionally, the great tapestries were kept in storage and hung for special occasions. All of the great courts, all of the great households had wardrobe departments staffed with individuals whose principal job was to hang up the tapestries and take them down again, with the constant theatrical turnover lending drama to the interiors of the day. Today few institutions have that sort of manpower, and so the tapestries that survive are either in storage or they hang in permanent installations, sometimes well cared for, sometimes not. Organizing an exhibition like this is challenging, and very few institutions have the resources for it. We brought together tapestries for this show from twenty-five collections in twelve different countries, an enormous business that involves an extremely experienced team of conservators, who did a wonderful job under the leadership of Florica Zaharia, and riggers to help install the tapestries (figs. 15, 16). For these reasons, we are not going to see many tapestry exhibitions in our lifetime—certainly not in the optimum circumstances under which we saw them in the Tisch Galleries, against appropriately

---
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colored backgrounds, beautifully lit, and with the space to really appreciate them.

Such an exhibition encourages the critical archival, art historical, and scientific research on tapestries that is being carried out today. And the results presented here not only enhance our knowledge and understanding but also affirm our dedication to promoting this historically and artistically important art form. I am grateful to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, whose sponsorship made the symposium possible. I also thank my colleagues in the Education Department, especially Joseph Loh and Nicole Leist, whose hard work brought speakers from around the world and enabled everything to run very smoothly.

1. For the catalogue to that exhibition, see Thomas P. Campbell, with contributions by Maryan W. Ainsworth et al., *Tapestry in the Renaissance: Art and Magnificence* (New York, 2002).


Fig. 14. View of the “Brussels, 1660–1715” gallery showing *The Siege of Boucaun III* (Blenheim Palace, Woodstock) and, at right, part of *A Naval Battle* from the *Art of War II* (Neues Schloss Schleissheim, Munich). Photograph: The Photograph Studio, The Metropolitan Museum of Art

*Tapestry in the Baroque*
Fig. 15. Conservators unfolding *A Naval Battle* preparatory to hanging it in the “Brussels, 1660–1715” gallery (see fig. 14, right). Photograph: © Librado Romero/The New York Times/Redux

Fig. 16. Riggers hanging *The Triumph of Venus* (Palazzo Pitti, Florence) in the “Gobelins, 1662–94” gallery. Photograph: Department of Textile Conservation, The Metropolitan Museum of Art

4. Cleland, cat. 8, in ibid., pp. 81–86.
7. Isabelle Denis, cat. 13, in ibid., pp. 147–54.
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Tapestry Production
New Light on the Raes Workshop in Brussels and Rubens’s Achilles Series

Since the 1990s, Brussels tapestry of the seventeenth century has been studied steadily. Substantial research effort has been devoted in particular to the rich body of series designed by pivotal artists such as Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640), 1 Jacob Jordaens (1593–1678), 2 and Charles Poerson (1609–1667). 3 While these and other studies shed light on iconographic features of sets and stylistic developments, they also reveal the need for more data on workshop managers, the entrepreneurial strategy devised by merchants and producers, and the configuration of the production landscape. Indeed, lack of elementary biographical information on tapisiers and a fragmentary insight into the dynamics shaping the industry unquestionably hinder the discourse on seventeenth-century Brussels tapestry. 4

A case in point is the Raes family and workshop. The Raes producers clearly dominated the industry between about 1600 and 1650: no fewer than twenty-nine different series, including all three sets by Rubens that were produced in Brussels (the Story of Decius Mus, the Triumph of the Eucharist, and the Story of Achilles), have been traced to their workshop. 5 As a result, the family features prominently in any discussion of Brussels tapestry of the first half of the seventeenth century. However, all studies that zoom in on the Raes firm suffer from a major weakness: there is no clear genealogical tree of the family, so that the history and development of the workshop and consequently the attribution and dating of tapestries are based on assumptions rather than facts.

This article sheds new and conclusive light on the pivotal scholarship on the Raes family. The deconstruction of the discussion will reveal that the debate is burdened with presumptions and methodological pitfalls and that therefore a tabula rasa must be made of all hypotheses. New archival findings will subsequently be used to reconstruct a correct genealogical tree of the Raes family. The article will then focus on the development of the Raes workshop and network. Finally, prompted by the new contextual history of the workshop, the article will present a new dating for Rubens’s Story of Achilles.

DECONSTRUCTION OF THE DEBATE

In his pioneering 1878 Les tapisseries bruxelloises, Alphonse Wauters, director of the Brussels Stadsarchief (city archives), paid considerable attention to the Raes firm. 6 Wauters, who extracted most biographical data from the “Registers der Tresorij” (Records of the Treasury), identified Jan Raes the First as the founding father of the workshop, which was located in the Hoogstraat (High Street), the main street of the parish of Our Lady of the Chapel (Onze Lieve Vrouw ter Kapelle). Wauters did not provide life dates, but he revealed that Jan Raes the First was granted tax relief in 1613 and held various offices in the city administration in the 1620s and 1630s. 7 Raes served a last term in 1638, which seems to suggest that he died shortly thereafter. Wauters further stated that Jan the First was married to
Margriet van den Acker and that they had at least five children: François, Peter, Arnoul, Hieronymus, and Jan the Second. Peter was granted tax relief in 1643. Jan the Second also received exemption from taxation “on March 15, 1629” or “in 1628”—Wauters unfortunately was inconsistent. Wauters also presented contradictory information on the date of death of Jan the Second: he “died prior to 1637,” or was still alive in 1644.

While Heinrich Göbel duly echoed Wauters’s history of the workshop in his Wandteppiche (1923), Georges van Doorslaer presented additional data and assumptions on the Raes family in a 1925 article. He contended that Jan Raes the Second died in 1634 and was outlived by his father who died in 1638. Van Doorslaer’s study, published in a regional journal, became overshadowed by an article written by Marthe Crick-Kuntziger, curator of textiles and tapestries at the Royal Museums of Art and History in Brussels, which was published in the museum’s Bulletin in 1934. She constructed a Raes family tree based on two documents: a contract recorded by a Brussels notary public in 1649, and a genealogical tree recorded by the Brussels noble Jean-Baptiste Antoine de Grez (d. 1727), who copied a document compiled by the seventeenth-century Brussels politician Jan-Baptist Houwaert (1626–1688). According to Houwaert/De Grez, the tapissier who was married to Margriet van den Acker was Jan Raes the Second—whereas Wauters had named him Jan Raes the First. Crick-Kuntziger identified this man with “Jan Raes, former burgomaster delegated by the guilds” who features in the 1649 contract. Still according to Crick-Kuntziger, Jan the Second was granted tax relief in both 1613 and 1629—whereas Wauters had asserted that the 1613 privilege was granted to Jan the First. The family tree recorded by
Houwaert/De Grez further claims that Jan Raes the Second was the son of Jan Raes (whose occupation is not recorded in the document) and Anna Cardinael, and that Jan the Second and Van den Acker had five children: François, Jan-Baptist, Maria, Anna, and Peter. Houwaert/De Grez asserted that the eldest son, François, succeeded his father and that the other sons, Jan-Baptist and Peter, were not involved in the industry—whereas Wauters had claimed that Peter was granted tax relief in 1643. The documents used by Crick-Kuntziger thus contradict the archival sources put forward by Wauters on crucial points.

The Houwaert/De Grez tree, which seems to be almost an eyewitness account, gained supremacy over the documents disclosed by Wauters. In 1960 the reputable Belgian genealogist Paul-Eugène Claessens used the Houwaert/De Grez data to reconstruct the Raes family tree. Claessens contended that Jan the Second was born about 1570, and he highlighted the fact that François Raes, "successor to his father as director of the workshop," was married to Hieronyma van der Straeten, who was a niece of the lesser-known Brussels painter Servais de Couix (ca. 1560/70–1625/26). In 1970 Erik Duverger incorporated new documents in the Raes debate. The most important is a contract recorded by an Antwerp notary public in 1643 revealing that "Jan Raes den jongen" (Jan Raes the Younger) died between 1637 and 1643. As other documents (including the contract published by Crick-Kuntziger) show that a tapisier named Jan Raes was still alive in 1649, Duverger speculated that this workshop manager was a relative of Jan the Second, and he thus added Jan the Third to the Raes family tree.

The data presented by Wauters, Crick-Kuntziger, Claessens, and Duverger were synthesized by Guy Delmarcel in 1987, 1997, and 1999. He claimed that Jan the Second was the prime workshop manager who was granted tax relief in 1613 and 1629, and he further argued that Jan the Second was succeeded by two of his sons, namely, François and Jan the Third.

In 2002, I discussed the Raes family briefly, and relying heavily on Wauters, I proposed to identify Jan the First with the tapisier who was granted tax relief in 1613 and Jan the Second with the workshop manager who received the same benefits in 1629. In addition, I claimed that Jan the Second died in or before 1639 and that he was outlived by his father, who died in or after 1649; this obviously eliminated Jan the Third from the Raes genealogical tree. Delmarcel subsequently supported these claims, yet they were not substantiated by new archival evidence.

In sum, the archival sources used in the past—the "Registers der Tresorijen," the Houwaert/De Grez family tree, and the documents recorded by Antwerp and Brussels notaries in 1643 and 1649—generate conflicting views, the most intriguing being the possibility of the existence of Jan Raes the Third. However, the Brussels parish records, a collection of documents that until now has never been explored to address the issue, provide a key to the conundrum. In the seventeenth century, the vast majority of the Brussels tapestry producers were Catholics. They were baptized shortly after their birth in the presence of their parents and godparents; they had a church marriage; and they had a Christian funeral. These moments were staged in the parish church and carefully recorded in registers. As a result, the parish records are a rich source of basic yet crucial biographical and genealogical data. Unfortunately, not all the records of all the Brussels parishes have been preserved; some of the records are nearly impossible to decipher; only a limited number of registers have been indexed; and not all indexes are completely reliable. Fortunately, most members of the Raes family lived in the parishes of Our Lady of the Chapel and Saint Gudule, and the records of these parishes have been preserved rather well—though they are not complete and some of the registers are copies made in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Nonetheless, they allow us to recon-
struct a new and more complete genealogical
tree of the Raes family.

THE RAES FAMILY

Jan Raes (b. ca. 1545) and Anna Cardinaels
(d. 1608-12), then Margareta Lemmens (d. 1668)
According to Houwaert/De Grez, one Jan
Raes (whose occupation is not recorded)
was married to Anna Cardinaels and had
four sons: Peter, Michiel, Nicolaas, and
Jan.37 Research revealed that in 1612 one Jan
Raes married Margareta Lemmens in the
presence of four witnesses: Nicolaas, Michiel,
Peter, and Jan Raes.38 It can therefore be
assumed that Lemmens was the second wife
of Jan Raes. She died in 1668.39 Jan Raes
cannot be related to Brussels tapestry
industry. Consequently, Jan’s son Jan can be
regarded as Jan Raes the First.

Peter (ca. 1565—in or after 1615), Michiel (1577—
in or after 1612), and Nicolaas Raes (1578—1652)
The genealogical tree compiled by
Houwaert/De Grez states that Peter Raes
was married to Anna Goossens.40 She was
actually Peter’s second wife. His first wife
was Catharina van de Wouver (d. in or
before 1602). Their first child, Johanna, was
born in 1585,41 which means that Peter Raes
must have been born about 1565—which
of course means that his father Jan must
have been born about 1545. Peter Raes and
Catharina van de Wouver further had a
son, Peter (b. 1593), and a second daughter,
Elisabeth (b. 1596).42 Van de Wouver died
prior to April 30, 1602, as Peter Raes then
married Anna Goossens.43 Their first child,
Anna, was born in 1603.44 A son, Judocus,
was born in 1615.45

The Houwaert/De Grez tree does not
provide biographical data on Peter’s brothers
Michiel and Nicolaas Raes. Research has
revealed that Michiel was born in 1577.46 He
was married to Christina de Greve. They
had at least two children: Jan (b. 1608) and
Peter (b. 1612).47 Nicolaas was born in 1578
and died in 1652.48 He was married to Maria
Lyssens. They had at least two children:
Nicolaas (b. 1606) and Peter (b. 1608).49

Jan Raes the First (1574—1651) and Margriet
van den Acker (d. 1650)

Jan Raes the First, son of Jan Raes and
Anna Cardinaels, was baptized in the
church of Our Lady of the Chapel in 1574.49
He married Margriet van den Acker in
1592.41 The couple had ten children. Their
first child, born in 1593, was named Jan.42
Between 1594 and 1598 the couple had three
dughters: Anna, Francesca, and Doro-
thea.43 In 1602 they had another boy, named
Jan—which of course means that their
first son died in or before 1602. Another four
boys were born between 1604 and 1609:
Sebastiaan (1604), Daniel (1605), Francois
(1607), and Peter (1609).44 And, finally, in
1611 Jan Raes and Margriet van den Acker
had another daughter, named Catharina.45
Van den Acker died in 1650.46 Jan Raes the
First was buried on July 1, 1651.47

Jan the Second (1602—1639), Françoise (b. 1607),
and Peter Raes (b. 1609)

Jan Raes the Second was born in 1602.
In 1627 he married Johanna Bexij.48 They
had two daughters, Catharina (b. 1630) and
Maria—Anna (b. 1632).49 Jan the Second must
have died at the beginning of 1639 since on
March 12, 1639, the tapissier Jan de Strycker
filed an application for tax relief with the
city administration in which he stated that
Jan Raes the Younger had died recently.50

François Raes, born in 1607, married
Hieronyma van der Straeten in 1629.51 They
had at least one son, Hieronymus (b. 1630).52
One François Raes was buried in 1677,53 yet
it is not certain if this man can be identified
with the son of Jan the First. Peter Raes was
married to Agnes Villain. They had at least
one son, Peter (b. 1633).54 Unfortunately,
Peter’s date of death is not known: one
Peter Raes died in 1651, and a namesake was
buried in 1670—and it is of course possible
that neither of them can be identified with
the son of Jan the First.55

The Raes family tree based on the Brussels
parish records (fig. 1) differs manifestly from
the one that previous scholars compiled by
using the genealogy recorded by Houwaert/
De Grez. A document written in 1671 provides the key to this issue.7 The document presents a genealogical survey of the Raes family that is nearly identical to the tree made by Houwaert/De Grez. However, the document has a postscript revealing that it was recorded at the request of one Jan-Baptist Raes and that it had to serve a particular purpose: Jan-Baptist Raes wanted to prove that he was a descendant of the Sleeus family, one of the seven houses that had dominated Brussels politics ever since the fourteenth century.8 In other words, Jan-Baptist Raes wanted to become a member of the Brussels nobility. Therefore, the tree that was recorded in 1671 is propagandist material presenting manipulated data rather than solid historical evidence. Unfortunately, it was copied by Houwaert/De Grez and was subsequently used by twentieth-century scholars dealing with the Raes family. Interestingly, in 1666, about the same time the faulty Raes tree was recorded, Hippolyte de Comans (d. 1671), a son of Marc de Comans (1563–1644), one of the Flemish directors of the Saint-Marcel tapestry workshops in Paris, also recorded a family history that is manipulated.9 Like Raes, Comans compiled the genealogical survey to prove that he had noble roots.

THE RAES WORKSHOP AND NETWORK

The new family tree and additional findings allow us to reconstruct a more accurate history of the Raes workshop and network. Jan Raes the First started his career when he was about twenty. His first documented commission is that of an altar frontal for the church of Steenokkerzeel, a small village near Brussels.10 While he produced the frontal between 1593/94 and 1603/4, he also executed a set of five small pieces depicting the Story of Saint Rumbold for the same church.11 Relatively modest commissions of this type tend to go unnoticed in literature on tapestry, as the pieces usually have not been preserved and the archival evidence remains hidden in local collections (if preserved at all), but it is safe to assume that they played an important role in the development of Brussels workshops.

Shortly after Raes and eight other workshop managers had been granted tax relief in 1613,12 Jan the First started an impressive career in Brussels politics.13 He was councilor in 1617, 1624, 1632, and 1635; collector in 1618, 1619 (he was also dean of the tapestry guild in 1619),14 and 1635,15 treasurer of the Board of Shipping in 1620 and 1636, and, finally, burgomaster in 1623, 1633, and 1634.16 Raes thus belonged to the Brussels socioeconomic elite. His political career and status undoubtedly contributed to the development of his workshop, for it provided him with the key to success in business, namely, creditworthiness.17 Tapestry producers had to be creditworthy because they faced continuous capital demands and the ever-present danger of liquidity crises. While they had to pay wages, buy wools, silks, and silver metal-wrapped threads, and invest in designs and cartoons, the recovery of the capital invested was frequently slow and uncertain, as is revealed in archival documents.18 Creditworthiness consisted to a large extent in the social and symbolic capital (as defined by Pierre Bourdieu): in order to be creditworthy, an entrepreneur had to have prestige, recognition, and connections within and between social networks.19

Jan Raes the First clearly managed his social and symbolic capital with great care. He became a cornerstone of society, and, prior to his rise in Brussels politics, he had chosen his friends wisely in an era in which friendship was often based less on mutual personal affection than on economic reciprocity.20 It has long been asserted that during the first half of the seventeenth century Jan Raes the First frequently collaborated with Jacob (Jacques) Geubels (d. 1604/5),21 his widow Catharina van den Eynde (d. between 1620 and 1629),22 and his son Jacob Geubels II (1599–ca. 1630).23 The Raes and Geubels workshops coproduced, for example, a set of the Triumph of the Eucharist (1618),24 editions of various series such as the
Story of Diana, the Story of Hannibal, and the Story of the Trojan War. These ties were secured on a personal level: the godmother of Jan the First's daughter Catharina (b. 1611) was Catharina Geubels. She was born in 1592 and was the first child of Jacob Geubels and Catharina van den Eynde. Catharina Raes's godfather was François Sweerts the Younger (1567–1629), an Antwerp tapestry dealer and humanist and one of the most active and important members of the production and trading network. Sweerts commissioned the Story of Decius Mus from his friend Rubens, and he chose the Raes firm to coproduce the first Brussels editions of the series. The Raes/Geubels network also included the omnipresent Antwerp tapestry entrepreneur Hendrik Vranckx, who was married to Jacob Geubels's sister Judith.

The Raes/Geubels network further entangled the Reymbouts family. Maarten Reymbouts the Second (d. 1619) had married Enneken (Janneke) Geubels in 1569 and was godfather of Jacob Geubels's daughter Magdalena (b. 1595). After the death of Enneken Geubels, Maarten Reymbouts married Maria Swaen (d. in or after 1628). In 1611 their son François Geubels (d. 1658) was born. Between about 1630 and 1634 François Geubels married Elisabeth de Moor, the widow of Jacob Geubels II, and shortly thereafter he produced an edition of Rubens's Decius Mus.

The Raes/Geubels/Reymbouts/Sweerts/Vranckx production and trading network also included the Aerts family of Brussels tapissiers, as is attested by an edition of the Story of the Trojan War. Unsurprisingly, these ties were also secured on a personal level, since the godmother of Jan Raes the Second, Magdalena Appelmans, was the wife of Nicasius Aerts. The ties between the Raes and Aerts families can also be traced in another branch of the Raes family: Judocus Raes, son of Anna Goossens and Peter (who was a brother of Jan the First), married Dymphna Aerts, daughter of Jan Aerts, in 1642. Judocus Raes and Dymphna Aerts had ten children, including Catharina (b. 1651) and François (b. 1653). François's godfather was François van den Hecke (1595/96–1675), who had been married to Johanna Aerts (d. 1657) and who also produced Rubens's Decius Mus series. Catharina's godfather was one Gaspar Leyniers, who might be identified with the son (1605–1677) of the tapissier Gaspar Leyniers (1576–1649) or with the son (1574–1703) of the dyer Nicolaas Leyniers (1610–1658).

It can be assumed that this plethora of names and connections is just the tip of the iceberg and that the interlocking networks of Brussels workshop managers and Antwerp tapestry dealers dominated and shaped the dynamics of Brussels tapestry production in the first half of the seventeenth century. The multilateral cartel established by the tapestry entrepreneurs enabled flexible credit arrangements and joint ventures among various families and workshops whenever the occasion or need arose. The picture that thus emerges from these data is one of a dispersed manufactory located in the parish of Our Lady of the Chapel, rather than one of a production landscape formed by independent and competing workshops. The existence of such a dispersed manufactory obviously complicates the interpretation of marks and signatures on tapestries as well as the attribution of sets and tapestries based on marks, signatures, and borders.

It can be assumed that about 1629 Jan the First resigned as director of daily operations, for in 1629 his son Jan the Second was granted exemption from taxation, as were seven other workshop managers. At the time, Jan the First was not only of considerable age—fifty-six—but was also deeply involved in Brussels politics, and he may have opted for a role behind the scenes. Jan the Second, however, died at the untimely age of thirty-seven.

As there was no Jan Raes the Third, it may seem logical to assume that Jan the
First resumed his position as workshop manager after the early death of his son in 1639. However, according to the application for tax relief filed by Daniel Eggermans the Second (1604–1669) in 1662, it was his father, Daniel Eggermans the First, who took over the Raes workshop in 1639. 

Little is known about Daniel Eggermans the First. As he married in 1600, he must have been born about 1580 and thus was about the same age as Jan Raes the First. Interestingly, neither tapestries nor documents suggest that Eggermans was involved in the industry prior to 1639; for example, he is not recorded in a document of 1614 that lists more than eighty Brussels tapissiers, and he was never granted tax relief. While no direct link between Jan Raes the First and Daniel Eggermans the First could be established, research has revealed an indirect connection via the tapissier Johannes (Jan or Hans) Vervoort (Vervoert; b. 1590/91): Vervoort became godfather of Eggermans’s granddaughter Maria (b. 1625) shortly before he collaborated with Jan Raes the First on Rubens’s Eucharist series (ca. 1626–28).

When Daniel Eggermans the First became manager of the Raes workshop in 1639, Jan Raes the First presumably remained a shareholder. After the death of Eggermans in or even before 1642, Raes immediately reappeared on the scene when he engaged himself to produce an edition of Rubens’s Story of Achilles (October 17, 1642).
Several weeks later, on November 27, 1642, Jan the First’s son Peter, “coopman van tapiserijen” (tapestry entrepreneur), filed an application for tax relief with the city administration. In his application, Peter Raes, who was a member of the Brussels guild of the meerseniers (merciers) as well as a tapissier, explicitly referred to the death of Daniel Eggermans the First, thus underlining the continuous operation of the Raes/Eggermans/Raes workshop. It is possible that Peter Raes filed the application as a means of safeguarding or increasing the tax benefits that had been granted to the Raes workshop in the past and that he was never really involved in the management of the workshop. Neither documents nor tapestries link Peter to the production of tapestries—while three contracts recorded in 1649 and 1650 reveal that his father, Jan the First, then directed the Raes firm.

It is not clear when François Raes became involved in the industry, but it can be asserted that it was after the death of his father in 1651. Contrary to the generally held belief, he never received tax relief from the Brussels city administration. A document shows that François Raes had retired from the industry prior to November 1658, which means that by then the Raes workshop had closed down. It is possible that François rapidly lost interest in the workshop after 1651, for in 1653 the Antwerp entrepreneur Peter Fourment sold his sketches and cartoons of

Fig. 3. Peter Paul Rubens, *The Return of Briseis*, 1638–39 (?), sketch for the tapestry in the *Story of Achilles*. Oil on panel, 44.4 × 66.7 cm. Detroit Institute of Arts, Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Edgar B. Whitcomb (33.356). Photograph: © Bridgeman Art Library

*New Light on the Raes Workshop*
Rubens’s *Achilles* series to Jan van Leeuwen (1603–1668) and Gerard van der Streek (ca. 1610–1677) and not to François Raes.

In sum, Jan Raes the First produced tapestries between about 1595 and 1651. It is possible, however, that he did not sign tapestries between 1639 and 1642, when Daniel Eggersmans the First ran the workshop. Jan the Second, who used the signature “Jan Raes the Younger” to distinguish himself from his father, was active between about 1620 (when he became eighteen and involved in the industry) and 1639. Jan the Second’s brothers Peter and François may have been involved in the industry in the 1640s, but their father seems to have remained the driving force behind the workshop. Peter seems to have disappeared from the scene prior to 1649, and François closed down the Raes workshop in or presumably prior to 1658.

**RUBENS’S *ACHILLES* SERIES: 1638–39?**

The new contextual history of the Raes workshop sheds new light on the editio princeps of Rubens’s *Story of Achilles* series and the dating of the sketches (figs. 2, 3) and cartoons. It is traditionally assumed that the first edition of the series can be identified with a set of eight tapestries signed by Daniel Eggersmans, since these pieces (unlike other *Achilles* tapestries that are known) are very close to the *modelli.*

Guy Delmarcel recently highlighted the peculiarity of the fact that the editio princeps was produced by Eggersmans and not by Raes. Indeed, the Raes firm, one of the most renowned—if not the most renowned—workshops, had already produced editions of Rubens’s *Decius Mus* and the *Eucharist* series, and the workshop can also be linked to later editions of Rubens’s *Achilles* series. The untimely death of Jan Raes the Second in 1639 and Daniel Eggersmans the First’s interim directorship of the Raes workshop between 1639 and 1642 explain this peculiarity: when Rubens and Daniel Fourment (d. 1643), Rubens’s father-in-law and commissioner of the *Achilles* sketches and cartoons, scanned the Brussels production landscape for a reputable workshop that could produce editions, they could still safely rely on the “Raes” production and trading network.

It is widely accepted that Rubens created the series between 1630 and 1635. This dating is based on stylistic grounds only, as there is no archival evidence shedding light on the commission. Egbert Havercamp-Begemann asserted that “some of the sketches for the decorations of the Torre de la Parada are similar in colour and execution to Achilles sketches,” thus linking the *Achilles* series closely to Rubens’s monumental cycle depicting Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, executed between 1636 and 1638 for the hunting lodge of King Philip IV of Spain, the Torre de la Parada near Madrid. As it is now evident that Eggersmans supervised the production of the first edition between 1639 and 1642, or that Eggersmans at least produced one of the first editions in this period, the traditional dating of the *Achilles* series needs to be reassessed, for it is most improbable that the commissioner of the cartoons waited more than five years or more before marketing the series. Rather, it is likely that Rubens made the sketches and cartoons about 1638–39, after the Torre de la Parada cycle. Rubens scholars agree that it is extremely difficult (if not impossible) to pinpoint the exact date of works Rubens made in the last decade of his life, so that there are in fact no stylistic features that contradict a tentative dating of the *Achilles* series about 1638–39. This dating near the end of Rubens’s life (he died in May 1640) can also explain why Jacob Jordaens and not Rubens himself added extra scenes to the series about 1640–41.

By focusing on the Raes family and workshop, it has been demonstrated that archival research—time-consuming and unpredictable as it may be—provides the ultimate key to a better and more coherent macro-understanding of Brussels tapestry of the
seventeenth century. Additional archival documents will unquestionably enable reconstruction of the genealogical trees of other families involved in the industry, the development of their workshops, and their position in the interlocking regional and international networks of production and trade. This will obviously give us the means to correct or fine-tune the attribution and dating of cartoons and editions and to develop a conceptual framework (which I recently labeled tentatively as a non-zero-sum framework) that incorporates both historical and art-historical developments.¹¹³
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A New Look at the Story of Coriolanus

In 1597, after thirty years of civil and religious wars, Henry IV decided to reestablish the Paris tapestry manufactories. The Story of Coriolanus along with the Story of Artemisia and the Story of Diana were the first three tapestry series to go on the looms in the Paris workshops in the early seventeenth century. The Artemisia and Diana series were studied in the exhibition catalogue Tapestry in the Baroque: Threads of Splendor.¹ We thought it worthwhile to present the Story of Coriolanus here.

SUBJECTS IN THE SERIES AND THEIR INTERPRETATION

The life of Caius Marcius Coriolanus is related by Plutarch in his Parallel Lives, a work that has been well known in France since the publication in 1559 of a translation by Jacques Amyot, which found great success at the time and is still a standard reference.² Coriolanus, something between a historical figure and a legendary hero, is supposed to have lived in Rome at the beginning of the fifth century B.C., during a period fraught both with external perils (especially the incursions by the Volscians into Latium and Rome) and with the keen social tensions that, after the expulsion of the Roman kings, pitted patricians against plebeians, taking them to the brink of civil war. Caius Marcius, a member of the Roman nobility, distinguished himself by his military valor and probity. His consciousness of his personal merit and his inordinate pride led him to oppose violently the representatives of the people, whom he held in great contempt. Banished from Rome, he allied himself with the Volscians, enemies of his nation, until a new about-face on his part led to his assassination.

The most complete set of the Story of Coriolanus is the one with the coat of arms of France and the cipher of Henry IV that is in the collection of the Mobilier National, Paris.³ The large number of subjects in the series, sometimes difficult to identify, and their lack of clear cohesion have not facilitated its study, and even some recent publications leave areas unclear.⁴ The seventeen-piece set in the Mobilier National consists of ten large tapestries, which enable us to follow the narrative, and seven entre-fenêtres. The tapestries illustrating the earlier parts of the story, with their elongated figures and their foreground characters cut off at the waist and turned toward the viewer, are in the Mannerist tradition of the late sixteenth century. They devote a great deal of space to ancient and classical architecture: temples and palaces, rotundas, forests of columns, and, on either side, large plazas carefully rendered in perspective form the setting for this Roman history. An examination of the three drawings that can be linked to the series (figs. 12, 15, 23) shows that the direction of the compositions was not corrected when the tapestries were woven. This is the case for the ten large tapestries, which are all mirror images of what must have been the original concept: swords are held in the left hand, scabbards worn on the right, and so forth. Most important, the scenes, normally read from left to right, must here be read from right to left, which has lead to misinterpretation or lack of comprehension of some of the subjects.

We know that in 1606 a set of the Story of Coriolanus for the king was being woven
in the ateliers of the Louvre by Maurice Dubout, who worked on high-warp looms; no piece from it has thus far been identified. By the high-warp technique, the tapestry was woven in the same direction as the cartoon. In the workshops at the Faubourg Saint-Marcel located in the Hôtel des Gobelins, by contrast, preference was given to low-warp weaving, the traditional Flemish technique, which results in a tapestry that reverses the drawing. We may therefore assume that when the series that had been woven for the king in high warp was replicated by tapestries woven at the Faubourg Saint-Marcel, the weavers did not take the trouble to reestablish the original direction of the compositions, a costly step that would have required new cartoons. Two of the entrefenêtres, subsequently woven in the same workshop as the ten large pieces, are also reversed and therefore are probably from cartoons for the editio princeps of
Fig. 3. Siege and Capture of Corioli from a set of the Story of Coriolanus. Tapestry design attributed to Henri Lerambert, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, ca. 1605–10. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 470 × 540 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 14/13). Photograph: Ph. Sébert

Fig. 4. Coriolanus Receives a Horse from the Consul Cominius from a set of the Story of Coriolanus. Tapestry design attributed to Laurent Guyot, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1607–10. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 464 × 355 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 14/10). Photograph: L. Perquis

Fig. 5. Coriolanus on Horseback from a set of the Story of Coriolanus. Tapestry design attributed to Henri Lerambert, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1607–10; weaver’s mark FM. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 453 × 210 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 14/2). Photograph: Ph. Sébert

Fig. 7. Coriolanus Goes to Fight the Antiates from a set of the Story of Coriolanus. Tapestry design by Laurent Guyot after Antoine Caron, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marceau workshop, Paris, ca. 1608–10; weaver’s mark FM. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 470 × 395 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 14/12). Photograph: Ph. Sébert

the series originally made for Henry IV. The other five entrepétres, which have a slightly different border, were evidently made from additional cartoons intended from the outset for use by the low-warp workshops of the Faubourg Saint-Marceau, which thus anticipated the reversal during weaving.

First let us examine the compositions of the ten principal scenes. Reconsidering Plutarch’s Parallel Lives along with a recently published inventory of tapestries of the crown makes it possible to remove all ambiguity about their meaning. In the tapestries, the life of Coriolanus unfolds in three phases.

The first phase depicts the hero’s exemplary actions: Coriolanus receives a civic crown for having saved the life one of his comrades in battle (in the appendix, tapestry no. 1; figs. 1, 2); he takes the Volscian city of Corioli, a heroic action that earns him his nickname (no. 2; fig. 3); then, returning to civilian life, he presents himself to the people and asks them to elect him consul (no. 3; figs. 8, 9). Plutarch clearly describes this episode, though it has not been identified in previous studies of the tapestries.
Fig. 8. Coriolanus Solicits the People’s Votes for Consulship from a set of the Story of Coriolanus. Tapestry design attributed to Henri Lerambert, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1605–10; weaver’s mark FVP. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 470 × 510 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 14/11). Photograph: L. Perquis

Fig. 9. Coriolanus Solicits the People’s Votes for Consulship from a set of the Story of Coriolanus. Tapestry design by an unknown artist after Henri Lerambert, woven in Tours, ca. 1630–50. Wool and silk, 255 × 225 cm. Château de R***. Photograph: David Bordes

In the second phase, the tapestries evoke a more troubling aspect of Coriolanus’s life. Rejected as consul by the people, he retires to his home, accompanied by “the young patricians . . . [who] had always been devoted to his interest” (no. 4; fig. 10). The reversal of the scene does not facilitate comprehension, since we see Coriolanus descending the steps of the rostrum where the vote tellers are sitting on the right side of the composition, instead of on the left side, where they belong. Coriolanus is then depicted violently grappling with the aediles because of the words he had spoken against the people’s tribunes (no. 5; figs. 11, 13). The consequence is illustrated in the next tapestry, Coriolanus Condemned to Banishment (no. 6; fig. 14).

The third phase portrays Coriolanus’s downfall. Banished from Rome, he bids farewell to his family (no. 7; fig. 16). The piece after that illustrates, in an almost
archaic manner, two successive episodes (no. 8; fig. 18): the first, on the right (instead of the left since the composition is reversed), follows Plutarch’s account and shows Coriolanus disguised and seated in front of the fireplace of the Volscian Tullus, who recognizes him; on the left, Coriolanus, again identifiable by his helmet surmounted by a winged dragon, offers his services to the Volscians, thus becoming a traitor to his country. We then see him in the midst of the Volscian army, receiving his wife and mother, who have come to plead with him not to attack Rome (no. 9; fig. 21). Finally, the last tapestry shows the death of Coriolanus, assassinated by the Volscians for accepting peace with Rome (no. 10; figs. 22, 24).

Pascal Bertrand has rightly pointed out the renewed interest in Coriolanus at the start of the seventeenth century, especially in theatrical productions: Hermann Kirchner’s Coriolanus tragicomica (1599); Pierre Thierry de Mont-Justin’s Coriolan (1600); then versions by Alexandre Hardy (1607) and Shakespeare (produced in 1607 but not published until 1623). For Bertrand, “the tumultuous life of Coriolanus is similar to the agitated life of Henry IV.” He sees the story of the Roman hero as a celebration of patriotism (when the hero yields to his family), the illustration of a legitimate revenge against all seeking to pervert the order of Rome, and the depiction of a strong character exposed to the ingratitude of his people, which imparts on him a universal value.
Fig. 11. *Coriolanus Repels the Aediles* from a set of the *Story of Coriolanus*. Tapestry design by Henri Lerambert, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1605–10; weaver’s mark fvp. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 463 × 539 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 14/8). Photograph: I. Bideau


Fig. 13. *Coriolanus Repels the Aediles* from a set of the *Story of Coriolanus*. Tapestry design by an unknown artist after Henri Lerambert, woven in Tours, ca. 1630–50; weaver’s mark fvp. Wool and silk, 255 × 355 cm. Château de R***. Photograph: David Bordes
with which every beholder can identify. Bertrand concludes that “Henry IV could not help but have appreciated a cycle woven on the theme of the subject’s obedience to monarchical power.”

That interpretation seems risky, however: the life of Coriolanus, as the tapestries present it, appears more like a warning than an example. Plutarch, whose account seems to have served as guide for the creator of the models, commented very negatively on the Roman hero. Although he acknowledged Coriolanus’s valor in war and his integrity, he criticized as a “disgrace” and an “injustice” the contempt Coriolanus displayed toward the people. Further, he went on, Coriolanus used deception to foment war


Fig. 15. Henri Lerambert, Coriolanus Condemned to Banishment, late 16th century. Pen and brown ink, brush and brown wash, heightened with white on paper, squared in black ink, 29.5 × 30 cm. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris, Res. F3, fol. 6
Fig. 16. Coriolanus Bids His Family Adieu from a set of the Story of Coriolanus. Tapestry design attributed to Henri Lerambert, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1605-10. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 470 × 515 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 14/4). Photograph: Ph. Sébert

Fig. 17. Coriolanus Leaves Rome from a set of the Story of Coriolanus. Tapestry design by Henri Lerambert, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1607-10. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 435 × 238 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 14/7). Photograph: Ph. Sébert

between the Romans and their neighbors the Volscians, and it was “simply to gratify anger” that “he threw whole districts of Italy into confusion.” He was overly haughty and did not know how to make himself beloved, even by those who respected him. Plutarch added that Coriolanus’s greatest exploits were carried out against his country. The most dramatic episode, and the one most often represented, when Coriolanus gave in to the tears of his mother and his wife, was also a matter for sharp reproach: in granting for sentimental reasons what he had refused to the priests and then to the ambassadors of his country, he lost the opportunity for an honorable reconciliation. “[T]o concede all as a private favour to his mother was less an honour to her than a dishonour to the city.” Plutarch did not have words harsh enough to characterize Coriolanus’s “unsociable, supercilious, and self-willed disposition, which, in
Fig. 18. Coriolanus Goes to the Volscians from a set of the Story of Coriolanus. Tapestry design attributed to Henri Lerambert, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1605–10. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 468 x 650 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 14/9). Photograph: Ph. Sébert


Fig. 21. Coriolanus Receives His Family from a set of the Story of Coriolanus. Tapestry design attributed to Henri Lerambert, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1605–10; weaver’s mark FvP. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 465 × 645 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 14/3). Photograph: Ph. Sébert
Fig. 22. Coriolanus Put to Death by the Volscians from a set of the Story of Coriolanus. Tapestry design by Henri Lerambert, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1605–10; weaver’s mark FVP. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 470 × 335 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 14/17). Photograph: Ph. Sébert

Fig. 23. Henri Lerambert, Coriolanus Put to Death by the Volscians, ca. 1600. Pen and brown ink, brush and brown wash, heightened with white on paper, 36.5 × 50 cm. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris, Res. F3, fol. 9

Fig. 24. Coriolanus Put to Death by the Volscians from a set of the Story of Coriolanus. Tapestry design by an unknown artist after Henri Lerambert, woven in Tours, ca. 1630–50. Wool and silk, 255 × 290 cm. Château de R***. Photograph: David Bordes
all cases, is offensive to most people; and when combined with a passion for distinction passes into absolute savageness and mercilessness.”

Coriolanus clearly could not be identified with the figure of Henry IV, if only because of the tragic end met by the Roman. If his example seemed relevant at the beginning of the seventeenth century, it was surely more as a reminder of the disturbances, betrayals, and multiple rebellions, particularly on the part of the nobility, that Henry IV had to confront to establish his power. For example, Charles de Gonzaut Biron, an admiral at thirty (1592), Maréchal de France in 1594, duke and peer of the realm in 1598, betrayed the king by allying himself with Savoy and Spain in the hope of obtaining the principality of a province. Pardoned a first time, he committed a further offense and was decapitated in the courtyard of the Bastille on July 31, 1602. Within that context, we may imagine that the Story of Coriolanus tapestries, hung four years later in the chamber of the Dauphin at Fontainebleau, had particular resonance.

ARTISTS
The two groups of weavings already mentioned—the ten large tapestries and the seven entrefenêtres—emerged from rather different formal realms. The ten tapestries mostly belong to the Mannerist tradition. Preliminary drawings survive for three of them: Coriolanus Repels the Aediles, Coriolanus Condemned to Banishment, and Coriolanus Put to Death by the Volscians (figs. 12, 15, 23). The last drawing has an old inscription, Antoine Caron, a no-longer-credible attribution but one revealing a distinguished tradition. The kinship of the Story of Coriolanus to the Story of Artemisia is attested in the taste in both series for archaeological erudition, especially in the representation of ancient architecture, and in the compositions of certain scenes. We know that several artists participated in the illustrations for Nicolas Houel’s Histoire de la Royne Artémise, on which the Artemisia tapestries were based. Various hands also worked on the models for the Story of Coriolanus. Maffeo Barberini, the future Pope Urban VIII, who saw the Coriolanus tapestries at Fontainebleau in 1606, judged it as having a “sécheresse de dessin peu satisfaisante” (unsatisfactorily dull design). André Félibien, following the inventory of the furnishings of the crown, linked the Story of Coriolanus to Henri Lerambert (ca. 1540/50–1608). By the time he was named peintre des tapisseries du roi in 1600, Lerambert had already provided models for the tapestry series of the Life of Christ; we are indebted to him for some of the cartoons and drawings for the Story of Artemisia, and the drawings for the Story of Coriolanus are also attributed to him. Trained in the workshop at Fontainebleau, he was still within the Mannerist sphere of influence, though his style evolved toward greater realism and more simplified compositions, like those of his nephew Laurent Guyot, who worked beside him and succeeded him after his death.

There is a perceptible formal evolution, as can be seen in the three extant drawings. Coriolanus Condemned to Banishment (fig. 15), like the other tribunal scenes, takes place in an impressive architectural setting that overpowers the elongated, static figures. In Coriolanus Put to Death by the Volscians (fig. 23), although the classical architectural quotations remain essential, the composition is simplified, with a definite importance given to Coriolanus and his assailants, who are set clearly in the center of the scene. Drama and movement are expressed in the interlocking play of the legs, the conflicting diagonals of arms and swords, and the distressed expression of the dying Coriolanus that contrasts with the determination of his assailants. In the third drawing, Coriolanus Repels the Aediles (fig. 12), the figures occupy two-thirds of the composition, the architecture has receded into the background, and emphasis has clearly been put on the violence of the confronting protagonists in the foreground—the anger of Coriolanus and the surprise of the aediles. Comparison of the drawing with the woven

Tapestry in the Baroque
transcription allows us to appreciate the contribution of the cartoon painter: the scene has been enlarged, figures added to the group of aediles on the left, the architectural background and the mountain landscape developed, probably to reestablish a coherent scale with the other tapestries. Candace Adelson, whom we are hesitant to follow on this point, attributes to Guyot the drawing for Coriolanus Condemned to Banishment. The two other drawings, by their comparison with those for the Story of Artemisia, are given to Lerambert and witness the evolution of his work in his later years.

The seven entretenêtres of the Story of Coriolanus, like those of the Story of Artemisia, seem linked to the weavings. Two of them (entretenêtres E and G in the appendix; figs. 17, 20) partially repeat large compositions (nos. 4 and 5 [figs. 10, 11], respectively). Another tapestry, Coriolanus Goes to Fight the Antiates (entretenêtre D; fig. 7), is interesting for it provides us with a name and a date, since we know it is derived from two pieces of the Story of Artemisia, whose cartoons, realized after drawings by Antoine Caron, were assigned to Laurent Guyot in a contract of October 1607. The subject of the captain on horseback (Coriolanus on Horseback, entretenêtre B; fig. 5), also used in the Artemisia series, was borrowed from multiple sources, which is characteristic of the way the cartoon painters worked. The man holding the horse's bridle in Coriolanus Receives a Horse from the Consul Cominius (entretenêtre A; fig. 4) can be linked to one of the horsemen in the Hunts of Francis I, a series attributed to Guyot. In our view, the two remaining entretenêtres, Coriolanus Entreated by Volumnia (C; fig. 6) and Coriolanus Named Captain of the Volscians by Tullus (F; fig. 19), may also be linked to that artist. Although it might seem hazardous to determine each painter's precise share of what was above all a common enterprise, it seems likely that the entretenêtres, conceived as complements to the large pieces, involved a greater participation from Guyot, perhaps as a result of Lerambert's deteriorating health from 1607.

MANUFACTORIES AND WEAVINGS

At least one of the five entretenêtres (D) woven in the workshop of François de La Planche, then, cannot have gone to the looms before 1608. If we adopt nearby dates for the other four (A, B, E, G), the proposal by Bertrand that the set of the Story of Coriolanus in the Mobilier National might be the editio princeps would be undermined. More likely, the first edition was the one Maurice Dubout wove in 1606 for the king, some pieces of which may have been displayed on September 14, 1606, in the chambre de parade of the Dauphin at Fontainebleau, during the baptismal ceremonies for the royal children. That set does not appear in the inventory of the Garde-Meuble de la Couronne in 1666, and, as mentioned, no tapestries from that weaving have been identified.

The Parisian tapestry sets currently known are all from the manufactory of the Faubourg Saint-Marcel. Several belonged to the royal collections. In addition to the one in the Mobilier National, already mentioned (see note 3), others are familiar to us through the inventories of the Mobilier de la Couronne: one, in eight pieces and without gold, previously at Chambord, was sold in 1794. To it can be linked an entretenêtre that depicts Coriolanus in the House of Tullus, half of Coriolanus Goes to the Volscians. In December 1637, a nine-piece set was purchased by Cardinal Antonio Barberini from Jules Mazarin, who was then in his service and who, according to him, obtained it from the king. It comprised six large panels and three entretenêtres. Five of these tapestries are now in the Brooklyn Museum, New York. Three entretenêtres have the same border, as well as the mark of François de La Planche: one is in the Vatican collections, and the two others were previously with French & Company.

Inventory listings of Parisian sets of the Story of Coriolanus are few: the inventory of the collections of the Grand Condé, taken in his Paris hôtel in 1654, after he had left France to serve Spain, mentions an
eight-piece set of Coriolanus, woven at the Faubourg Saint-Marcel, from the Château de Saint-Maur. In 1730, another set, the “Histoire de Coriolan, haute lisse,” in twelve pieces, could be found at the Hôtel de Bouillon in Paris. We cannot but assume a family provenance and recall that Henri de la Tour d’Auvergne, duc de Bouillon (1555–1623), Maréchal de France in 1592, was implicated in the conspiracy that cost the Maréchal de Biron his life. The Parisian tapestry sets so far identified thus belonged for the most part to the king or to his immediate entourage.

We have seen that some of the Coriolanus subjects could not have gone on the looms before 1608; note as well that in 1627, on the death of François de La Planche, no Coriolanus weavings appeared either in the storerooms or on the looms at the Faubourg Saint-Marcel and the cartoons were not inventoried. We may assume that they were probably in Tours, where several sets are known to have been woven.

It is to that little-known manufactory that we propose to attribute the weaving of an eight-piece set in a French private collection, the Château de R***, which has recently been classified as a historical monument. If we are to believe the statutes of the weavers published in 1718, “[t]he first tapestry manufactories that appeared in France originated in the cities of Tours and Amiens... The one in Tours was noted for a level of workmanship so exceptional and so uniform that it was always greatly respected... Its mark was a double tower... and only high-warp work was done.” In 1612, Alexandre MOTHERON, master weaver of Tours, joined with Marc de Comans and François de La Planche to establish there a new tapestry workshop that would employ thirty to forty workers. A number of years later, in 1631, Cardinal Giovann Francesco Guidi di Bagno mentioned the Parisian weavers who soon installed themselves in that city: “The wool comes from France and England and is dyed on site in the water of the Loire. Cardinal Richelieu has had some tapestries made there for his personal use, which will be very rich, of an excellent design, and with strong colors, because there they work according to tradition, passing the wool through five or six successive baths and using a great deal of pastel blue and little Italian blue.” The manufactory soon ran into financial difficulties and seems to have disappeared shortly after 1636.

The eight pieces of the Story of Coriolanus at the Château de R***, purchased in Bordeaux in the early twentieth century, were installed in a room above wainscoting, completely covering the walls. These are Coriolanus Receives the Civic Crown (fig. 2), Coriolanus Entreated by Volumnia, Coriolanus Solicits the People’s Vote for Consulship (fig. 9), Coriolanus Leaves Rome (entrefenêtre E), Coriolanus Repels the Aediles (fig. 13), Coriolanus Goes to the Volscians (the entrefenêtre is the left part, showing Coriolanus offering his services to the Volscians; the composition is reversed from the tapestry in the Mobilier National), Coriolanus Receives His Family, and Coriolanus Put to Death by the Volscians (fig. 24). The borders of the tapestries have largely disappeared, except for a narrow band of scrolling vines around the edges with vestiges of cartouches in the center of each band. The cartoons, though similar to those used in Paris, were simplified and sometimes perceptibly modified. The main scenes were reversed again and thus appear in the proper direction. The well-preserved colors are quite vivid. Coriolanus Repels the Aediles is the same as a piece in the Château de Chambord that retains the fragment of a mark identifying it as coming from the workshops of Tours. Some well-known pieces can be attributed to the manufactory of Tours because they were woven from the same cartoon; such is the case with the Coriolanus Receives the Civic Crown in the Rijksmuseum, which displays the simplified composition and the new architectural features of the panel at the Château de R***. Another composition, Coriolanus Solicits the People’s Votes for Consulship, was appreciably modified from the cartoon used for the one
in the Mobilier National. Coriolanus, looking younger and smiling, helmeted and still half-clothed, is in the process of undressing; the Tours scene is at once more immediately comprehensible and less moving than the Paris version, which shows the nude hero isolated amid the crowd that is standing apart and pointing at him without approaching. A tapestry of this composition, previously at Milton Abbey, may also be from Tours. There was likely a painter in Tours assigned to modify the cartoons, but he has not been identified.

The set in the Château de R*** can be linked to the one described at number 119, without gold, in the Garde-Meuble de la Couronne: “A set of tapestries in high-warp, made in Tours, representing the Story of Coriolanus, with a border filled with leaves and fruit, between two guilloches of white and blue ovals, and, in the middle of that border, bronze-color figures in cartouches, all against brown backgrounds, 24 aunes across by 3 high, in eight pieces.” That set, purchased in 1679 from the tapisier Prozelle, was in 1786 in the Château de Saint-Cloud, from which it was removed in 1788. Its dimensions (357 by 2900 cm) are very close to those of the set at R***. If one takes into account the missing borders, whose width can be estimated at 50 centimeters, the dimensions would be identical.

Two other weavings from Tours are known through a contract. Louis de Valbelle, adviser to the king at the Parlement d’Aix, in Provence, made an agreement on February 15, 1631, with Laurent Simon, maître tapisier of Tours, to purchase a “Roman story of Coriolanus, 3 by 42 aunes, similar to the one that said Simon sold to M. le président de Banquemarre,” of silk from Tours and wool purchased and dyed in Paris, “the most harmonious and colorful as could be made.”

In conclusion, we would like to return to the relationship between the Story of Coriolanus and the Story of Artemisia and the unusual way the emphasis in them was placed on a less spectacular representation of political life rather than on traditional scenes of battle, triumph, and reward. The scenes of the elections, the tribunal, and the hero’s confrontation with the aediles constitute the core of the Coriolanus series, echoing the Requests of the People, the Petitions, and the Assembly of the States in the story of the queen of Caria. Both series express an aspiration for peace after decades of armed struggle that had divided the country; but Coriolanus appears as Artemisia’s opposite, illustrating the difficulties of the return to civic life. The qualities of the warrior are not necessarily those of the statesman: they have a dark side, attested by the unhappy fate of Coriolanus. His story therefore appears as a warning particularly well adapted to the lords frequenting the royal palaces, where the tapestries of the crown were displayed.

The translation from the French is by Jane Marie Todd.

13. Bertrand (Les tapisseries des Barberini, p. 177, n. 117), hindered no doubt by the reversal of the composition, did not recognize that the two scenes follow in sequence, which precisely reproduces the account in Plutarch (Lives, pp. 277–278).


16. Ibid., p. 292.


19. Adelson, European Tapestry in the Minneapolis Institute, pp. 179, 193–94 n. 27.


26. Cavallo, "The History of Coriolanus." For the Vatican piece, Coriolanus Goes to the Volscians (left part), see Bertrand, Les tapisseries des Barberini, p. 312, fig. 116. The other two entrelacs are
Coriolanus Entreated by Volumnia and Coriolanus Receives a Delegation from Rome; see Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, French & Company Archives, stock sheet 81479/H-180.

27. Condé owned two eight-piece sets of the Story of Coriolanus, one said to be from the Gobelins and the other described as an "old set from Flanders," estimated at only 600 livres. One of them was repaired in 1665. The two sets appear again in 1709, one said to be from Paris, but in ten pieces, was in Chantilly, and the other, in eight pieces, described as from Brussels, was in Ecouen. The ten-piece set figures again in Chantilly in 1719, as "high warp from Flanders," and was still there in 1740. Gustave Macon, "Les tapisseries des princes de Condé," Archives de l'Art Français: Mélanges offerts à M. Jules Guiffrey, n.s. 8 (1914, pub. 1916), pp. 124–37, esp. pp. 127, 129, 132, 136; Mireille Rambaud, Documents du Minutier central concernant l'histoire de l'art [1700–1759] (Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N., 1964–71), vol. 1, p. 721.


30. "Les premières fabriques de tapisseries qui ont paru en France ont pris naissance dans les villes de Tours et d’Amiens. . . . Celle de Tours se faisait remarquer par un goût de travail si singulier et si uniforme, qu’elle a été de tout temps fort estimée . . . sa marque était une tour double . . . et l’on n’y travaillait qu’en haute lisse"; Jules Deville, Recueil de documents et de statuts relatifs à la corporation des tapisseries, de 1258 à 1875 (Paris, 1875), p. 110.


35. Milton Abbey sale, 1932, no. 1865.

36. "Une tenture de tapisserie de haute lisse, fabrique de Tours, représentant l’Histoire de Coriolan, dans une bordure remplie de feuilles et de fruits, entre deux guilloches d’oves blancs et bleus, et au milieu de ladite bordure sont des figures couleur de bronze dans des cartouches, le tout sur fonds brun, contenant 24 aunes de cours, sur 3 de haut, en huit pièces . . . ."; Guiffrey, Inventaire général, vol. 1, p. 354.


Appendix: List of Subjects in the Story of Coriolanus

The listings of the tapistries are transcribed from the 1665 inventory of the Garde-Meuble de la Couronne, which I discovered while it was in the Beauvais Archives; it has since been transferred to the Archives Nationales, Paris (AN O 3282a%). Our proposed identifications of the subjects are given in italics, followed in parentheses by the names of the scenes, where they differ, that were given by Maurice Fenaille (État général des tapisseries de la Manufacture des Gobelins, vol. 1 [Paris, 1923]), pp. 23–18) and used in succeeding publications. INV indicates the description of each piece in the 1665 inventory. Plutarch indicates the pertinent passages in Plutarch, The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans, trans. John Dryden, rev. Arthur Hugh Clough (New York: Modern Library, 1932).
The ten large tapestries are numbered 1–10, and the seven entreprenes are designated A–G.

1. Coriolanus Receives the Civic Crown (figs. 1, 2)
Inv: “Coriolanus couronné d’une couronne de chêne par le dictateur pour avoir sauvé un citoyen romain dans une bataille contre Tarquin le Superbe”
Plutarch: “The general, after having gained the victory, crowned him for this act, one of the first, with a garland of oaken branches; it being the Roman custom thus to adorn those who had saved the life of a citizen” (p. 264).

2. Siege and Capture of Corioli (F: Coriolan attaque Rome) (fig. 3)
Inv: “le Siège et la prise de Corioles par la valeur de Coriolanus”
Plutarch: “The Romans were now at war with the Volscian nation, whose principal city was Corioli. . . . Marcus, by strength of hand, and swiftness of foot, and daring of soul, overpowering every one that he assailed, succeeded in driving the enemy to seek refuge, for the most part, in the interior of the town, while those remaining submitted, and threw down their arms” (pp. 266–67).

A. Coriolanus Receives a Horse from the Consul Cominius (F: Coriolan jure fidélité au roi des Volques) (fig. 4)
Inv: “Le Consul Cominius monté sur un tribunal qui lui fait présent d’un cheval et ordonne qu’à l’advenir outre le nom de Martius il portera celui de Coriolanus”
Plutarch: “When Marcus, with the rest of the army, presented themselves at the consul’s tent, Cominius rose, and . . . delivered the strongest encomium upon [Marcus’s] rare exploits. . . . And then he required him to choose a tenth part of all the treasure and horses and captives that had fallen into their hands, before any division should be made to others; besides which, he made him the special present of a horse with trappings and ornaments, in honour of his actions. The whole army applauded; Marcus, however, stepped forth, and declaring his thankfull acceptance of the horse, and his gratification at the praises of his general, said, that all other things, which he could only regard rather as mercurial advantages than any significations of honour, he must waive, and should be content with the ordinary proportion of such rewards. . . . When the noise of approbation and applause ceased, Cominius, resuming, said . . . “[L]et us pass a vote, I mean, that he shall hereafter be called Coriolanus . . .”” (pp. 268–69).

B. Coriolanus on Horseback (fig. 5)
Inv: “Coriolanus monté sur un cheval qui lui ait esté donné pour récompense de sa valeur est mené par le camp”
Note: The same composition appears in the Story of Artemisia as Captain on Horseback, to which more soldiers were added; those on the right were taken from a drawing by Henri Lerambert used for the Story of Artemisia.1 The figure of Coriolanus derives, as noted by Candace Adelson, from a horseman at the left of the Triumphant Carriage in Giulio Romano’s Fructus belli series.2 But the overall effect of the intricate circumvolutions of the mantle around Coriolanus’s head and legs comes from an engraving by Giovanni Battista Ghisi, Warrior in Antique Armor on Horseback.3

C. Coriolanus Entreated by Volumnia (F: Coriolan sollicité par sa mère Véturie) (fig. 6)
Inv: “Coriolanus, à la prière de Volumnia sa mère, prend pour femme Virginia qu’elle luy présente”
Plutarch: “He took a wife, also, at her request and wish, and continued, even after he had children, to live still with his mother, without parting families” (p. 265).
Note: The figures of Volumnia and her followers show a kinship to that of Artemisia and her women in the Gifts in the Story of Artemisia, also known by a drawing attributed to Laurent Guyot.4 There is a definite likeness between Volumnia’s and Artemisia’s faces, and Artemisia’s left arm and hand are found on the girl just behind Volumnia. The impressive architecture, with its strong emphasis on the massive horizontal cornices in front of which the columns stand out, can also be linked to the drawing for the Sacrifice to the Gods in the Story of Artemisia.5 The figures do not have the same elongated, Mannerist proportions, however; more realistic and demonstrative through expressive gestures and attitudes, they seem closer to what we know of Lerambert, who might have collaborated with his nephew Guyot on that composition.

D. Coriolanus Goes to Fight the Antiates (F: Préparatifs pour le combat) (fig. 7)
Inv: “Coriolanus sort de Rome avec ses amis & affidez pour aller courir la terre des Antiates”
Plutarch: “[H]e mustered up his own clients, and as many others as could be wrought upon by persuasion, and with these made inroad into the territories of the Antiates, where, finding a considerable quantity of corn, and collecting much booty, both of cattle and prisoners, he reserved nothing for himself in private, but returned safe to Rome” (p. 271).
Note: The composition is taken from two tapestries in the Story of Artemisia: the horsemen on the left and the soldiers at their feet in the foreground, and the architecture in the background all come from Les manoeuvres d’armées, while the group of soldiers on the right derives from the Riding Lesson.

3. Coriolanus Solicits the People's Votes for Consulship (F: Coriolan banni de Rome) (figs. 8, 9) Inv: "Coriolan se présente au peuple tout nu couvert seulement d'une robe pour demander les suffrages au peuple pour le consulat" Plutarch: "It was usual for those who stood for offices among them to solicit and address themselves personally to the citizens, presenting themselves in the forum with the toga on alone, and no tunic under it; either to promote their supplications by the humility of their dress, or that such as had received wounds might more readily display those marks of their fortitude..." Marcus, therefore, as the fashion of candidates was, showing the scars and gashes that were still visible on his body, from the many conflicts in which he had signalized himself during a service of seventeen years" (pp. 271–72).

4. Coriolanus Rejected as Consul by the People (F: Cornélié est envoyée à Coriolan) (fig. 10) Inv: "Coriolan refusé pour Consul par le peuple, au grand dépôtis du Sénat et des nobles" Plutarch: "But when the day of election was now come, and Marcus appeared in the forum, with a pompous train of senators attending him, and the patricians all manifested greater concern, and... began to feel something of indignation and envy... In conclusion, they rejected Marcus... He, for his part, could not bear the affront...[and] retired, full of fury and bitterness against the people. The young patricians... adher[ed] to him" (p. 272).
Note: In their dramas, Alexandre Hardy and Shakespeare both had Coriolanus's mother step in at this point. She is depicted in Henry IV's tapestry, but in the version now in Brooklyn, she was replaced by a man.

5. Coriolanus Repels the Ædiles (F: Coriolan jure une haine éternelle à Rome) (figs. 11, 13) Inv: "Coriolan repousse avec violence les Ediles qui le veulent contraindre de venir rendre raison aux Tribuns du peuple des discours qu'il a tenus contre eux" Plutarch: "And when he contemptuously repulsed the officers who brought him the summons, they came themselves, with the Ædiles, or overseers of the market, proposing to carry him away by force, and, accordingly, began to lay hold on his person. The patricians, however, coming to his rescue, not only thrust off the tribunes, but also beat the Ædiles" (pp. 273–74).

6. Coriolanus Condemned to Banishment (F: Coriolan accusé) (fig. 14) Inv: "Coriolan accusé au bannissement perpétuel par le peuple" Plutarch: "[W]hen they came to vote, a majority of three tribes condemned him; the penalty being perpetual banishment. The sentence of his condemnation being pronounced, the people went away with greater triumph and exultation than they had ever shown for any victory over enemies; while the senate was in grief and deep dejection... Any one who was glad was, beyond all doubt, a plebeian, any one who looked sorrowful, a patrician" (pp. 276–77).

7. Coriolanus Bids His Family Adieu (F: Coriolan vaincu par Cornélié) (fig. 16) Inv: "Coriolan après sa condamnation dit adieu à sa mère et à sa femme" Plutarch: "[I]nteresting his mother and his wife, who were all in tears and full of loud lamentations... he proceeded at once to the city gates" (p. 277).

8. Coriolanus Leaves Rome (F: Le Défi) (fig. 17) Inv: "Coriolus sort de Rome, accompagné de quelques-uns de ses amis" Plutarch: "[H]e proceeded at once to the city gates, whither all the nobility came to attend him; and so not so much as taking anything with him, or making any request to the company, he departed from them, having only three or four clients with him" (p. 277).
Note: Partial repeat of no. 4.
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Marcius. . . . I have been stripped and deprived by the envy and outrage of the Roman people, and the cowardice and treachery of the magistrates and those of my own order. I am driven out as an exile, and become an humble supplicant at your hearth, not so much for safety and protection (should I have come hither, had I been afraid to die?) as to seek vengeance against those that expelled me. . . . Tullus, on hearing this, was extremely rejoiced, and . . . then proceeded to feast and entertain him with every display of kindness” (pp. 277–78).

F. Coriolanus Named Captain of the Volscians by Tullus (F: Coriolan vainqueur est complimenté par le roi) (fig. 19)

Inv: “Coriolanus élu Capitaine général des Volques par Tullus contre les Romains”

Plutarch: “But when the whole strength of the Volscians was brought together in the field, with great expedition and alacrity, it appeared so considerable a body, that they agreed to leave part in garrison, for the security of their towns, and with the other part to march against the Romans. Marcius now desired Tullus to choose which of the two charges would be most agreeable to him. Tullus answered that since he knew Marcius to be equally valiant with himself, and far more fortunate, he would have take the command of those that were going out to the war” (p. 281).

Note: The proportions of the two principal figures and the way they occupy the whole space in the front may be attributed to Guyot, as can the stiff horse on the right, which can be compared with those in the Heralds on Horseback in the Story of Artemisia.

G. Coriolanus Receives a Delegation from Rome (fig. 20)

Inv: “Coriolan accompagné des principaux capitaines des Volques reçoit avec mespris les Ambassadeurs des Romains qui sont envoyés pour le rappeller”

Plutarch: “The persons sent by the senate . . . were chosen out of his kindred and acquaintance, who naturally expected a very kind reception at their first interview, . . . however, they were much mistaken. Being led through the enemy’s camp, they found him sitting in state amidst the chief men of the Volscians, looking insupportably proud and arrogant” (pp. 282–83).

Note: Partial repeat of no. 5. The groups of figures at the right and left of Coriolanus Repels the Aediles have been reversed and moved closer together, leaving out the central part of the composition, and the old aedile has been changed to a younger man representing an ambassador. This was made from the cartoon rather than from the drawing, for it includes on the right figures and architectural features that were added for the weaving of no. 5.

9. Coriolanus Receives His Family (fig. 21)

Inv: “Coriolanus dans son Tribunal accompagné de l’armée des Volques qui reçoit sa mère, sa femme ses enfants et les dames romaines qui le viennent prier de lever le siège devant Rome”

Plutarch: “[O]vercome by his feelings . . . he did not endure they should approach him sitting in state, but came down hastily to meet them, saluting his mother first, . . . and then his wife and children” (p. 286).

10. Coriolanus Put to Death by the Volscians (figs. 22, 24)

Inv: “Coriolan assassiné à Antium par les menées de Tullius”

Plutarch: “When Marcius came back to Antium, Tullus . . . proceeded at once to contrive how he might immediately despatch him . . . . An assembly was called and popular speakers . . . came forward to exasperate and incense the multitude; but when Marcius stood up to answer, the more unruly and tumultuous part of the people became quiet on a sudden, and out of reverence allowed him to speak without the least disturbance . . . . Tullus, therefore, began to dread the issue of the defence he was going to make for himself; . . . [and] the conspirators judged it prudent not to make any further delays, nor to test the general feeling; but the boldest of their faction . . . fell upon Marcius in a body, and slew him there” (pp. 289–90).

Drawing (fig. 23): Attributed to Henri Lerambert; stamped SG; Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris, Res. F3, fol. 9. Candace Adelson attributes the drawing to Laurent Guyot and likens it to Present to the Orator in the Story of Artemisia.
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Charles de Comans’s Posthumous Inventory, 1635

As we know, the tapestry workshop at the Faubourg Saint-Marcel in Paris, which is the forebear of the current Gobelins workshop, was founded by Flemish tapestry makers in the early years of the seventeenth century. In 1601, Marc de Comans (1563–1643 or 1644) and his brother Hiérosme, from Antwerp, and Frans van der Plancken (1575–1627), François de La Planche in French, who was born in Oudenaarde, joined forces to found a tapestry workshop before setting up in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel the following year, in the former house of the Gobelins family of dyers. Marc de Comans was François de La Planche’s brother-in-law through his marriage to Catherine de La Planche, François’s sister. In 1607, Marc de Comans and François de La Planche obtained letters patent from Henry IV to open and operate a tapestry workshop with exclusive privilege for fifteen years. In 1625, this privilege was renewed for a further eighteen years.1 Some of the most beautiful Parisian tapestry sets came out of this workshop: the Story of Artemisia, the Story of Coriolanus, as well as the Story of Diana.

François de La Planche died in 1627, which is the reason a major inventory was drawn up that included the property of the deceased and all property relating to the tapestry workshop. This exceptional document, which today still serves as a basis for our knowledge of French tapestry at the begin-

ning of the seventeenth century, was published by Jules Guiffrey and Maurice Fenaille in 1923.3 After François de La Planche’s death, Marc de Comans sold the management of the workshop in 1628 to his eldest son, Charles de Comans. Charles in turn died at the workshop, prematurely, on January 19, 1635. A new inventory was drawn up, again including both the personal property of the deceased and that of the workshop, between January 20 and February 7, 1635. This thirty-eight-page document, which in some places is very hard to decipher, is today conserved at the Minutier Central de Notaires (central office of notary registers) in Paris. It has not been published, except for a short extract that appeared in 1967.4 In light of the research on Parisian tapestries carried out by scholars over the past century, I here offer an analysis of this document, whose contents form a useful complement to information already provided by François de La Planche’s inventory of 1627. Despite the lack of precision in the document, I shall propose some new identifications of tapestries, which has rarely been attempted to date.

The notaries responsible for drafting the inventory began by describing Charles de Comans’s clothing. Next they gave details of his papers and documents. Among the most important of these were about ten commercial registers relating to the manufacture of tapestries. Some of these deal with measuring tapestries woven in the various studios of the workshop and include the names of the master tapestry weavers who worked in these studios, such as Lucas van den Dale, Pierre Brimard, Josse van den Huique, Jean de La Croix, Louis Bloemaert, Robert Alleaume, and Jean and Théodore Dautriche. We also learn from one of the registers that Charles de Comans, in partnership with Jacques Henetof, imported verdure tapestries (tapestries in which veg-
etation is the dominant motif) from the town of Oudenaarde. The descriptions of the documents even permit us to know some of the workshop’s clients: for example, there is mention of Madame du Vigeran, for tapestries bought in 1627; the Cour des Aides in Paris, to which tapestries bearing fleurs-de-lis were delivered; the duc de Savoie, for a set of tapestries with gold thread of Pastor Fido, supplied in 1627–28; the marquis de Villars, Madame Tallon, Madame d’Effiat, and Monsieur Scarron, treasurer to the duc de Vendome.

The most interesting part of Charles de Comans’s inventory, however, is that which deals with the tapestries that were found in the workshop. The inventory of these, drawn up with the help of Peeter Vaenendries, weaver in the boutique d’or, catalogues sixty-seven completely finished tapestries. Forty-four were stored at the Gobelins, while the other twenty-three were in the shop at his house on the rue Neuve-Saint-Médéric. The inventory also mentions a group of Oudenaarde tapestries, unfortunately not described, of which were left on consignment by merchants from there. In addition, the inventory refers to sixty looms on each of which a tapestry was in progress.

I will now go over in more detail the various tapestry sets stored in the workshop at the Gobelins. The most expensive set of all, valued at 30,000 livres, was an eight-piece Story of Diana, woven in silk and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, with borders having the rare quality of gold-woven backgrounds. This evidence leads me to conclude that this sumptuous set was a reweaving of the famous set created for King Henry IV from cartoons made by Toussaint Dubreuil in the first years of the seventeenth century. The rich set described among Comans’s property in 1635 had already been mentioned, about 1630, in a document in the Barberini Archives in the Vatican Library. Its very high price no doubt explains why by 1635 it had still not found a purchaser. In addition, we can assume that the set was woven after 1627, since François de La Planche’s inven-

tory of that year does not describe a Diana set as sumptuous as this one. The only tapestry set of this series that survives today and that is as richly woven as this one, including the gold thread in the borders, is the set in six panels that is currently in a private collection in Geneva (figs. 1–3). These tapestries bear the coat of arms of the Pallavicino family of Genoa, to which the set belonged from the eighteenth century, but its earlier provenance is unknown. The posthumous inventory of Marc de Comans, Charles’s father, who died in 1643 or 1644, also mentions four Diana tapestries, valued at 8,000 livres, which were woven with gold and silver threads and whose borders have a gold-woven background, and thus were possibly from the same set? Charles de Comans’s inventory mentions two other Diana sets, one in six panels with figures highlighted with gold thread, which, because it was less rich than the eight-panel set, was valued at only 12,000 livres. Tapestries that could correspond to the description of this set are in the collections of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna and the Mobilier National in Paris (fig. 4).

Next mentioned in Charles de Comans’s inventory is a set of the Story of Artemisia comprising sixteen tapestries woven with silk and highlighted in gold and silver. This remarkable group was given the high value of 24,000 livres. As has long been known, the first versions of this series, created from drawings by Antoine Caron, had been woven for Henry IV and Marie de’ Medici in the first years of the seventeenth century. The inventory specifies that one of the sixteen tapestries bears the king’s coat of arms, which leads me to believe that the others had no coats of arms. A wide variety of borders frame surviving Artemisia tapestries, but the only panels to have been woven with precious threads and without the royal coat of arms are those whose borders have large scrolls and the letters AM (probably referring to Artemisia and her husband, Mausolus) in cartouches centered in the side borders. An important Artemisia set, with a
Fig. 1. *Diana and Apollo Slaying the Children of Niobe* from a set of the *Story of Diana*. Tapestry designed by Toussaint Dubreuil, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1630. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 415 × 540 cm. Private collection, Geneva. Photograph: courtesy Mobilier National, Paris.

Fig. 3. Diana among the Giants from a set of the Story of Diana. Tapestry designed by Toussaint Dubreuil, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1630. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 415 × 450 cm. Private collection, Geneva. Photograph: courtesy Mobilier National, Paris.

Fig. 4. Diana and Apollo Slaying the Children of Niobe from a set of the Story of Diana. Tapestry designed by Toussaint Dubreuil, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1630. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 400 × 535 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 15/3). Photograph: Ph. Sébert.
border of this type, belonged to Charles-Emmanuel, duc de Savoie, in the seventeenth century. Nine of its panels are still preserved in Turin (Palazzo Chiabele [6 pieces], Museo Civico [2], and Palazzo Reale [1]) and Milan (Lutomirska Collection in 1952). The Mobilier National has a seven-piece set with the same border (figs. 5–7). This set was purchased during the reign of Louis XIV, in 1662, from a tapissière named Petit. Indeed, this type of border was already being frequently used as early as 1627, when at least twenty-one tapestries with this border were included in François de La Planche’s inventory. Later, according to the 1644 posthumous inventory of Marc de Comans, seven of the sixteen tapestries mentioned in 1635 were still in the workshop. We cannot exclude the possibility that these seven tapestries are those that entered the royal collections under Louis XIV in 1662.

Another important tapestry set mentioned in Charles de Comans’s inventory is the Story of Constantine. Peter Paul Rubens had received the commission about 1622 to devise a tapestry series for Louis XIII based on the theme of the Christian emperor Constantine. The initial weaving is now in the Philadelphia Museum of Art, but the series returned to the looms several times afterward. The set mentioned in 1635 as part of the property of Charles de Comans, woven with silk and highlighted with gold, consisted of only four panels that were valued at a total of 8,000 livres. All the evidence shows that this was the set that was acquired in 1662, again from the tapissière Petit, by the Garde-Meuble Royal de la Couronne and which is now at the Mobilier National (figs. 8–11). The weaving characteristics and the dimensions described in the 1635 inventory correspond exactly with those of the set in the Mobilier National, whose border is
identical to that of the royal version now in Philadelphia. The four *Constantine* tapestries in the 1635 inventory were apparently what was left of a twelve-piece set, woven with precious threads, listed in the 1627 inventory. In the Kunsthistorisches Museum, there are six pieces of the *Story of Constantine*, which match the four in the Mobilier National and which certainly formed part of the same set (figs. 12, 13). However, it should be noted that in the 1644 posthumous inventory of Marc de Comans, there is listed a six-piece *Constantine* set, woven with silver and gold thread and valued at 15,000 livres, which is also close to the one in Vienna.

Charles de Comans’s posthumous inventory further includes a four-tapestry set with figures from *Ovid’s Metamorphoses*. The valuation of 1,000 livres gives the impression that the weaving was less rich than that of the other tapestries listed above. Also listed are eight tapestry cartoons representing scenes from *Ovid’s Metamorphoses*, appraised at 400 livres. Until now, it has not been known what the tapestries constituting this *Metamorphoses* series looked like. However, the Mobilier National has a tapestry, acquired in 1876, of the *Hunt of Meleager*, which most likely corresponds to this series (fig. 14). Since the story of Meleager and Atalanta is an episode in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, and since the Mobilier National tapestry bears the CC monogram of Charles de Comans in its right selvage, identification of the tapestry with the series listed in the 1635 inventory is especially plausible. Two other tapestries from the same series exist, but they do not bear any workshop mark. A panel relating to the
Fig. 8. *The Marriage of Constantine* from a set of the *Story of Constantine*. Tapestry design by Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1625. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 455 x 555 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 43/1). Photograph: Ph. Sébert

Fig. 9. *Worshipping the True Cross* from a set of the *Story of Constantine*. Tapestry design by Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1625. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 470 x 472 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 43/4). Photograph: Ph. Sébert
Fig. 10. *Constantine Defeating Licinius* from a set of the *Story of Constantine*. Tapestry design by Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1625. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 455 × 636 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 43/2). Photograph: Ph. Sébert

Fig. 11. *Constantine and Crispus* from a set of the *Story of Constantine*. Tapestry design by Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1625. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 465 × 407 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 43/3). Photograph: Ph. Sébert
Fig. 12. *The Entry into Rome* from a set of the *Story of Constantine*. Tapestry design by Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1625. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 470 × 530 cm. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (XVIII/4)

Fig. 13. *The Death of Constantine* from a set of the *Story of Constantine*. Tapestry design by Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1625. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 464 × 470 cm. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (XVIII/1)
Story of Narcissus and another showing Cephalus and Procris belong to the Centre des Monuments Nationaux, Paris (figs. 15, 16). We also know that Cardinal Richelieu owned a set of the Metamorphoses, but the borders on those are different. Isabelle Denis has published three tapestries from this set, two of which illustrate subjects I have not referred to so far, Venus and Adonis, Cephalus and Procris, and Apollo and Coronis. Two additional tapestries from Richelieu’s set, Narcissus and Pyramus and Thisbe, are known from old photographs (figs. 17, 18), which bring to six the number of subjects identified in this series of eight.

Charles de Coman’s inventory includes other tapestries of lesser value, such as verdures, a panel from the Hunts of Francis I after Laurent Guyot,20 as well as a panel showing a fountain from the Story of Rinaldo and Armida (valued at 400 livres), from the series designed by Simon Vouet, inspired by Torquato Tasso’s Gerusalemme liberata.21 This was probably Carlo and Ubaldo at the Fountain of Laughter (fig. 19).

Charles de Coman’s inventory also mentions several series of painted models used for tapestry weaving, but it does not provide the names of the artists. The first cartoons mentioned are the Loves of Apollo in eight parts, valued at 200 livres. It is highly likely that tapestries were woven from these cartoons. In 1928, Heinrich Göbel published a panel, whose whereabouts today are unknown (fig. 20). It has the mark of the Comans workshop, and it shows Apollo and Clytie, which fits in with the series. This tapestry was undoubtedly part of the three-piece set sold at auction in Paris in 1908, the catalogue of which reproduced Apollo Slaying Coronis.

Fig. 14. The Hunt of Meleager from a set of Ovid’s Metamorphoses. Tapestry design by an unknown designer or artist, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1630. Wool and silk, 337 × 388 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GOB 87). Photograph: Ph. Sébert


Fig. 17. Narcissus from a set of Ovid’s Metamorphoses. Tapestry design by an unknown designer or artist, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1630. Wool and silk, 305 × 287 cm. Whereabouts unknown. Photograph: Mobilier National, Paris, Braquenié collection

Fig. 18. Pyramus and Thisbe from a set of Ovid’s Metamorphoses. Tapestry design by an unknown designer or artist, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1630. Wool and silk, 317 × 285 cm. Whereabouts unknown. Photograph: Mobilier National, Paris, Braquenié collection
which is now in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (fig. 21). The third panel, *Apollo and Cupid*, is certainly the same as the one that appeared in a sale in Lille in 2003 (fig. 22). On cartouches in the upper corners of the borders, there are heads haloed with shafts of sunlight, and in the lower corners of the borders are sunflowers, which are symbols of Apollo. Among the tapestry cartoons belonging to Charles de Comans is listed a *Story of Rinaldo and Armida*, with small figures in nine subjects (valued at 400 livres), and another with large figures consisting of three panels (150 livres). The latter undoubtedly corresponds to Vouet’s designs, mentioned above. Also listed in the inventory are cartoons for a series based on the *Loves of the Gods* in four panels (valued at 400 livres), which could refer to the series of the same subject designed by Simon Vouet, as well as the cartoons for a *Diana* series in four panels (100 livres), possibly the one designed by Dubreuil, and eight cartoons for verdures (200 livres).

Although Charles de Comans’s inventory is not as detailed as the posthumous inventory of François de La Planché, drawn up in 1627, it provides valuable testimony to the financial situation of the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop during the first third of the seventeenth century and enables us to know in greater detail the stylistic development of Parisian tapestry during the reign of Louis XIII. In particular, it can be seen that the various series whose designs were created in the sixteenth century, such as *Pastor Fido*, *Gombault and Macée*, or the *Story of France*, which could still be seen in 1627, had completely disappeared by 1635. Very expensive tapestry sets, whose style was old-fashioned, such as the *Artemisia*, the *Diana*, or the *Constantine*, are still listed in the 1635 inventory, but these may have been weavings done some years before. Most noteworthy is the appearance in Charles de Comans’s posthumous inventory of 1635 of sets that were not listed in the earlier inventories and apparently not yet being produced in the Comans—De La Planché workshop, such as the *Metamorphoses*, the *Loves of the Gods*, the *Story of Rinaldo and Armida*, and the *Loves of Apollo*. These testify to the unceasing effort to keep adopting designs for new tapestry series and
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Fig. 20. Apollo and Clytie from a set of the Loves of Apollo. Tapestry design by an unknown designer or artist, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1630. Wool and silk, 320 × 450 cm. Whereabouts unknown. Photograph: after Heinrich Göbel, Wandteppiche, vol. 2, Die romanischen Länder (Leipzig, 1928), vol. 2, fig. 64.

Fig. 21. Apollo Slaying Coronis from a set of the Loves of Apollo. Tapestry design by an unknown designer or artist, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1630. Wool and silk, 320 × 290 cm. Los Angeles County Museum of Art (31.36.2).

Fig. 22. Apollo and Cupid from a set of the Loves of Apollo. Tapestry design by an unknown designer or artist, woven in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel workshop, Paris, ca. 1630. Wool and silk, 345 × 246 cm. Auction, Lille, 2005. Photograph: after sale cat., Mercier, Lille, December 11, 2005, no. 391.
to ensure the success and the reputation of the seventeenth-century Parisian tapestry workshops for a long time.

The translation from the French is by Jane MacAvock.

I thank Carine Politi, Marie-Hélène de Ribou, and particularly Christine Raimbault who helped me with the transcription of Charles de Comans’s inventory.

3. Archives Nationales, Paris, Minutier Central de Notaires, Paris (hereafter ANMC), file xviii, register 51, fols. 97r–115v, January 29, 1651; the inventory is published here as an appendix.
7. ANMC, file xiii, register 42, January 5, 1644: “quatre pieces de tapisserie de l’histoire de Diane rehaussé d’or et d’argent avec des bordures à fondz d’or contenant dix-huit aulnes de cours ou environ et trois aulnes et demye de hault, prisée huitc mil livres.”
12. ANMC, file xliii, register 42, January 5, 1644: “sept pièces de tapisserie rehaussées d’or et d’argent représentent l’histoire d’Artémise sur quatre aulnes de hault ou environ et trente-deux aulnes de cours ou environ, priseses quinze mil livres.”
16. ANMC, file xliii, register 42, January 5, 1644: “six pieces de tapisserie de l’histoire de Constanti rehaussée d’or et d’argent de trente-deux aulnes ou environ de cours sur quatre aulnes de hault, prisée quinze mil livres.”
19. Documentation in the Mobilier National, Braquenié collection. In the same collection is a photograph of a tapestry from a set of Aminta, showing the *Despoir de Sylvia* (305 × 520 cm), with Richelieu’s coat of arms and the same border as his *Metamorphoses* set.
Appendix: Charles de Comans’s Posthumous Inventory

The inventory, dated January 29, 1635, is in the Archives Nationales, Paris, Minutier Central de Notaires, file LVIII, register 51, fols. 97v–115v. To assist the reader, quotations from Charles de Comans’s commercial registers listed in the inventory have been transcribed in italics. Inconsistencies in spelling are explained by the fact that the inventory was drafted by two different scribes. Similarly, the notaries could not always get the citations from the commercial registers comprehensively transcribed.

Abbreviations: l.—livre; s.—sol; d.—denier

L’an mil six cens trente cinq, le lundi du matin vingt-neufième jour de janvier et autres jours conséquents et ensuivant, certaine sentence donnée au Chastelet de Paris entre les parties souabnommées le vingt-septième jour des présens mois et an qui sera cy-après transcipte, et à la requeste de noble homme Marc de Comans, directeur des manufactures des tapisseries du roy façon de Flandres en France, demeurant en l’hostel de Canaye scitue à Saint-Marcel hors et près la faulce porte dudit lieu, tant en son nom comme habille à se dire et porter seul et unique héritier mobiller de dudit noble homme Charles de Comans son fils, vivant aussy dudit directeur desdites manufactures, que se faisant et portant fort de Louis de Comans son fils escuyer, capitaine d’une compagnie de gens de pied au régiment du sieur comte de Candalle et encore tuteur de Hipolite de Comans, fils mineur de luuy et de duffunct dameoiselle Catherine de La Planche jadis sa femme, Alexandre de Comans directeur desdites manufactures, dameoiselle Catherine de Comans veuve de feu Jean Vandenmeeze, vivant escuyer, et dameoiselle Francoise de Comans, femme séparée quant aux biens d’avec Adrian Coxh son mary bourgeois de Paris, tous demeurans aussy dans ledict hostel de Canaye, lesditz Louis, Alexandre, Catherine, Francoise et Hypolite de Comans, frères et sœurs, habilles aussy se porter héritiers immobiliers quand aux propres dudit duffunct Charles de Comans leur frère, et aussy à la requeste de damoiselles Marie, Francoise, Elisabet et Jeanne de La Planche sœurs, filles, lesdites Marie et Francoise majeure et lesdites Elisabet et Jeanne émancipées d’age, usantes et jouissantes de leurs droits sous l’autorité de maître Louis Turpin, procureur audit Chastelet de Paris, leur curateur, demeurantes lesdites domoilles de La Planche dans le mesme hostel de Canaye, en la presence dudit Turpin tant audit nom de curateur lesdites domoilles de La Planche que comme procureur de Louis de La Planche, escuyer, sieur du Croissant, de noble homme Raphaël de La Planche, pareillement directeur desdites manufactures, demeurant à Paris rue Quinquamupois paroisse Saint-Jose, et de maistre Charles Carré, aussy procureur audit Chastelet de Paris ayant charge comme il a dict dudit Adrian Cochx et, à la conservation des droitz de qui il appartierit, après que le scelé qui avoit esté mis et apposé sur les biens dud. deffunct Charles de Comans à la requeste lesdites domoilles de La Planche par M’Claude Le Vacher, commissaire examinateur audit Chastelet de Paris, auquel lesditz Raphaël de La Planche et Cochx estoient opposans, a esté par lesdits Le Vacher recognoict, levé et esté suivant ladite sentence, par Claude Caron et Jacques Belin, notaires et gardonettes du roy nostre sire en sondict Chastelet de Paris soubzsignez, a esté faict invenitaire et description de tous et chacuns les biens meubles, ustancilles d’hostel, linge, habitz, orfèverie, deniers comptans, ouvrages et marchandises de tapisserie, debtes, créances, letters, titres, papiers et enseignemens demeurers après le dixdict dudit deffunt Charles de Comans, advenu audit hostel de Canaye le dix-neufième jour de dudit présens mois et an, trouvés et estans tant en une chambre et cabinet que lesdits deffunt de Comans occupoit dans le mesme hostel, que en une maison où il estoit demeurant sciez et scituee en ceste dicte ville de Paris, rue Neufve et parroisse de Sainct-Médéric, monstrez, enseignez et representez par lesditz Marc et Alexandre de Comans, père et fils, et par Jacques Hincxthouen, commis dudit deffunt Charles de Comans, François Chefdeville et Nicole Aublet, servantes domestiques dudit Marc de Comans père, après serment par chacun d’eulx fait devant lesditz notaires soubzsignez de ne cacher, réceler ny labeter aucune chose des biens et droitz de la succession dudit deffunt Charles de Comans soubz les peynes de droit à chacun d’eulx exprimées par lesdiz notaires, lesdits biens meubles prisez et estimés par Robert Ollard et Nicolas.
Ithier, sergens à verge priseurs vendeurs de biens meubles audit Chastelet prévosté et vicomté de cette ville de Paris, qui ont faict la susdite prise en leurs consciences eu égard au temps présent, et a esté par lesdits notaires, en ensuite ladite sentence, procedé audit inventaire comme s’ensuit et est signé:

De Comans
De La Planche
Elizabeth
Marie de La Planche
Françoise de La Planche
Quarré
Caron
Alexandre de Comans
Françoise de Comans
Caterine de Comans
Elizabeth de La Planche
Jeanne de La Planche
Turpin
Belin

Ensuite la teneur de ladite sentence.

A tous ceux qui ces présentes lettres verront, Louis Séguier, chevalier, baron de Saint-Brisson, seigneur des Ruaux et de Saint-Firmain, conseiller du roy notre sire, gentilhomme ordinaire de sa chambre et garde de la prévosté de Paris, salut. Sçavez faisons que aujourd’hui, sur la requête faite en jugement devant nous au Chastelet de Paris par M. François Martin, procureur de Marc de Comans directeur des manufactures de tapisseries du roy aux Gobellins, tant en son nom que comme habillé à se dire et porter héritier de defunct Charles de Comans son filz, aussi directeur desdits manufactures, demande aliencontre de M. Louis Turpin, procureur de Marye, Françoise, Elisabet et Jeanne de La Planche et noms qu’elles procedent, qui ont fait sceller tant les biens demeurés après le decese susdite defunct que ceux appartenant audict demantere, et Jeanne et Catherine de Comans, veufve de feu Jean Vandelrenèze, maistre Daniel Ameline procureur de Raphaël de La Planche, directeur desdites manufactures, opposans audit scellé, et maistre Pierre Mollé procureur de ladite Catherine de Comans, parties ouyes avec lesdiz Turpin, Martin et Mollé esdits noms et par vertu du defaut de nom donné aliencontre audict Ameline non comparant, nous ordonns que les scellés, qui ont esté apposez tant sur les biens dudit defunct que dudit demantere et de ladite Catherine de Comans, seront levés et ostés par le commissaire qui les a apposez, i-cez préalablement reconnus, inventaire et description faits par Caron et Belin notaires ceans de ce qui se trouvera de la succession dudit defunct de Comans, ensemble des effects, papiers, livres et société qui se trouveront soubz lesdiz scellés et des tapisseries qui sont au magasin, la prise et vente faict par Ithier que nous nommons d’office et, pour les meubles, titres, papiers et enseignemens appartenans au dudit Marc et Catherine de Comans, leur en avons faict et faisons mainlevée, despens, domages et intérêts réservés, à la levée duquel scellé seront les opposans présens ou deument appelés, et exécuté nonobstant oppositions ou appellations quelconques, en temoin de quoy avons fait sceller ces présentes; ces fut faict et donné par noble homme maistre Antoinne Fend, conseiller du roy et lieutenant particullier tenant le siège, le samedi vingt-septième janvier mil six cens trente-cinq et plus bas est escript collationné avec un paraphe et à costé est aussi escript Martin Baudier.

[Start of the inventory]

En la chambre dudit defunct en laquelle il est décédé ayant veue sur le jardin, s’est trouvé:

Un coffre de bahud carré de trois pieds ou environ de long à une serrure fermant à clé prisé quatre livres tournoiz cy... II. L.

Dans ledit coffre se sont trouvez:

Un pourpoint et haut de chausse de drap d’Espagne, un manteau de pou de soye doublé de panne garny d’un passement de soye façon de Flandres, le tout noir, prisé ensemble quarte-livre cy... XL. I.

Items trois chappeaux de castor garnis de leurs cordons dont l’un presque neuf, prisé ensemble cinquante livres cy... L. I.

Item un pourpoint de tabis, un haut de chausse de taffetas avec un manteau de drap d’Espagne doublé de tabis chamarrez d’un passement de soye façon de Flandres, le tout prisé ensemble vingt livres cy... XX. I.

Item un haut de chausse de drap d’Espagne, un pourpoint de satin plein et un autre manteau de drap d’Espagne doublé de panne, le tout non garny d’un passement de soye façon de Milan, prisé ensemble cinquante livres cy... L. I.

Item deux pourpointez et un haut de chausse de pou de soye noir et un manteau aussey de pou de soye doublé d’autre pou de soye, le tout chamarré d’un passement de soye façon de Milan, prisé ensemble vingt livres cy... XX. I.

Item un autre manteau de drap d’Espagne doublé de panne prisé trente livres tournoiz cy... XXX. I.

Item un calleçon de revesche rouge avec un bas de laine grise, prisé ensemble trente solz cy... XXX. s.
Item un bas de soye, deux paires de jarretières et trois paires de nœuds à mettre aux souliers le tout noir, prisé ensemble douze livres tournois cy... XII l.

Item sept chemises de thoiolle de Hollande à usage dud. defunct, une thoiitte de thoiolle à entretoilles, deux paires de bas à botter bordez de passement, un bonnet de lainée doublé, une coiffe de nuict et six paires de chaussons, le tout ensemble prisé vingt-cinq livres cy... XXV l.

Au regard d’une paire de chenets de cuivre garnis de leur feu, une table de bois de noyer se tirant par les deux bouts sur laquelle est un tapis de mocquette, une grande couche de bois de noyer, un lict traversin, trois pontes de serje jaune en housse, une couche à bas pilliers garnie de son lict et traversin et une couverture de lainée, et une tanière de tapisserie de cloute lice contenant sept pièces rehaussées de soye à verdures, le tout trouvé en lad. chambre, led. Marc de Comans a dict qu’ils luy appartiennent et en laissant servir s’ils lorsqu’il couchoit audict hostel de Canaye, au subject de quoi ils n’ont esté prises et a led. de Comans signé.

De Comans

Dudit jour lundi de relevée, lesdzctz notairez auraient vacqué toute lad. relevée, à la requeste et en préséance desd. partiez, à veoir les papiers et enseignements trouvez dans les coffres, buffets et cabinetz appartennans audizctz damoiselles Vandrenèze et Cochx, sur lesquels led. scellé aivoit aussy esté apposé pour recognoistre sy entre ices papiers il y en avoit aucunz concernans les biens et droitz dud. defunct Charles de Comans et ne s’en estant trouvé de lad. succession d’ielyz deffectz, les partiez ont remis la continuation duz. inventaire à demain mardy, deux heures de relevée, aud. hostel et ont signé.

Françoise de Comans
De Comans
Alexandre de Comans
Marie de La Planche
De La Planche
Caterine de Comans
Elizabeth de La Planche
Françoise de La Planche
Jeanne de La Planche
Turpin
Quarré

Dud. jour mardy trentizmesse dud. mois de relevée, fut led. inventaire continué comme s’ensuit par la description des libresz cy-aprez déclarez tirez du cabinet dudit deffectz, à cause que led. Sde Comans père et fils ont dict en avoir besoin.

Premièrement un livre de papier réglé, relié et couvert de parchemin, intitulé sur la couverture mil VFXXV livre de caisse commencé le XXIII octobre mil VFXXV et au-dessous invento backdrop six vingt-seize, contenu led. livre plusieurs feuilletz dont soixante-un sont escriptz, laquelle escription led. S de Comans et de La Planche ont dit estré de la main dud. deffectz, commenceant sur le premier desdizctz LXXIP feuilletz par ces motz mil VF-XXV cassa dejet ady dix-huitzmesse octobre et au-dessous ady XVIII octobre quatre cenz livres recuez de Mz Jacquelin et finissant par les dernières lignes du septizmesse feuilletz recto par ces motz mil sept cenz trente une livres recuese de Mz de Crien pour cinq pieces de menues verdurez à luy vendues sur autres deux et demy et recommencée la despine sur le huitzmesse feuilletz recto aussy en ces motz mil VF vingt-cinq adi XXXIII octobre adi vingt-quarizmesse octobre payé comptant à un homme de Millty pour huitz cenz diz-neuf livres de houblon qu’il nous a vendu et finist sur ledicit LXXXIP feuilletz en ses dernières par ces motz quizne cenz livres tournois au S Marc de Comans à luy payé comptant et le sommé à la fin de la ligne par chiffres d’arithmetique à trois cenz quatre-vingtz quize mil cent cinquante-trois livres quatorze sols neuf deniers tournois et après ledict soixante unziemesse feuilletz sont plusieurs feuilletz blancs et ensuitz d’iezctz vingt-six autres feuilletz escriptz de mesme main des frais de marchandises commençant audict dix-huitzmesse octobre mil six cenz vingt-cinq jusques au vingt-sixizmesse apriz mil six cenz trente-trois suivant les dattes cotez en marge, en tousz ledzctz feuilletz dudit livre n’y a aucun article rayé, dans lequel livre se sont trouvez trois mémoires aussy escriptz de la main dudit deffectz en forme de souete de caise, invento backdrop au bas dud. LXXXIP feuilletz en fin dud. vingt-sixizmesse suivant sur la couverture dud. livrez et chacun desd. mémoires l’un comme l’autre... Un.

Item un autre livre relié et couvert de parchemin contenant plusieurs feulletz non cotez, seize desquelz sont escriptz aussy de la main dud. deffectz, aucuns d’un seul costé et les autres d’un et d’autres, commenceant par ces motz, sur le premier d’izctz feuilletz escriptz verso, facture des tapisseriesz qui estoient sur les mesitres le cinquizemesse septembre MVF trente trois et qui me sont demeurez par le partage que j’ay faitz avec le S Raphaël de La Planche led. jour, et finissant la derniere ligne dud. XVI’ feuilletz aussi verso, par ces motz monté par fosse de La Hauque le XXVII novembre MVF trente-quatre, des articles duquel livre n’a que le VII’ du XV’ feuilletz verso rayé, inventoiéz sur led. XVI’ feuilletz et sur led. livre... Deux.
Item un autre livre d'aulnages et mesure des tapisseries, aussy relié et couvert de parchemin et escript de la main dud. defunt, contenant plusieurs feuilletz dont y en a dix du commencement escript consécutivement de costé et d'autre, lors ledit X qui n'est escript que recto, et commence le premier par MVF'XXIII aulnage chez Lucas Vanderdale, et finissant sur led. X pour autre aulnage dud. Lucas Vanderdale MVF'XXXIII inscript au titre dud. feuillet duquel la dernière ligne est du XXIII° décembre, depuis lesquels dix feuilletz sont plusieurs feuilletz blancz et après iecuex cinq autres escript consécutivement de mesmo main commences par MVF'XXXIII aulnage chez Pierre Brinard et finissant sur led. cinquiesme recto par ces motz le XXIII° décembre, le titre duquel cinquiesme feuillet est de lad. année MVIV° trente-quatre, ensuite desquelz sont autres feuilletz blancz et après iecuex six autres feuilletz escript de mesmo main commences en mil VI° trente-trois par l'aulnage de Joss Van den Huique et finissant sur led. sixiesme feuillet coté au haut MVIV° trente-quatre par ces motz le XXIII° décembre, après suivent cinq autres feuilletz escript consécutivement, plusieurs feuilletz blancz et iecuex les précédens commences en MVIV° trente-trois par l'aulnage de Jean de La Croix et finissant sur led. cinquiesme verso en lad. année MVIV° trente-quatre par ces motz le XXIII° décembre payé sur le plat bold trois livres, suivent encore autres feuilletz blancz et après iecuex trois escript de suite commences en lad. année MVIV° trente-trois par l'aulnage de Jean Vernetort et finissant sur le troiesime et verso par autre aulnage du mesmo ouvrier MVIV° trente-quatre en ces motz le XXIII° décembre trois livres sur la bordure, lequel livres led. de Comans père et filz ont dict ne servir que pour aulnier et compter avec les ouvriers et maistres des boutiques d'icelles manufactures, inventorié sur chacun desd. derierns feuilletz escriptz l'un comme l'autre et sur led. livre . . . Trois.

Item un autre livre de papier, relié et couvert de mesmo que les précédens, contenant plusieurs feuilletz dont les pages sont cotées verso et recto, desquelz feuilletz y a au commencement trente-cinq escript consécutivement d'un costé d'autre, lors le premier qui n'est escript que verso et le XXXV° recto, commencez sur led. premier en l'année 1633 par ces motz une piee de Regnault et Armide à on, et finissant led. XXXV° feuillet coté au haut 1634 par ces motz le XXIII° décembre, ensuite desquelz les feuilletz sont blancz jusques à la IIII°XXIII° cotte, à laquelle commence au XVII° septembre MVIV° trente-trois les testes naturelles et plusieurs autres feuilletz des chaurnes, paisages et autres besongnes doubles desd. tapisseries que led. parties n'ont désiré estre plus particulièrement descriptz, memento l'estat des payemens faictz aux ouvriers, finissant sur la IIIF°XXXVI° cotte, led. livre aussy escript de la main dud. defunt Charles de Comans, lequel led. de Comans père et filz ont dict ne servir que pour les mesure et aulnages de la boutique d'or, inventorié en fin desd. XXXV° feuillet et derierns escriptz et sur la couverture . . . Quatre.

Item un petit livre de papier, long et estroit, relié et couvert comme les précédens, aussy escript de la main dud. defunt, contenant cent XIXVIII cottes, desquellez y en a plusieurs feuilletz escriptz et autres blancz, commenceant au premier feuillet 1633 estat des ouvriers travaillans en la boutique d'or, finissant sur lad. CXXVIII° cotte par ce que doibt Jean Hessebench, inventorié en fin dud. livre et sur la couverture . . . Cinq.

Item un autre livre de papier long et estroit, escript de la main dud. Jacques Hincoft, que led. S° de Comans et Hincotf ont dict estre le livre de caisse de recepice et despense par luy faitz des factures des tapisseries des marches des ville de Haudenarde, dont la vente a esté faisct et le faitz journellement en la maison et magasin dud. defunt esant en la ville de Paris, contenant quarante-sept feuilletz escriptz, plusieurs blancz entre [il]ecuex, commenceant en 1631 l'XVII° décembre, lequel livre, à la réquisision desd. damoiselles et S° de La Planche, a esté paraphé par Balin, l'un des notaires soubszignez, en fin de l'escripture de chacune page et inventorié sur led. dernier feuillet escript et couverture . . . Six.

Item un grand livre de papier, aussy relié et couvert de parchemin et de toille verte par-dessus, contenant plusieurs feuilletz dont IIII°XIX° cottez, desquelz y en a IIII°XXIX° escript consécutivement lors le III° qui est blanc et le reste des feuilletzd. livre après led. IIII°XIX° est aussy blanc, commenceant au premier feuillet coté recto par ces motz Aulx der anno 1630 Paris, Cassa doibt avoir XIX° juillet par M° Raphael de La Planche trente-deux livres, et finissant audit IIII°XXIX° feuillet verso par ces motz Aulx der anno 1632 Paris, Robert Alleasom doibt et est sommé en chiffres à V'FLVIII l. III° s. III d., lequel livre led. parties ont dict entre le grand livre de compte double des parties extraictes du journal cy-après inventorié, inventorié à la fin dud. IIII°XXIX° feuillet . . . Sept.

Item un grand autre livre relié et couvert comme le précédent, qui est le journal sur led. desd. parties ont esté extraictes et portées au septiesime livre dud. inventorié, lequel journal commence au III° feuillet coté Aulx der anno
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1630 a adj XIe juillet Paris, et finissant sur la CVIIe page dernière cotée recto par ces mots Carré à raison de neuf livres X s. l'aune, inventorié à la fin de lad. CVIIe cotée... Huitc.

Item deux gros cayers de papier attachez ensemble et couverture d'une carte en fason de cuir intitulé livre de la brasserise de cette année 1634 contenant IIII.XXV feuilletz escriptz de la main dud. S' de Comans père ainsi qu'il a déclaré, lors le LXIIXIIe qui est blanc, commençant au feuillet coté ung 1634 pour la dispensa de la brasserise de cy-devant folio premier IIII-XLIII. VI., et finissant sur led. IIII.XXV recto par ces mots Jose Vanhauque à folio IIII.XXVII livres sept, lequel ilvre led. S' de Comans a dict luy apartsenir et n'importer que à luy seul, pourquoi il proteste que l'inventorié ne luy puisse nuire ni préjudicer et par led. damoiselles et Ss' de La Planche a esté protesté au contraire et que lesd. protestations ne leur puissent préjudicier, inventoriées... Neuf.

Ce faict, lesd. livres dessus inventoriées ont esté délaissées en la possession desd. Ss' Marc et Alexandre de Comans, qui s'en sont chargées et, estant près de six heures du soir, la continuation d'dud. inventaire a esté remise à demain mercredy deux heures de relevé aud. hostel de Canaye et ont signé.

De Comans
De La Planche
Françoise de La Planche
Elizabeth de La Planche
Jeanne de La Planche
Quarre
Alexandre de Comans
Caterine de Comans
Francoise de Comans
Marie de La Planche
Turpin

Dudict jour mercredy dernier janvier mil six cens trente-cinq de relevé, fut led. inventaire continué à la requête et présence que dessus comme s'ensuit par la description des autres libres et papiers trouvez dans led. cabinet, à quoiz est intervenu led. Louis de La Planche susnommé.

Item un autre libvre relié et couvert de parchemin intitulé sur la couverture libre de taille de la boutique d'or commencé le quatrième janvier l'an mil six cens trente-deux, contenant plusieurs feuilletz tant escriptz que blanc non cotiez, que lesd. parties n'ont désiré estre plus particulièrement descript, avec lequel est un cahier de papier contenant trente feuilletz escriptz intitulé sur le premier facture des tapisseries façon de Plandres pour M. Charles de Comans, commençant au quatrième juillet mil six cens trente, inventorié sur la couverture dud. premier libvre et trentiesme feuillets verso de l'autre semblablement... Dix.

Item trois cahiers de papier attachés ensemble en façon de libvre couvert d'une carte, sur la couverture duquel libvre est escript livre des factures de tapissiers mil VI. XXVI et mil VI. XXVII, XXVIII et XXIX. XXX contenant trente et neuf feuilletz escriptz commençant au hault du premier feuillet escript verso par ces mots mil VI. XXXVI [sic] facture d'une tante de tapissier de Constanti le grand et finissant sur led. trente-neufiesme feuillet recto par ces mots livr par Jean de La Croix le douziésme octobre mil VI. trente, dans lequel libvre en a plusieurs articles rayez, inventorié sur led. dernier feuillet escript... Unze.

Item un mémoire des tapissiers qui ont esté fournis et livrés à M. de Vigean escript sur la première page d'une feuille de papier, portant qu'il reste à payer la somme de trois mil cent cinquante quatre livres tournois sans aucun datte de jour ny année, avec lequel mémoire est cospie du marchéd fait par led. Raphael de La Planche avec la dame du Vigean pour fourniture desd. tapissiers datée du XXIIe septembre mil VI. XXVIII signé Anne de Neufbourg, inventorié au bas dud. mémoire et marché l'un comme l'autre... Douze.

Item un explicit de commandement et emprisonnement faict à la requête dudit Marc de Comans par Boursier, huissier aux requetes du paileys, le XXIIe mars mil VI. XXXIII de la personne de Bernard Guéroult, Ss' de La Rocque, pour les sommes de deux mil huit cens quarante livres de principal et douze livres dix solz tournois portez par sentence du Chastelet du trentiesme aoust mil six cens vingt-huit, inventorié au bas... Treize.

Item un acte passé pardevant Belin et Bonot, notaires au Chastelet de Paris, le dixiesme juillet mil VI. trente-quatre, par lequel damoiselle Anne Lescipier, fille majeure usante et jouissante de ses droitz, auroit reconu que ledict defunct Charles de Comans avoit passé procuration, le nom du procureur en blanc, et icelle délivrée à lad. damoiselle pour poursuivre et recevoir le payement de seize cens livres de damoiselle Jeanne Pajot, en laquelle led. Ss' de Comans ne prétendoit aucune chose ains appartenoit à lad. damoiselle Lescipier, qui auroit partant promis l'acquierer et garentir de l'évenement d'icelle procuration, inventorié... Quatorze.

Item un contract en parchemin passé pardevant Parque et ledict Belin, notaires, le dix-neufiesme d'april mil six cens trente-quatre, en forme
d'accord et transaction entre ledict defunct Charles de Comans et Louis Blommart, ouvrier edictes tapissiers, par lequel ledict Blommart s'est obligé envers led. defunct au payement de deux cens quatre-vingt sept livres quinze solz qu'il luy deboit pour les causes y contenus et des despens faizt es instances contre luy menés le tout a volonté dud. S' de Comans, inventorié . . . Quinze.

Item un mémoire que led. parties ont dict estre escript de la main dudit defunct Charles de Comans,cotté au haut mil six cens vingt-sept et commençant par ces mots receu le XIX aoüst pour une description de la somme de trente-trois mil trois cens trente livres tournoiz, dont nous avons esté réassignez sur le second payement du trésoré des ponts et chaussées, lequel mémoire contient assy la despence de lad. somme, inventorié au bas . . . Seize.

Item un inventaire contenant plusieurs cahiers de papier faict a la requête dudit Marc de Comans, en la présence de M' Thomas de Comans, S' d'Astry, habilles d'estre héritiers de feu M' Hérosme de Comans, vivant conseiller et maistre d'hostel du roy, des biens demeurant après le décès dud. defunct, par Garnon et Lemoyne, notaires aud. Chatelet, le dernier janvier mil six cens trente-un et autres jours suivans, inventorié en fin . . . Dix-sept.

Item une obligation passée aud. Charles de Comans de la somme de cinquante livres tournoiz par Jean et Théodore Dauthuche père et fils, tapissiers françois, pardevant de Mon-roussel et Nourry, notaires, le huicetieuse aoust mil six cens trente-trois, portant promesse de servir led. de Comans pendant le temps y déclaré en considération du don qu'il leur auroit fait d'autres cinquante livres, inventorié . . . Dix-huict.

Item une autre obligation de cinquante une livres passée aud. de Comans par Feddon Perelasie, tapissier, pardevant led. notaires le neufviesme aoust mil six cens trente-trois, inventorié . . . Dix-neuf.

Item une autre obligation de dix-sept livres tournoiz passée aud. de Comans par Abraham van Haubequin pardevant led. notaires led. neufviesme aoust aud. an, inventorié . . . Vingt.

Item une obligation de trente-quatre livres tournoiz passée aud. defunct par Abraham van Huabequin pardevant led. notaires led. neufviesme aoust aud. an, inventorié . . . Vingt-un.

Item une autre obligation de Gabriel Lefebvre aud. defunct de la somme de vingt-cinq livres dix solz devant Huart et led. Nourry le septiesme desd. mois et an, inventorié . . . Vingt-deux.

Item une autre obligation de trente-quatre livres au nom dud. defunct par Adrien Amhoine passée pardevant led. notaires led. neufviesme aoust mil six cens trente-trois aud. de Comans, inventorié . . . Vingt-trois.

Item une autre obligation de dix-sept livres passée aud. de Comans devant led. notaires par Gatian Crespin le huictiesme desd. mois et an, inventorié . . . Vingt-quatre.

Item une autre obligation de vingt-cinq livres dix solz tournoiz passée par Nicolas Crespin devant led. notaires le landemain neufviesme desd. mois et an, inventorié . . . Vingt-cinq.

Item une autre obligation de trente-quatre livres tournoiz passée par Louis Bellanger le huicetieuse desd. mois et an devant led. notaires, inventorié . . . Vingt-six.

Item une autre obligation de dix-sept livres passée devant led. notaires le neufviesme desd. mois et an par Jean Bellanger, inventorié . . . Vingt-sept.

Item une autre obligation de vingt-cinq livres dix solz passée led. jour devant led. notaires par Jacques Rigault, inventorié . . . Vingt-huict.

Item une autre obligation de vingt-cinq livres dix solz tournoiz passée par Isaac du Monteil devant led. notaires le treiziesme jour desd. mois et an, inventorié . . . Vingt-neuf.

Item une autre obligation de mesma datte et somme passée devant led. notaires par Pierre Bardasolle, inventorié . . . Trente.

Item une autre obligation de vingt-huict livres tournoiz passée le sixiesme jour desd. mois et an par Guérard de Bacher devant led. notaires, inventorié . . . Trente-un.

Item une obligation de dix-sept livres passée audict defunct de Comans par Abraham de Lacorde devant led. notaires le neufviesme jour desd. mois et an, inventorié . . . Trente-deux.
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Item une autre obligation de quatre-vingt-dix livres dix solz tournoi passé audict deffunct par Lucas Tanermer devant lesd. de Monrossel et Nourry, notaires, leu neuvième aoust mil six cens trente-trois, inventorié... Trente-quatre.

Item une autre obligation de vingt-cinq livres dix solz passé aud. deffunct par Pierre Degrain devant lesd. notaires le huitième aoust aud. an, inventorié... Trente-cinq.

Item une autre obligation de Jean Hoffhuns de la somme de cent livres tournoi passé aud. deffunct devant lesd. notaires le XXVI® septemb. mil six cens trente-trois payable six solz par semain, inventorié... Trente-six.

Ce faict, lesd. papiers dessus inventoriées a eté délaissées en la possession desd. S® de Comans père et fils qui en sont chargé et estant six heures du soir la continuation a eté remise à demain jeudy une heure de relevée et ont signé.

De Comans
Caterine de Comans
De La Planche
Françoise de La Planche
Quartré
Alexandre de Comans
Louis de La Planche
Françoise de Comans
Elizabeth de La Planche
Marie de La Planche
Jeanne de La Planche
Turpin

Dudict jour jeudy de relevée, premier jour de février audict an mil six cens trente-cinq, fut led. inventaire continué à la requête et en présence que dessus commença s’ensuit.

Item une feuille de papier commencée par ces mots compte que rend le S® Charles de Comans au S® Raphael de La Planche de toutes les tapiserries qui estoient sur les meubies le III® juillet MVI® tente, dont ils ont esté chargez par le procés-verbal qui en a esté fait par M° de Fouey et finissant par ces mots fait et arrêté devant nous soussignéz à Paris le XVI® jour de septembre MVI® trente-trois double, signé de Comans compagnie, de Comans et de La Planche, inventorié... Trente-sept.

Item une copie signée par collation Dupin, commis au greffe de la cour des aysdes à Paris, datée du XVI® juillet MVI® vingt-huit, d’un certificat des S® commissaires dépeutez pour la construction du nouveau bastiment de lad. cour des aysdes datée du XX® avril MVI® vingt-sept qu’il a esté fourny par le S® de Comans cent neuf aulnes de tapiserrie de haute lice à fleurs de lis vallans II®LXXI® 1 au prix porté par led. certificat, l’original duquel est demeuré au greffe de lad. cour comme il est mentionné par lad. collation, inventorié... Trente-huit.

Item ung acte en papier signé Belin et Remond, notaires au Chastelet, en datte du XXIII® avril MVI® trente-deux, par lequel apert noble homme Marc de Comans, entrepreneur des manufactures de tapiserrie de Flandres en France, auroit cédé à nobles hommes Cornelle Roger et François Dujardin, valet de chambre du roy, de la somme de dix-neuf mil III®XXV l tournoi de deux aud. S® de Comans par monseigneur le duc de Savoye, led. transport fait moyennant six mil VII®III®III®X VII® l X payés lors comptant aud. S® de Comans aveau promesse de luy payer par led. S® Roger et Dujardin la somme de dix mil II®LXXIII® l X et les II®XXIII® l restans auroient esté reçus par led. S® de Comans, le tout selon qu’il est plus au long et particulièremment déclaré par led. transport, inventorié... Trente-neuf.

Item ung escript datté à Paris du XX® novembre MVI® vingt-sept signé Lumague et Mascarani par lequel ils reçoignoient avoir receu dud. S® Marc de Comans et compagnie une renture de tapiserrie de Paris nommée le Pastor fido, de laine, soye et or, contenant vingt-sept aulnes de tour sur trois aulnes un tiers de hault, pour envoyer à Thurin au S® Charles Barome aux conditions et selon qu’il est plus au long porté par led. escript, avec lequel estoient une copie de lettre missive dud. Marc de Comans et compagnie adressing au S® Carlo Baroma de Thurin, datée du quinzième juillet mil VI® vingt-huit, par laquelle il luy mance qu’il a accordé avec lesd. S® Lumague à six mil livres tournoi pour le prix de lad. tapisserie payable à la fin d’icelle année, et une autre missive dud. Baroma aud. de Comans et compagnie portant qu’il avoit receu ladite missive et qu’il feront ressouvenir s’altene pour luy donner satisfac. tion dont et veu par icelle qu’ils airoient accordé depuis avec lesdits S® Lumague pour lad. tapiserrie et qu’il approuvoit ce qu’ils en avoient fait ou feroinent, inventorié sur led. trois pièces l’une comme l’autre... Quarante.

Item une promesse signée Villars datée du XI® avril MVI® vingt-deux contenant qu’il est debu au S® Adrian Cox la somme de trois mil livres tournoi pour reste de vente d’une tapiserrie, au dos de laquelle promesse sont trois receus le premier contenant qu’il a esté receu de M° le marquis de Villars IV® l le X® mars MVI®XXIII signé de Comans, le second de III® l du XXVI® avril aud. an signé Cochx, et le III® de VI® l du
XVIIe avril MVIe vingt-sept signé de Comans, inventorié . . . Quarante-ung.

Item une feuille de papier dont une page escrite de la main dud. defunct S' Charles de Comans, ainsi que lesd. S' de Comans père et filz ont dict, commençant par ces mots M' de Comans et de La Planche dédient au S' Jean Van der Niesen du 28 janvier 1627 et finissant par ce chiffre 252x8 13, inventorié . . . Quarante-deux.

Item deux feuilles de papier contenant trois roles et deux descriptions, signées de Comans et Catherine Haimbert, commençant est et déclaration des dettes de a la communauté et societé d’entre les S' de Comans et de La Planche par plusieurs et diverses payements faits et présentés par le S' de Comans suivant et ainsi qu’il est porté en l’inventaire fait après le décéd dud. defunt S' de La Planche et finissant lequel présent estat cy-dessus nous Marc de Comans et damoiselle Catherine Haimbert, veuve de feu François de La Planche, certifions contenter vérité, fait doux souvz nos seing ce dernier aoust MVF vingt-sept, inventorié pour seconde fois . . . Quarante-trois.

Item une missive ou mandement, signé de Comans, daté du VIIe avril MVF trente-quatre, adressée à M' Desnoz, trésorier général des bastiments de sa majesté, par lequel il y mande de payer à M' de La Planche, son cousin, la somme de cinq cens livres que M' Jacques luy a promis il y a longtemps, au dos duquel mandement est le receu de lad. somme de V' l. dud. S' Desnoz en datte dud. jour signé Louis de La Planche, son cousin, luy a donné un billet pour recevoir led. V' l, inventorié l'une comme l'autre . . . XLIII.

Item une promesse signée de Comans compagnie datée du XVIIe mars MVF trente-deux contenant qu'il est deue à Mademoiselle de Vandrenest la somme de cinq mil VIIe IIII XXI XV I XVII s de prest, inventorié . . . XLV.

Item une autre promesse signée de Comans compagnie datée du XXVIe novembre MVF trente-deux par laquelle apter qu'il est deue à lad. damoiselle Vandrenest la somme de deux mil cent trente huit livres VI s pour prest, inventorié . . . XLVI.

Après l'inventorié desquelles deux pièces le S' Louys de La Planche et consorts ont protesté qu'elles ne leur puissent nuire ni préjudicier pour les raisons ci-devant en temps et lieu. Comme aussi a esté fait pareilles protestations par led. S' Raphaël de La Planche.

Item un escript signé Louys de La Planche et Marie de La Planche, daté du XXVIe septembre MVF trente-trois, par lequel aperent que les y soubsignez ont receu de leur cousin Charles de Comans la somme de quinze cens livres dont ils luy tiendront compte, inventorié . . . XLVII.

Item un autre escript signé Desperières en datte du IXe décembre MVF trente-trois contenant que le y soubsignez a receu du S' de Comans par les mains du S' Chateau la somme de trois mil livres pour les causes y portées, inventorié . . . XLVIII.

Item quatre actes en papier attache ensemble, le premier contenat Louys de La Planche avoit déclaré et reconnu qu’il a cy-devant receu et touché de Madame Tallon la somme de mil livres en datte du dernier mars MVF trente-trois signé Louys de La Planche, de Monroussel et Noury, notaires au Chasteau, le deuxieme, du mesme jour, signé desd. notaires, est une reconnaissance faicte par le S' Marc de Comans qu’il a receu de Madame d’Effiat la somme de mil livres tournoiz et au-dessous est ung autre acte par lequel ledit Louis de La Planche déclare qu’il a connoissance du contenu en l’acte ci-dessus, le IIIe acte daté comme dessus et signé desd. notaires, par lequel aper led. Marc de Comans avoit declaré qu’il a esté vendu à M' Scaron, trésorier de M' de Vendosme, une tauture de tapisserie la somme de VIIP'Ve l qu’il ait receu selon qu’il est plus au long porté par led. acte, et le IIIe signé de Comans et compagnie, de Monroussel et Noury notaires, du IIIe avril MVF trente-trois qui est une procuration faicte par led. S' Marc de Comans à Charles de Comans, son filz, pour demander payement au S' Raphaël de La Planche des effectz y mentioniz, inventorié sur led. actes l’un comme l’autre . . . XLIX.

Item ung mémoire non signé ni daté, escript de la main dud. defunct Charles de Comans apert que lesd. S' de Comans père et filz ont déclaré commencement par ces mots pour distribuer vingt-deux mil vingt livres et finissant aussi par ces mots au S' Polond, lequel mémoire led. S' de Comans père et filz ont dict entre l'employ des XXIIeXXI que led. Charles de Comans est obligé envers led. S' Raphaël de La Planche de l'acquier suivant la transaction entre eulx passée pardevant Bonot et son compagnon, notaires, du [left blank] jour du [left blank] MVF trente-trois, pour laquelle somme led. S' Raphaël de La Planche a formé son opposition, led. mémoire inventorié . . . Cinquante.

Ce faict, led. papiers dessus inventoriez sont demeurez en la possession desd. S' de Comans.
père et fils qui s'en sont chargé et estant six heures du soir a été continué à samedi IIII détud. présent mois de fevrier et ont signé.
Louis de La Planche
De Comans
Jeanne de La Planche
Catherine de Comans
De La Planche
Alexandre de Comans
Françoise de Comans
Elizabeth de La Planche
Marie de La Planche
Françoise de La Planche
Quarre

Dudict jour samedi troisieme fevrier de relevée fut led. inventaire continué comme s'ensuit:

Item une feuille de papier sur la première et seconde page de laquelle est un estat des desbtes deuexes par la compagnie des directeurs des manufactures de tapisserie façon de Flandres qui se fabriquent à Paris aux personnes denomnées audict estat contenant dix-sept articles non signez en fin et, en l'autre page, est un autre estat des desbtes deuexes à lad. société contenant dix articles, compris le dernier signé au-dessous dedud. Marc de Comans et compagnie qui a certifié par le dernier desd. dix articles que lesd. deux estats de desbtes sont véritables, lad. certification datée du vingtismes juillet mil six cens trente-deux, inventorié au bas de lad. signature . . . Cinquante-un.

Item un escript en une feuille de papier sur les première, seconde et partie de la troisieme page, intitulé estat pour distriuer la somme de vingt-deux mil vingt livres, dont huit mil vingt livres payables présentalement et quatorze mil livres tournoiz au dernier jour de décembre prochain an présent mil six cens trente-trois, non signé en fin, lequel escript contient les noms des personnes ausquelles lad. somme estoit à distriuer et quelle partie d'icelle chacun en receuroit et une recongoignage en fin dud. Marc de Comans, par laquelle il auroit promis en son privé nom de satisfaire et accomplir le contenu aude. estat des deniers comptans qui seroient mis en ses mains et de ceux qui proviendroient de la promesse de quatorze mil livres tournoiz du S Chateau mise souze le nom du S de Comans d'Astry, son neveu, pour luy faire plaisir, datée lad. reconnaissance du XXII septembre mil six cens trente-trois, inventorié au-dessous de la coppie d'icelle recongoignage . . . Cinquante-deux.
Lesd. S de Comans, S et damoiselles de La Planche ont declaré que lad. somme de vingt-deux mil vingt livres provenoit de la vente faict de au roy en lad. année de plusieurs pièces de tapisserie de l'ancienne fabrique et que led. estat est meme chose que celuy cy-dessus inventorié cinquante.

Item un escript non signé intitulé estat des payemens que doit faire le S Dujardin aux créanciers de son alettes de Savoye acompte d'une assignation de quatre-vingte dix mil livres qu'elle luy a fait contenant led. estat six articles, par le premier desquels led. de Comans et de La Planche sont employez et assignez tant en principal que changes depuis mil six cens trente-un pour dix-neuf mil quatre-vingte cinq livres tournoiz, inventorié . . . Cinquante-trois.

Item un morceau de papier cotté au dos compte de Messieurs les Gobelins le quatrieme janvier mil six cens trente trois, d'un costé duquel papier est l'estat de ce que devoiroient led. de Comans et de La Planche, daté au hault mil six cens trente, et en la page suivante et opposée a l'autre est l'estat de ce qui avoit esté par eux payé, montant Pm compte du débit comme semblablement l'un et l'autre desd. estat à quatre mil trois cens quatre-cinq livres dix solz tournoiz, inventorié au-dessoubzd. estat de débit signé Henry Gobelin . . . Cinquante-quatre.

Item une promesse faict par led. Marc de Comans et compagnie le vingt mars mil six cens trente trois, le nom du créancier en blanc, de la somme de quatre mil trois cens quatre-quatere livres six solz qu' ils auroient receu, pour laquelle ils auroient promis fournir créances de change payables à Lion aux payemens de Pasques lors prochain, inventorié au-dessoubz de la signature . . . Cinquante-cinq.

Item un escript en langue italienne daté du XXV aprill mil six cens vingt-sept signé Alexandre Scagliay, par lequel le soubz y signé mande au S Lumague de payer ausd. Marc de Comans et François de La Planche la somme de dix mil deux soixante-treize livres dix solz tournoiz pour les causes y contenues, au bas duquel est l'accepcion en langue italienne signée Lumague et Mascrano, datée du XXVII aprill aud. an mil six cent vingt-sept pourveu que l'argent aye esté recue et qu'auparavant il ne vienne aucune révocation de lad. lettre cottaue au dos, en français, promesse de M l'ambassadeur de Savoye acceptée par M Lumague, inventorié au-dessoubzd. de lad. acceptation . . . Cinquante-six.

Après l'inventorié desd. pièces cy-dessus déclarées concernans l'ancienne société d'entre luy et led. François de La Planche, led. Marc de Comans a declaré qu'ils ne regardent en façon
quelconque la succession dud. defunct Charles de Comans son filz et n’estoinx à inventorié. C’est pourquoi il proteste que la description d’icelles ne luy puisse préjudicier et par lesd. de La Planche et consors a esté protesté au contraire et que lad. protestation ne leur puisse préjudicier. Ce fait, tous lesd. papiers ont esté délaissées en la possession desd. de Comans père et fils et, estant cinq heures du soir, la continuation dud. inventaire a esté remise à lundi, huict heures du matin, et ont signé.

De Comans
De La Planche
Elizabeth de La Planche
Jeanne de La Planche
Quarré
Alexandre de Comans
Louis de La Planche
Marie de La Planche
Françoise de La Planche
Turpin

Dud. jour lundy cinquiesme dud. mois de février aud. an mil VIe trente-cinq du matin, lesd. notaires ont procedé à la continuation dud. inventaire à la requête et présence desdus nommez: Turpin, esté au seclet levé par led. commissaire le Vacher de quelques autres cabinetz, coffres et armoires levé, auoir esté trouvé quelques papiers concernans lad. ancienne societé que led. Sr de La Planche et damoiselles ses soeurs auraient requis entre inventories; pour ce qui concerne et regarde les marchandises de tapiseriseries, tant celles qui sont faciotes et manufaturees que de celles qui sont encore sur les mestiers, ensemble lesd. mestiers et ustancilies servans aud. manufactures, laquelle prisée a esté facie par lesd. Ollard et Ethier, sergens et priseurs, appelé avec eux Pierre Vendrais, maistre tapissier et conducteur de la boutique d’or desd. manufactures, demeurant aud. hostel, selon et ainsi qu’il ensuit.

Premièrement au magasin se sont trouvées les pièces de tapissierie qui ensuivent:

Assavoir une tapissierie de soye rehaussée d’or, les bordures à fondz d’or, contenant huict pièces, compris une que lesd. Sr de Comans père et filz ont dict estre au magasin de la maison où estoit demeure led. defunct, rue Neuve-Saint-Médéricq, lad. tapissier contenant trente-deux aulnes de cours sur trois aulnes et demie de haut où est représentée l’Histoire de Diane, prisée la somme de trente mil livres tournois cy . . . XXXI*.

Item une autre tapissierie de quatorze pièces de quatre aulnes de haut sur soixante de cours, assy de soye rehaussée d’or et d’argent, où est représentée l’Histoire d’Artémise, en l’une desquelles quatorze pièces sont les armes du roy, de laquelle tonteure lesd. Sr de Comans ont dict y avoir encore deux pièces outre lesd. quatorze qui sont aud. magasin de la rue Neuve-Saint-Médéricq, prisée lad. tonteure la somme de vingt-quatre mil livres tournois cy . . . XXIV*.

Item quatre pièces de tapissierie de l’Histoire de Constantin, aussi de soye rehaussée d’or, ayant quatre aulnes de haut sur dix-sept aulnes et demie de cours ou environ, prisées lesd. quatre pièces de tapissierie la somme de huit mil livres tournois cy . . . VIII*.

Item deux pièces de tapissierie de verdures, rehaussées de soye, dessorties de trois aulnes de haut, l’une ayant trois aulnes et demie de cours et l’autre trois aulnes, prisées l’aune vingt livres tournois.

Item trois autres pièces de verdures, rehaussées de soye, dessorties de deux aulnes et demie de haut ayant ensemble sept aulnes et demie de cours, prisées l’aune vingt livres tournois.

Item une autre pièce de tapissierie de Chasse du roy François, de trois aulnes de haut et autant de cours, rehaussée de soye dessorties, prise soixante livres tournois cy . . . IX.

Item une autre pièce dessortie de l’Histoire de Diane rehaussée de soye, de deux aulnes et demie de cours et trois aulnes et demie de haut prise [left blank].

Item unz autres pièces de tapissierie dessorties à personnages de Haudenarde, prisées ensemble deux cens vingt livres tournois cy . . . I* XX.

Item deux cens cinquante livres de laine tant en bottes que cheveaux, partie teintes et la plus grande partie blanche, prisée la livre trente deux sols tournois, revenant aud. prix à quatre cens livres tournois cy . . . III*.

Item deux cens quarante six cheveaux de laine teintes pesant ensemble quatre-vingt deux livres, prisé la livre quarante sols tournois, revenant aud. prix à cent soixante-quatre livres tournois cy . . . CLXXXIII.

Item deux cens quarante six cheveaux de laine teintes pesant ensemble quatre-vingt deux livres, prisé la livre quarante sols tournois, revenant aud. prix à cent soixante-quatre livres tournois cy . . . CLXXXIII.

Dedans les six boutiques où se font et manufac- turent les tapisseries et dans une armoire estant dans le cabinet dud. defunct, a esté trouvé la quantité de trois cent vingt-huict livres de soyes de diverses couleurs prisé à raison de quinze livres tournois chacune desd. livres de soye, revenant le tout ensemble aud. prix à la somme
de quatre mil neuf cens vingt livres tournoiz cy... III° IV° XX l.

Item quatre cens quatre-vingtze livres de laine de diverses couleurs prisé cinquante sols tournoiz chacune livre, revenant le tout ensemble aud. prix à la somme de douze cens livres tournoiz cy... XII° l.

Item dans lesd. six boutiques, s'est trouvé la quantité de soixante mètres de bois de chene et haistre, moitié grandz mestiers et l'autre moitié petitz, le tout servans à faire tapisseriez avec leurs ustancillas, prisé le tout ensemble la somme de deux mil livres tournoiz cy... II° l.

Ensuite les patrons servans à faire les tapisseries estans en détrempe sur papier.

Premièrement le dessin de l'Histoire des Amours d'Apollon contens huict pièces, prisées ensemble deux cens livres tournoiz cy... I° l.

Item ung autre dessin aussi en détrempe sur papier contenant neuf pièces où est représenté l'Histoire de Regnault à petits personnages, prisé le tout ensemble quatre cens livres tournoiz cy... III° l.

Item ung autre dessin de lad. Histoire de Regnault à grandz personnages contenant trois pièces, prisées ensemble cent cinquante livres tournoiz... CL l.

Item ung autre dessin de diverses pièces de la Méthamorphose d'Ovide contenant huict pièces, prisées ensemble la somme de quatre cens livres tournoiz cy... III° l.

Item ung autre dessin de verdures contenant huict pièces, prisées ensemble IIF. l. tournoiz cy... IIF. l.

Item quatre pièces d'un autre dessin de l'Amour des dieux, prisé ensemble quatre cens livres tournoiz cy... III° l.

Item ung autre dessin de Diane contenant quatre pièces prisées ensemble CL. tournoiz cy... CL l.

Outre lesquelles marchandises cy-dessus inventorizées, a esté trouvé ésé. six boutiques la quantité de soixante pièces de tapisserie ausd. métiers et équelles on travaille journellement ainsi qu'il est mentionné és livres journaux inventorizier au présent inventaire souzb les cottes trois et quatre, et lesquelles pièces n'ont esté prisées point n'étans achevées.

Dud. jour de relevée, a esté continué led. inventaire, ayant esté fait ouverture par led. S' comissaire Le Vacher du cabinet dud. S' de Comans père, a esté trouvé quelques papiers concernans ses affaires particulières qui luy ont esté laissés sans inventorier du consentement des parties, et, quand à quelques autres papiers concernans l'ancienne societté, ont esté mis à part dans ung coffre de bahut carré qui a esté rescellé par led. S' comissaire, comme il est à plein contenu à son procès-verbal.

Ce fait, toutes lesd. choses cy-dessus inventorizées sont demeurées en possession desd. S° de Comans père et fils, qui s'en sont chargez et parce que il estoit six heures sonnées, a esté continué à demain trois heures de rellevée en la sud. rue Saint-Médériq et ont signé.

Louis de La Planche
Elizabeth de La Planche
Jeanne de La Planche
Marie de La Planche
Peeter Vaenendries
De Comans
François de La Planche
Turpin
Alexandre de Comans
De La Planche
Quarré

Du mardy sixiesme jour dudict mois de fevrier de relevée, fut led. inventaire continué comme s'ensuict à la requeste et en presence que desus en lad. maison rue Neufve et paroisse de Saint-Médéric par la description des biens meubles, ustancillas d'hostel, marchandises de tapisserie, papiers et enseignemens trouvez en lad. maison représentez et mis en evidence par led. Hincxthouen, commis dudit defunct.

En la chambre dudict defunct s'est trouvé:
Premièrement une paire de chemin de cuivre à grosses pommes de deux pieds et demy ou environ de hault avec une pelle [et] une pincette, le tout prisé ensemble quinze livres tournoiz cy... XV l.

Item une table ronde de bois de noyer sur son châssis et un tapis de Turquie servant à icelle de deux aulines et demye de long ou environ, le tout prisé ensemble vingt cinq livres cy... XXV l.[l]

Item une autre table de bois de noyer sur son châssis ayant un tirouer fermant à clef, prisée quatre livres cy... III° l.

Item une armoire façon de pied de cabinet de bois de noyer ayant par bas deux guichetz fermans
à clef et une layette coulisse par hault, prise
neuf livres cy . . . IX l.

Item douze chaires de bois de noyer et deux
siéges plans, le tout couvert de trippes de
vellours jaune figuré et quatre autres siéges plans
couverzt de toillle, le tout pris ensemble
cinquantte livres cy . . . L l.

Item un grand miroyer duquel la glace à deux
pieuds et denny de haut ou environ garny d’une
bordure d’ebeyne, prisé soixante quinze livres
cy . . . LXV l.

Item une grande couche de noyer à hauts
piliers ferrans à vices, une pailliace, un
traversin de couit plein de plume, un mathelas
de futane remply de bournaille, une couver-
ture de Castalongue jaune, six pantes, le dos-
sier, trois grands rideaux, deux bonne-grâces,
un fond de ciel, deux fourreaux de pillier et
une couverture trainante, le tout de damas
jaune garny de crepisines, franges et mollet de
soye, prisé le tout ensemble trois cens livres
 tournoiz cy . . . XII l.

Item deux tantures de tapissarie contenans
seize pièces de cuir doré, ayans ensemble
cinquantte aulnes de cours, trouvées en lad.
chambre pliées, lesquelles led. Hincxhouen
a dict appartenir au sieur Vanufe, marchant
holandois, et avoir esté par led. Vanufe chargé
desd. tapissarie pour en procurer la vente,
nonobstant laquelle déclaration que lesdicts
de La Planche ont protesté ne leur pouvoir
prjudicier, lesdicts tapissaries ont esté à leur
requisition prisées ensemble douze cens livres
cy . . . XII l.

Ledict Hincxhouen a aussy protesté que lad.
prisée ne puisse prejudicier audict Vanufe par
les missives duquel il justifiera lesd. tapissaries
luy appartennir.

En une garde-robb joignant lad. chambre
s’est trouvé:

Un tableau peint sur bois où est représentée
la Vierge, de quatre pieds de haut ou environ,
garny de son châssis de bois d’ebeyne, un aultre
tableau sur bois garny de sa bordure de bois doré
où est peinte une danse d’Espagnols et deux
petits tableaux de fruizct garniz chacun d’une
plate-bande, le tout pris ensemble trente livres
cy . . . XXXI l.

Ensuit les habitz.
Item une casaque de drap d’Angleterre doublée
de tabis, un pourpoint de tabis et un hault de
chausses de mesme drap, le tout de couleur de
gris de souris chamarré de deux larges passemens
de soye façon de Flandres, prise ensemble
trente-six livres, cy . . . XXXVI l.

Item un pourpoint et hault de chausses de drap
de Spange noir, un manteau de drap de Berry
doublé de panne, le tout aussi chamarré d’un
passement large de soye façon de Flandres, prisé
quarante livres cy . . . XL l.

Item un pourpoint et hault de chausses de pou de
soye noir tel quel garny de passement de soye,
prisé soixante solz cy . . . LX s.

Item un hault de chausses de drap d’Espagn e et un
pourpoint de satin façonné, le tout aussi garny
de passement de soye noire façon de Flandres,
pris ez ensemble neuf livres tournoiz cy . . . IX l.

Item deux volumes de librnes en folio relié en
veau des Anallest eclesiastiques de Barounis,
pris ez ensemble six livres tournoiz cy . . . VI l.

Item deux autres volumes de librnes en folio,
aussy relié en veau, qui sont les premier et
deuxiesme dates de l’Histoire romaine de
Coffeeteau, priz ez ensemble six livres tournoiz
cy . . . VII l.

Item un autre librve en folio relié en veau de la
Bible en françois, impression de Paris, prisée sept
livres tournoiz cy . . . VII l.

Item un autre librve en folio relié en parchemin
des Œuvres de Xénophon, prisé quarante solz
tournoiz cy . . . XL s.

Item un autre librve en quarto relié en parchemin
des Recherches de la France par Estienne Pasquier,
pris trois livres tournoiz cy . . . III l.

Ensuit la vaisselle d’argent.

Item un bassin rond, une aiguëire et une salière,
le tout d’argent blank, pesans ensemble neuf mars
d’argent, priz le mar vingt-une livres tournoiz,
revenant le tout audict pris à cent quatre-vingt
neuf livres cy . . . CIHI l.

Ledit S. de Comans père a déclaré que lesd.
bassin et aiguëire luy appartenient et les avoir
presté à sondict flls, partant proteste que led.
inventorité et prise ne luy puissent prejudicier.
Par lesdicts S. et damoiselles de La Planche a esté
protesté que lad. déclaration et protestation ne
leur puissent prejudicier.

En une petite chambre joignant la précédente
s’est trouvé:

Une grande couche de bois de noyer à hauts
pilliers, une paillasse, lict et traversin pleins de
plume, un mathelas de futaine, une couverture de
laine bleue et une autre blanche, trois rideaux,
trois pantes de ciel, une bonne-grâce et dossier, le
tout de serge jaune imprimée tel quel, prises
ensemble dix-huit livres tournois cy . . . XVIII l.

Item trois tables de bois de noyer assises sur leurs
châssis telles quelles, prises ensemble cent sols
cy . . . C s.

Item trois petits cabinetz d'Allemagne, un moyen
sans tirouers et deux petit à tirouers, le tout de
bois d'ébène fermant à clef, prises ensemble
douze livres tournois cy . . . XII l.

Ledict Hainciof a déclaré que lesdits cabinetz
huy appartenient et proteste que l'inventorieté
et prise d'iceux ne luy puissent préjudicer.

Item un grand coffre de bahud carré à deux
serrures, prisé soixante solz tournoiz cy . . .
LX s.

Ledict Hainciof a faitte same déclaration et
protestation pour led. coffre que pour lesd.
cabinetz.

En la cuisine s'est trouvé:
Une petite paire de chenets de fer, une pelle et
une tenaille, prises ensemble trente solz cy . . .
XXX s.

Item une table de cuisine scize sur son pied,
prisée quarante solz tournoy cy . . . XI s.

Item une table ronde de bois de l'estre auxsey scize
sur son pied, prisée vingt solz tournoiz.

Item une grande paire d'armoires de bois de
chesne à quatre guichets fermans à clef et deux
layettes coulisses, prisée dix-huit livres tournoiz
cy . . . XVIII l.

Une autre petite paire d'armoires de bois de
chesne à deux guichets fermans à clef, prisée
soixante solz cy . . . LX s.

Item une fontaine d'airain garnye de son
couvercle et robinet tenant deux saeux ou
environ, prisée six livres cy . . . VI l.

Item une marmitte de cuivre jaune garnye de son
couvercle, prisée trente-deux solz cy . . .
XXXII s.

Item une bassinoire d'airain et deux petitz
chauderons, prises ensemble soixante solz
cy . . . LX s.

Item une poesle, deux broches, une lêchefritte,
un gril de fer et un tournebroche de bois, prisé le
tout ensemble soixante solz cy . . . LX s.

Item en potz, platz, escuellas et autres ustancilles
d'estain tant sonnant que commun, s'est trouvée
la quantité de quarente-neuf livres tournoiz,
prisé la liobre l'un portant l'autre dix solz
tournoiz revenant le tout auctid prix à . . .
XXIII l. X s.

Ensuitent les tapiserries trouvées dans le
magasin d'icelle maison prises et estimées par
lesd. sergens prisez apellez avec ledict Pierre
Vaendris susnommé.

Premièrement deux pièces de tapiserrie de
soye rehaussee d'or et d'argent de l'Histoire
d'Artémise, dont le surplis de la tunture a esté
trouvé au magasin dud. hostel de Canaye et est
cy-dessus inventorié, contenus lesd. deux pièces
sept aulnes de cours sur quatre aulnes de hault,
prisées lesd. deux pièces quatre mil deux cents
clivres cy . . . IIIIM l.

Item sept pièces une tunture de tapiserrie conte-
nant sept pièces de l'Histoire de Diane rehaussee
de soye ayant vingt-six aulnes et demye de
cours sur trois aulnes un quartier de hault, prisé
quatre mil livres tournoiz cy . . . IIIIM l.

Item six pièces de tapiserrie de lad. Histoire
de Diane, dont les figures sont rehaussees d'or,
ayans lesdites six pièces vingt-quatre aulnes de
cours sur trois aulnes et demye de hault, prises
desdites six pièces douze mil livres tournoiz
cy . . . XIIIM l.

Item une pièce de tapiserrie de l'Histoire de
Regnauld et Armide rehaussee de soye de trois
aulnes un quart de hault sur trois aulnes de cours
où est représentée la fontaine, prisée quatre
cents livres cy . . . IIIIM l.

Item trois pièces de tapiserrie de menues verdures
rehaussees de soye de trois aulnes de hault sur dix
aulnes et demye de cours, prises ensemble cinq
cents livres tournoiz cy . . . V l.

Item quatre autres pièces de tapiserrie à
personages des Métamorphoses d'Ovide ayans
trois aulnes de hault sur dix aulnes de cours,
prises ensemble mil livres tournoiz cy . . . M l.

Plus se sont trouvées dans ledict magasin plusieurs
autres marchandises de tapiserrie, lesquelles n'ont
esté inventorizées ny prises d'aultant que ledict
Hainciof a déclaré qu'elles appartiennent à plu-
sieurs marchans d'Audenarde qui les ont envoyées
audict deffunct pour les vendre par commission.

_Tapestry in the Baroque_
Et ont lesd. Ollard, Ithier et Vaendries signé la présente priée, laquelle à l’égard desd. tapisseries lesd. Louis et damoiselles de La Planche ont protesté ne leur pouvoir préjudicier à cause de sa modicité et lesd. de Comans au contraire; et a esté la continuation dud. inventaire remise à demain trois heures de relevée et lesd. meubles et tapisseries devant inventoriez délaissée en la possession desd. de Comans père et fils et ont signé.

Iter
Louis de La Planche
J Hincthouen
Marie de La Planche
Françoise de La Planche
Jeanne de La Planche
De Comans
Alexandre de Comans
Peeter Vaenndries
Quarrez
Elizabeth de la Planche
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Dudict jour mercredy septiesme dudict mois de fevrier de relevée, fut à la requête et en presence que desus led. inventaire continué comme s’ensuit par la description des livres, papiers et enseignements trouvez dans le cabinet dudict defunt et autres representez par led. Haintcouen.

Premièrement un libvre journal relie et couvert de parchemin contenant plusieurs feuillats dont quatre-trois sont cotez et entiètement escriptz sans aucune rature, lors le quatre-troisiesme qui n’est escript que sur partie du recto, commeneant ledict libvre par ces motz audict premier feuillet mil six cens trente-deux adj trente-uniesme janvier diverses parties doithvent à capital douze mil six cens neuf livres tournoiz et finissant par le dernier article dudict quatre-troisiesme feuillet Claude Coustazer à fraix quaere cens douze livres dix sols tournoiz pour deux demye année de loyer de la boutique 412 l 10 s, inventorié au-dessous dudit dernier article et sur la couverture dudit libvre . . . Cinquante-sept.

Item un grand libvre, assy relié et couvert de parchemin, contenant plusieurs feuillatz dont trente-sept sont cotez et escriptz, aucuns entiétement et de costé et d’autre et le reste en partie, dans lequel libvre led. Haintcouen a dict estre les comptes doubles des parties escriptes sur led. journal, lequel libvre commence au premier feuillet cote par la datte de lad. année mil six cens trente-deux et par ces motz capital à davoix par plusieurs personnes spécifiées au journal et finis-
sant par le dernier article dud. trente-septiesme feuillet en ces motz mil V" trente-quatre à davoix par balance quarte-vingtz dic-sept livres six solz, inventorié au-dessoubz dudit dernier article et sur la couverture . . . Cinquante-huit.

Item un autre moyen libvre, assy relié et couvert de parchemin, contenant plusieurs feuillats escriptz, commeneant au haut du feuillet cote trois verso et finissant sur le feuillet cote douze recto, les feuillatz, duquel libvre escriptz ont esté paraphez au-dessoubz de l’escripture de chacun d’cieux, lequel libvre led. Hinctouen a dict estré un journal naguères commencé, les premières lignez duquel libvre sont en ces termes l’ans deo mil six cens trente-quatre adj XXXI jullet pour les suivantes à Jean Blemmart et finist par ces motz payé à Jean Robbins le fils pour retir huitz pièces ver de chez le S de La Planche douze cens soixante livres tournoiz, inventorié . . . Cinquante-neuf.

Item un autre libvre de coppies de missives contenant plusieurs feuillats dont cinquante-cinq sont escriptz, inventorié sur led. cinquante-cinquiesme verso . . . Soixante.

Ce fait, ne s’estans trouvez entre les papiers dudict cabinet aucuns qui méritent d’estre inventoriez, lesd. livres ont esté laissez en la possession desd. S‘ Marc et Alexandre de Comans qui s’en sont chargez et ont protesté avec lesd. damoiselles Vandrenesse et Coex de recouvrir tous despens, domages et intérests qu’ils ont encouru et pourroient encourir au subject tant de lad. apposition de scellé que du présent inventaire et de se pourvoir pour rai-
son d’iceux contre qui et ainsi qu’ils adviserez bon estre; et par led. S‘ et damoiselles de La Planche a esté protesté au contraire et assy de se pourvoir ainsi qu’ils adviserez estre à faire pour leur deub, despens, domages et intérestz et ont signé.
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Charles de Comans’s Posthumous Inventory
A Question of Scale: Was It Necessary to Weave Poussin’s Paintings?

The question I ask here aims at renewing reflection on the unceasing debate regarding the conception of tapestry and its models. This debate generally structures itself around two stances: One is the idea of a painter specializing in the production of designs and cartoons—the “painter and cartoonist” as exemplified by Jean Lurçat during the twentieth century or Bernaert van Orley in earlier periods. The other is the notion of “tapestry painting,” a term used by those who uphold the theory that tapestry is subservient to painting in order to denounce the absurdity of translating a painting into a composition to be woven.

Nicolas Poussin represents a singular case. Here is a painter who, with few exceptions, refused to paint large canvases. He received at least one commission for a tapestry, which he did not honor. Yet some of his pictures were woven. The facts are known. However, one should note at the outset that Gobelins tapestries woven after work by Poussin were admired during the eighteenth century and judged as aberrations during the second half of the nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth. Further, while these tapestries have always been mentioned in the main scholarship on tapestry, they were not displayed in the two major retrospective exhibitions of Poussin’s work in Paris (1960 and 1994), and, above all, they have been ignored in all but one recent study, which deals with the reception of the artist. These facts could be interpreted as resulting from an incompatibility between Poussin’s paintings and tapestry weaving. But I would like to argue that the reason is quite the opposite.

The role of the painters responsible for making tapestry cartoons is crucial. For Poussin’s compositions, it was a matter of adapting them to the requirements of large size and tapestry making, which involved, among other things, modifying the ratio of the proportions between the figures and the landscapes. There is, however, another essential conclusion, which has been overlooked by historians: Poussin’s Story of Moses, which I will use here as my main example, was woven in the Manufacture Royale des Gobelins as part of an artistic program intended to spread the theory of painting that was then taking shape at the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture. With a few significant examples, I would like to demonstrate how the series was designed to spread the concept of the beau idéal that makes Poussin the epitome of the doctus pictor, the perfect painter. It is thus necessary to question the nature of the transposition that took place, and a number of questions come to mind: To what extent did the woven image recall the painted image and how did it differ from it, or, in other words, how was the change made from painting to tapestry? What qualities of the painter’s work were reflected through tapestry? Did the woven image match the expectations of the patrons?

REASONS PROPOSED FOR WEAVING POUSSIN’S PAINTINGS
The tapestries of the Story of Moses came at a turning point in the history of the Gobelins
workshops and of the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture. When François Michel Le Tellier, marquis de Louvois, succeeded his rival Jean-Baptiste Colbert as the head of the Bâtiments du Roi (the royal office in charge of building and public works) and gained control over the academies and the manufacturers in 1683 (Colbert died on September 6), a change became evident in the strategy of royal artistic policy, though not in its objectives. Indeed, these objectives remained the glorification of the king and the promotion of the splendor of art. As director of the Gobelins since 1662 and as First Painter to the King two years later, Charles Le Brun had, for roughly twenty years, drawn all the original designs for tapestry after concepts provided by the Petite Académie (later the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres). He had been particularly vigilant concerning the quality of the weaving, elevating it to the highest level of the period. Under Louvois, Le Brun came under attack but was not excluded. Louvois could not dismiss the First Painter outright and hire his own protégé, Pierre Mignard, for this would have been tantamount to saying that the king’s judgment was flawed. However, his interrupting the weaving of the History of the King indicated his rivalry with Le Brun and with Colbert’s legacy. Louvois had to wait until Le Brun’s death in 1690 before replacing him with Mignard as First Painter to the King and director of the Gobelins. In the meantime, Henri de La Chapelle-Bessé, another protégé of Louvois, was entrusted with the administration of the Gobelins. First clerk of the Bâtiments du Roi, La Chapelle-Bessé was also a member (honoraire amateur) of the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture (1668) and had recently been named secretary of the Petite Académie (1683). With Le Brun out of favor, La Chapelle played a part in the selection of the new designs. During the 1680s, many of the hangings put on the looms were derived from easel paintings, frescoes, and drawings (it is known that La Chapelle played a prominent part in the selection of drawings by Raphael and Giulio Romano belonging to the Cabinet du Roi to be woven at the Gobelins). Though deriving new designs from old or modern master works had been practiced before, the extent to which it was now employed was innovative. Indeed, it was a method of creating new tapestry designs without requesting cartoons from the First Painter or offending the king.

We know that the Académie Royale drew up the precepts of art and that its other mission was to elaborate on the practice of art. In this context, Raphael and Poussin were exalted as absolute examples of the perfect painter. As early as 1666, André Félibien celebrated Poussin as the best artist France had ever known. From 1667 to 1681, no fewer than ten paintings by Poussin, belonging to the French Crown, were the subject of conferences held at the Académie Royale. The fame and reputation of this “national genius” took on such proportions that his painting practice and theory became the standard. Furthermore, in 1683, two more paintings by Poussin, the Infant Moses Trampling on Pharaoh’s Crown and Moses and Aaron before Pharaoh, also called Moses Turning the Rod of Aaron into a Serpent, were sold by the dealer Alvarez to Louis XIV for the Cabinet du Roi, which already contained twenty-eight pictures by Poussin.

About a half century ago, Roger-Armand Weigert pointed out how involved in the commission of Gobelins tapestries the art lover—and friend of Poussin—Paul Fréart de Chantelou (1609–1694) probably was. In 1640, Chantelou was secretary to François Sublet de Noyers, the superintendent of the Bâtiments du Roi. He and his brother Roland Fréart de Chambray were sent to Rome by King Louis XIII to fetch Poussin and the sculptor François Duquesnoy. The latter lagged behind and never reached France (he died in Livorno in 1643), but Poussin arrived in Paris in December 1640. During his stay in Paris from 1641 to 1642, Poussin was commissioned to design
tapestries for the French Crown. He never
got further on this project than the idea of
making cartoons based on the Seven Sacra-
ments he had just painted for Cassiano dal
Pozzo, his chief patron in Rome. Poussin
worked without enthusiasm, for he was irri-
tated by the impatient Sublet de Noyers and
thought that with more time he could
design something new instead of making
copies after dal Pozzo's paintings.12

After he returned to Rome, Poussin
painted a second set of the Seven Sacra-
ments (1644–48) for Chantelou, who then ordered
a tapestry after one of these canvases. The
weaving was not a great success. Blame was
laid on the weaver, called Soucans, a col-
league of Hippolyte de Comans in the
factory established in the Faubourg Saint-
Marcel.13 By 1665, three years after the
founding of the Gobelins, Chantelou had
still not abandoned the idea of weaving a
hanging after paintings by Poussin. He
believed "it was impossible that a tapestry
[woven after Poussin's work], well executed,
would not be more beautiful than any in
France, if one did not count those of
[Raphael's] Acts of the Apostles, there being in
[Poussin's work] landscape, figures, and
architecture."14 It was therefore the diversity
offered by Poussin's painting that caught the
interest of Chantelou. Poussin was still alive
(his died on November 19, 1665) when,
on September 15, Chantelou suggested to
Colbert that a set of tapestries of Poussin's
Old Testament be put on the looms. The
paintings were in the collections of Pous-
sin's close friend Jacques Stella, the duc de
Richelieu (great-nephew of Cardinal
Richelieu), and other Parisian curieux (con-
noisseurs) of Poussin's work.15 Chantelou
stipulated that five or six artists of the high-
est capability should be selected to make the
cartoons, and he specifically named Sébasti-
tien Bourdon, a painter renowned for the
designs and paintings for a seven- or eight-
piece set of the Story of Moses woven for his
friend "M. le baron de Vauffert."16

But Colbert was not convinced by Chan-
telou's proposal. For him, the difficulty was
in translating easel paintings with small
figures into large cartoons with lifesize fig-
ures.17 The decision to use pictures by Poussin
for a set of tapestries woven at the
Gobelins was not finally made until after
Colbert's death. It resulted from the inter-
section of two antipathetic artistic views: on
one hand, court art and the artistic policy
of the Bâtiments du Roi, which emphasized
the magnificent or brilliant aspect of art;
and on the other, art for a restricted circle of
connoisseurs and the image of Poussin as an
erudite painter conveyed by the Académie
Royale. From then on, for a painter to be
considered a famous artist, he would have to
produce very large format paintings and
tapestries.18 Poussin's predilection for paint-
ing small and medium-size pictures is well
known. So the effect of translating his
work from painting to tapestry contributed
to raising him to the rank of a Raphael, a
Rubens, or a Le Brun, who, throughout
their own careers, had produced large-scale
paintings, frescoes, and tapestry cartoons.

For the Story of Moses tapestry series after
Poussin, eight of his paintings were chosen
from the Cabinet du Roi and from Parisian
private collections.19 To complete the series,
two pictures by Le Brun were added, a
reminder that he was still First Painter to
Louis XIV.20 Cartoons were made by a team
of painters who usually worked under the
direction of Le Brun at the Gobelins.21 The
series was woven at least six times.22 At this
stage of my argument, it becomes obvious
that the subject, the life of Moses, was not
the primary motivation for weaving this
series, for it was a universal subject. Images
of Moses the Legislator had been in favor
ever since Pope Sixtus IV commissioned a
fresco cycle on this subject to decorate one
wall of the new Sistine Chapel in the late
fifteenth century, an iconographic program
that emphasizes the venerable roots of the
true Church. In the case of Poussin's Story
of Moses, representation of the "Highly
Christian King," or ruler of France, the
"Eldest Daughter" of the Church, can
easily be understood. And Poussin, like
many artists, painted this subject many times (nineteen).

A CHANGE OF SCALE
According to Colbert, the main difficulty in weaving a Poussin was a question of scale. For the tapestry cartoons (about 324 cm) with lifesize figures, the images in the easel paintings were enlarged by multiplying their height (between 92 and 154 cm) about two or three-and-a-half times. The *Exposition of Moses* painted for Stella in 1654 was in the hands of his niece, Françoise Bouzonnet-Stella (now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford). Compared to the painting, the woven image is slightly reduced in height, mostly in the upper register. The same figures are to be found, and the setting is the same except for a strip of sky that was cut out. Consequently, the figures appear a little taller in the tapestry (fig. 1). Jacob holds his son in a basket on the river. Miriam, Moses's sister, finger to her mouth asking for silence, holds out her other hand to indicate the palace of Pharaoh, which looks like the Castel Sant'Angelo. Amran (Moses's father) and Aaron (Moses's brother) are walking along the bank of the river. On the right of the tapestry, there are Egyptian motifs included by Poussin to delight the viewer for both their newness and their diversity: a river god with a sphinx, with two trees on which are a

Fig. 1. *The Exposition of Moses* from the first set with gold of the *Story of Moses*. Tapestry woven in the Manufacture Royale des Gobelins workshop of Jean Lefebvre, Paris, before 1687. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal–wrapped thread, 360 × 511 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 32/1). Photograph: L. Perquis
cornucopia, a nilometer, and the whole motif of bow, quiver, cymbals, pipes, and crooked stick that refer to the legends of Bacchus and Pan, as well as to the Egyptian god Osiris, all of whom, like Moses, were born in Egypt.

The same process was used for the *Israelites Gathering Manna in the Desert*. It was painted for Chantelou in 1637–39, and it then entered Nicolas Fouquet’s collection before Louis XIV bought it in 1667. At the time of its weaving, the painting was smaller, as we can see by comparison with the engravings, dating from 1680, by Guillaume Chasteau and Henry Testelin (fig. 2); between that date and 1709, the painting was enlarged in the upper and lower registers and maybe slightly on the right side. In the woven image, the upper part of the composition is missing (fig. 3): the tops of the high rocks and trees were cut out. The new centering of the image emphasizes the importance of the now life-size figures. Consequently, the section in which the story is depicted is emphasized to a greater degree.

I would now like to stress that this adaptation seems to coincide with the “reading” of the painting done at the same time at the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture. Le Brun spoke about the *Israelites Gathering Manna* at a conference held on November 5, 1667, which was also the first lecture given on a painting by Poussin. Le Brun arranged his comments—a fastidious explanation—around four points: first, the general disposition and grouping of the figures; second, the design (drawing) and proportion of the figures; third, the expression of the passions; and fourth, the perspective and the harmony of colors. Many scholars agree that the two most fascinating parts of the lecture are those that deal with the expression of the passions, since it is the
keystone of Le Brun’s conception of painting, and with proportion, since he used the proportions of famous antique statues to conceive a catalogue of physiognomic characterizations.26

What is significant here is the insistence on proper poses and expressions, which serve to inform and enlighten the beholder. Indeed, according to Poussin, the purpose of painting was, as he wrote to Chantelou, to “read the story and the painting to find out if each thing is appropriate to the sub-
ject.”27 In 1680, Testelin edited his precepts of art, which he had given in a series of conferences dealing with the different parts of painting and set out in six tables. Exam-
ination of just one of the tables, the one headed “Ordonnance” (composition or arrangement), shows how much this precept owes to Le Brun’s theory of art. Compos-
tion depends on three things: first, on the setting of the place; second, on the dispo-
sition of the figures; and third, on contrast.
To illustrate this, Testelin chose the Israelites Gathering Manna, the best-known example of a well-ordered arrangement of different groups both distant from one another and linked together, without any confusion, the whole composition “appearing as reduced to a single group contrasted by a variety of actions and judicious expression.”28 Conseq-
sequently, the woven image of the Israelites Gathering Manna can be understood as a concrete example of a means to spread the idea of perfect disposition as it is set out in Testelin’s treatise.

ARCHITECTURE DOES NOT TRANSLATE WELL INTO TAPESTRY
Colbert argued that architecture does not translate well into tapestry when he refused
Chantelou’s proposal in 1665. The best means to overcoming the difficulty would have been to choose subjects depicted in an exterior setting. But two episodes in the series are represented in interiors. In these, woven after the pendant pair commissioned by Camillo Massimo and owned by the king since 1683, the *Infant Moses Trampling on Pharaoh’s Crown and Moses and Aaron before Pharaoh*, important adaptation was done in making of cartoons. Architecture usually produces large, plain woven surfaces that create a monotone impression. The question was how to avoid this impression.

Let us look at the tapestry woven after the second picture (figs. 4, 5). It was easy to establish a new centering of the image by erasing a strip of the marble pavement in the foreground and to make a faithful transcription of the figures by enlarging them. To do that, the cartoon painter (François Bonnemer) conceived a specific preparatory drawing for the figures (Louvre), in which they were closely copied and enlarged to life scale. Then the woven image was given a decorative appearance by enriching the background architecture. The severe antique brown wall, pierced by a door and flanked by Ionic pilasters, was changed into a colored-
Fig. 5. Nicolas Poussin, *Moses and Aaron before Pharaoh*, also called *Moses Turning the Rod of Aaron into a Serpent*, ca. 1647. Oil on canvas, 92 × 128 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris (7274). Photograph: Réunion des Musées Nationaux/Art Resource, NY

Fig. 7. The Infant Moses Trampling on Pharaoh’s Crown from the first set with gold of the Story of Moses. Tapestry woven in the Manufacture Royale des Gobelins workshop of Jean Jans the Younger, Paris, before 1687. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 363 × 460 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMYT 32/3). Photograph: I. Bideau

Fig. 8. Nicolas Poussin, The Infant Moses Trampling on Pharaoh’s Crown, ca. 1647. Oil on canvas, 92 × 128 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris (72373). Photograph: Réunion des Musées Nationaux/Art Resource, NY; René-Gabriel Ojéda

Fig. 10. *The Infant Moses Trampling on Pharaoh's Crown* from the second set with gold of the *Story of Moses*. Tapestry woven in the Manufacture Royale des Gobelins workshop of Jean Lefebvre, Paris, before 1687. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 330 × 480 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTEE 33/3)
marble wall. The plain green curtains were replaced by heavy hangings adorned with strips of embroidery and fringe. The woven image is a compromise between the unity of the disposition of the figures (found in Poussin’s painting) and the decorative effect of an interior setting (required in a tapestry).

The so-called Moses Turning the Rod of Aaron into a Serpent was engraved by François Poilly (fig. 6). This engraving, in mirror image, is said to have been made after the painting. However, a new comparison between the painting and the engraving leads me to think that the differences between painting and engraving are identical to those between painting and tapestry. Engravings after Poussin are usually considered rather close to the original paintings, so it is logical to infer that Poilly made the engraving not after the painting, but after the tapestry, or even after the cartoon, since the border of the tapestry does not appear in the engraving.

A comparison between the painting and the tapestry of the Infant Moses Trampling on Pharaoh’s Crown reveals great complexity in the rearrangement (figs. 7, 8). First, two figures were added, one at each end of the composition, and the whole is flanked by two marble columns. The two figures were taken from the first version of the painting, done in 1645 for Poussin’s close friend the banker Jean Pointel (fig. 9), which was one of the paintings Chantelou selected for the Old Testament tapestry series he was planning. Second, space was created in the background of the tapestry, which was enriched by decorative patterns, with the plain curtain changed into sumptuous gold-damask hangings. The severe wall was replaced by a luminous and deep diurnal landscape, which recalls the opening to a blue night sky in the background of the first version of the painting. The tapestry of the Infant Moses Trampling on Pharaoh’s Crown appears to be a sort of combination of the two painted versions: the second version, which had recently entered the royal collections, was the basis for the woven version but with additions and alterations deriving from the
first canvas, which Germain Brice described as praised for the beauty of its colors.32

In the adaptation of these two paintings for a woven panel, making the cartoon was truly a redrawing or redesign of the original pictures. But one could note that this adaptation involved vacillation. In the second weaving of the *Infant Moses Trampling on Pharaoh’s Crown* (fig. 10), the columns and figures that were added to the composition for the first weaving are missing. This cannot be attributed to a question of the width of the tapestry because no edition of the series was made for a specific place. In the third or fourth weaving (Victoria and Albert Museum, London), the columns and figures reappeared, and the tapestry is in mirror image because this panel was woven on a low-warp loom. The “Magnificent Style” of Poussin was defined by Giovanni Pietro Bellori as a great whole unified by the necessary relation of all its parts.33 The challenge of adapting the two paintings to tapestry consisted of transferring this style to a larger scale without disturbing the unity of the whole by adding decorative patterns. Success was achieved by establishing a balance between these factors.

**CORRECTING POUSSEN**

On June 6, 1668, for the conference held at the Académie Royale de Peinture et de
Sculpture, Philippe de Champaigne chose to speak on the *Finding of Moses* (fig. 11). The picture, painted for Pointel in 1647, entered the French royal collection in 1665 with the collection of the duc de Richelieu, who purchased it in 1660 after Pointel’s death. A second lecture of this conference took place on December 5, 1682. Champaigne’s lecture focused on the noble reconstitution of the Egyptian setting. In the background, embankments, sumptuous palaces, obelisks, and pyramids clearly refer to the city of Memphis on the west bank of the Nile. The troubled water of the river is carefully depicted, as are the hunters and the hippopotamus in the middle of the river. Champaigne also praised the stateliness and grace of the figure of Pharaoh’s daughter, as well as the harmony of the colors. The discussion that followed the lecture focused on two breaches of the rules of decorum. The first affected the color of the skin of Pharaoh’s daughter, which is brown and greenish, a color considered unsuitable for European princesses and women of high rank, who were required to avoid the heat of the sun in order to keep a pale complexion. The second controversy concerned the use of a river god to personify the Nile. Although recurrent in Poussin’s mythological pictures, here this antique practice was considered both a pleonasm and inappropriate for a biblical subject. This polemical point resurfaced in 1695 in a commentary on the picture by Louis Henri de Loménie de Brienne, but by then, it had already been taken into consideration in the weaving of the tapestry. Hans Willem van Helsingden was the first to observe, in 1984, that the river god had been removed from the composition for the tapestry (fig. 12). Moreover, the complexions of Pharaoh’s daughter and her attendants are fairer in the tapestry than in the painting. Like the *Infant Moses Trampling on Pharaoh’s Crown and Moses and Aaron before Pharaoh*, the *Finding of Moses* was enlarged and retouched.

In this last case, the adaptation can be understood as an illustration of the debates held at the Académie Royale. I have in mind René Magritte’s work on the distance between reality and its images. His painting *The Betrayal of Images* is better known by the words written on it: “Ceci n’est pas une pipe” (This is not a pipe). Images are deceptive. Consequently, it would be possible to say of the tapestry of the *Finding of Moses*: “This is not a Poussin.” Here, the tapestry is a corrected Poussin, or, better, an idealized Poussin. It is obvious that the director of the Gobelins and the painters of the cartoons were fully conscious of the role that tapestry could play in the diffusion of the theory of painting as elaborated by the Académie Royale. It is also apparent that the complex process of making the cartoons forces us to acknowledge the fundamental discrepancy between seeing and knowing. The lack of understanding of the purpose of the series during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries most probably lies in an incomplete reading of these established facts.

The corrected images only affected pictures belonging to the king. It was only possible to criticize these paintings because they were not for sale. The four other pictures, which were in private hands, were not redesigned, except for changes in the centering that led to an enlargement of the figures. Removed from the tapestry of the *Finding of Moses*, the river god was preserved in the weaving of the *Exposition of Moses*. Nevertheless, to ensure the harmony of the tapestry series, the coloring was unified. This was necessary, since each of the pictures, painted at different times for various owners, had its very own coloring. Poussin was criticized for the severity of his paintbrush, and for the lack of truth, vigor, and harmony of his coloring. The colors of all the tapestries are vivid and brilliant, and the tapestry series also has its own coloring. This coloring was obtained by accentuating the outlines and reducing the number of tones, as was done with large-format paintings destined to be viewed from a distance.
The *Story of Moses* is a precise example of the function of the Gobelins, of its role within the institution of the bâtiments du Roi, and of its connection to the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture. Another project was taking place at the same time at the Gobelins: drawings by Raphael and Giulio Romano in the Cabinet du Roi were selected by La Chapelle-Bessé for two series of tapestries of *Mythological Subjects*. Sketches made from them were exhibited in a chapel in the Palais des Tuileries in February 1686. They were intended to be examined by Louvois before they were sent to be woven. One of them, the *Abduction of Helen* by François Verdier, was criticized because the painter had not corrected Raphael's mistake of perspective. These series of tapestries were modern interpretations of Raphael's and Giulio's concept of painting, as the *Story of Moses* is a transcription of the perfect idea of the painting of Poussin. Tapestries woven after works by Poussin pose the question of the model and its translation. In the middle of the nineteenth century, such an example made Adrien-Léon Lacordaire notice, and rightly so, that it is not necessary to have models especially designed for tapestry in order to obtain a favorable result, that everything is a question of transposition, the role of the tapestry designer being of primary importance in this process.

It was the same circumstance during the twentieth century, when Pierre Baudouin painted cartoons after pictures by Picasso, Braque, Le Corbusier, and many other artists, although not always especially for tapestry making.


4. Katharina Krause, "Die *Histoire de Moïse* des Nicolas Poussin," *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* 56 (2005), pp. 139–66. The author did an erudite study on the various "readings" of the paintings of Poussin dealing with themes from Exodus, but she neglected to ask two questions: First, why was such a series woven? Second, what was the significance of weaving Poussin's paintings in the 1680s? Since the symposium held at the Metropolitan Museum in October 2007 on the occasion of the exhibition "Tapestry in the Baroque: Threads of Splendor," another article has been published that deals with the tapestry series the *Story of Moses*, particularly on the links between Poussin and Le Brun; see Bénédicte Gady, "D'un ministre à l'autre: Rencontres entre Poussin et Le Brun," in Jean-Claude Boyer, Barbara Gaehgtsens, and Bénédicte Gady, eds., *Richelieu: Patron des arts, Passages/Passagen* 17 (Paris, 2009), pp. 357–67.

5. The marquis de Louvois (1641–1691), minister and state secretary of war, had bought the office of superintendent of the bâtiments from Colbert's fourth son, the marquis d'Ormoy and de Blainville (1663–1684), who had inherited the position of superintendent but was unable to handle the position satisfactorily.


13. Soucani is likely to have been the same person as the weaver Fouchani who delivered to the French Crown in 1663 a set with gold thread of the *Loves of the Gods or Metamorphoses* after Laurent de La Hyre. See Jean Vittet, “Les tapisseries de la Couronne à l’époque de Louis XIV. Du nouveau sur les achats effectués sous Colbert,” *Vestiaire*, no. 10 (2007), pp. 188–89. Lacordaire (*Notice historique sur les manufactures* . . . , new ed. [Paris, 1855], pp. 54–55) said he examined a set of the *Sacraments* after Poussin, but he did not specify whether the tapestries were woven in Paris during the seventeenth century or in Brussels during the eighteenth century after Poussin’s engravings (one such tapestry is in the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, and two others are in the Galerie Chevalier in Paris).


16. Jacques Thuillier, *Sébastien Bourdon*, 1616–1671: *Catalogue critique et chronologique de l’oeuvre complet, exh. cat.*. Musée Fabre, Montpellier, and Musées de Strasbourg (Paris, 2000), pp. 370–72, nos. 243–47 (ca. 1658–60). Baron Vuveret was also known as Pierre d’Athisville, a Protestant who invited Bourdon to stay in Montpellier in 1657–58. Bourdon also painted the very large *Devotion of Saint Protas* (1655–56; Arras) for a set of tapestries commissioned some years before by the wardens of the church of Saint-Gervais–Saint-Protas in Paris (the other cartoons were painted by Le Sueur and Champagne; ibid., pp. 341–43, no. 205).

17. “Il [Colbert] n’a pas goûté cette proposition, pour la difficulté, a-t-il dit, de réduire ces sujets en grand, qui ne sont exécutés qu’en petites figures”;


19. Four paintings came from the Cabinet du Roi (now in the Louvre): the *Finding of Moses* from the duc de Richelieu’s collection; the *Isaélites Gathering Manna in the Desert* formerly in the hands of Chancellor Fouquet; and the two pictures bought in 1683, the *Infant Moses Trampling on Pharaoh’s Crown* and *Moses and Aaron before Pharaoh.* The four other paintings were the *Exposition of Moses* in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; *Moses Striking the Rock* commissioned by Melchior de Gillier, then belonging to the marquis de Seignelay, Colbert’s eldest son, who bought it in 1681 from the Parisian connoisseur Thomas de Dreux, adviser to the “Grand Conseil” (National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh, loan of the Duke of Sutherland; on the history of the painting, see


21. Since 1690, the cartoon of the Exposition of Moses (Louvre, inv. 7311) has been attributed to the “sieur Stella.” If the attribution is correct, it means that the cartoon was completed before May 1682, date of the death of Antoine Bouzonnet Stella (1657–1682), one of Jacques Stella’s nephews, but this fact does not account for the decision, made after 1683, to weave Poussin’s paintings. Or does the attribution result from a mix-up between the owner of the painting and the painter of the cartoon? The other painters were Antoine Pailet (1626–1701)—the Finding of Moses; François Bonnemier (1638–1690)—the Israelites Gathering Manna in the Desert, Moses and Aaron before Pharaoh, and the Brazen Serpent; Joseph Yvart, called Yvart the Son (1649–1728), or Henry Testelin (1615–1695)—the Crossing of the Red Sea; Pierre de Sève (1623–1695)—the Infant Moses Trampling on Pharaoh’s Crown, Moses Striking the Rock (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rouen), and the Adoration of the Golden Calf (Mobilier National, Paris); Henry Testelin—the Burning Bush.

22. The first set consisted of ten high-warp tapestries, with gold thread, woven in the workshops of Jean Jans the Younger (1644–1723) and Jean Lefèvre (ca. 1622–1700), 1683–87 (Mobilier National, Paris); inventoried under Louis XIV by the Mobilier de la Couronne as no. 98 with gold; in 1900, as no. 92 of the Garde-Meuble, the Crossing of the Red Sea missing.

The second set consisted of eleven high-warp tapestries, with gold thread, woven in the workshops of Jans the Younger and Lefèvre, 1683–87 (Louvre and Mobilier National, Paris, and Château de Paau); inventoried under Louis XIV by the Mobilier de la Couronne as no. 99 with gold; in 1900, as no. 33 of the Garde-Meuble.

The third set consisted of ten low-warp tapestries, with gold thread, woven in the workshops of Jean-Baptiste Mozin (act. 1667–93) and Jean de La Croix (ca. 1628–1712), 1683–87; the tapestries are in mirror image because reversed cartoons were not made for the weaving on low-warp looms: inventoried under Louis XIV by the Mobilier de la Couronne as no. 100 with gold. Of six tapestries that were given by Louis XIV to his brother, one may be in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (George Wingfield Digby and Wendy Hefford, “A Poussin Tapestry from the Gobelins,” Victoria and Albert Museum Bulletin 3 [1967], pp. 111–17), and four were formerly in the Holford collection (sold, Christie’s, London, July 13–14, 1927, no. 224; three of them sold, Christie’s, New York, April 26, 1990, no. 3–5). The four remaining tapestries of the set were inventoried in 1900 as no. 34 of the Garde-Meuble (Mobilier National, Paris, and Château de Paau).

The fourth set consisted of ten tapestries with gold thread; they were a private order woven by Lefèvre for an ambassador before 1694.

The fifth set consisted of ten low-warp tapestries, without gold thread, woven in the workshops of de la Jean de La Fraye (ca. 1655–1730), Jean de La Croix and his son Dominique (ca. 1652–1737), Étienne Le Blond (ca. 1652–1727), and Jean Souet (act. 1693–1724), 1711–16: lent (1719) and then given (1726) to the comte de Senneterre, French ambassador to England (present location unknown).

The sixth set consisted of seven high-warp tapestries, without gold thread, woven in the workshops of Jans, Lefèvre, and Louis Ovis de La Tour (ca. 1699–1734), 1711–18: five were given to the Premier président d’Ormesson (three are in the collection of the town of Paris and one is in the Musée des Gobelins; the fifth piece is probably a tapestry formerly belonging to a family of South America that was sold at Sotheby’s, New York, May 23, 2003, no. 86, under the title Acts of the Apostles [256 × 389 cm]); the two remaining tapestries of the set were inventoried in 1900, as no. 35 of the Garde-Meuble (Mobilier National, Paris).


24. In 1683, the size of the painting was 1.30 × 1.95 m; in 1709 it was 1.43 × 1.95 m; and today it is 1.49 × 2 m. Arnauld Brejon de Lavergnée.


31. In 1665, the painting was in the Cottebleanche collection. In 1684, according to Germain Brice, it belonged to Mme Lescot, the widow of the goldsmith François Lescot (she was a collector of agates, carved stones, and modern medals, and above all she was a connoisseur of Poussin and Rubens); Brice, Description nouvelle de ce qu’il y a de plus remarquable dans la ville de Paris (Paris, 1684), vol. 1, p. 257. Is this assertion credible? The provenance of the picture reveals a hiatus between 1665 and 1685–88. It was commissioned about 1645 by Pointel, then purchased in 1660 by Loménie de Brienne, and seen in 1665 by Gian Lorenzo Bernini in the Cottebleanche collection. Between 1685 and 1688 the picture entered the collection of the marquis de Seignelay, who had bought it from Pierre Le Tessier de Montarsy (1647–1710); Thuillier, Poussin, p. 214, n. 96. On Mme Lescot, see Antoine Schnapper, Caricux du Grand Siècle: Collections et collectionneurs dans la France du XVIIe siècle, vol. 2, Oeuvres d’art (Paris, 1994), p. 100.


37. The difference in coloring is apparent in a comparison of the Adoration of the Golden Calf by Poussin with the cartoon painted after it: the coloring of the painting is brown; the coloring of the cartoon is lightened. The cartoon is published in Arnauld Berjon de Lavergnée, “Painted Cartoons,” Connaissance des arts (English), hors sér., no. 320/1 (2007), p. 44.

Patronage
Tales from the Tapestry Collection of Elector Palatine Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart, the Winter King and Queen

Following the destruction of Heidelberg Castle and the pillaging of its furnishings by troops of King Louis XIV of France in 1689 and 1693, during the Palatinate War of Succession, the fact that the Counts Palatine and Electors of the Rhine had assembled in their residence one of the most splendid collections of tapestries in Germany fell into oblivion. The counts’ self-image, derived from their royal lineage, did not mean that they were exempt from permanent competition for status, rank, and prestige with other princely families, such as the Habsburgs and their rival Wittelsbach cousins, the dukes of Bavaria. Therefore, the Counts Palatine could not neglect the use of the richest and most prestigious pictorial medium of the time and the preferred means of princely propaganda to further promote their family reputation. Unlike most of their German peers, they had begun to summon master weavers to work in Heidelberg in the 1430s. This explains the enthusiasm with which the size and the richness of the Palatinate tapestry collection were praised by Antoine de Lalaing, count of Hoogstraten and Culemborg, chamberlain to the court of Duke Philip the Handsome, the son of Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I. De Lalaing was thus very well acquainted with the current standards of Burgundian court culture, against which all other forms of princely display were measured. On the occasion of the duke’s visit to the Palatinate to meet with Elector Philip in the fall of 1503, de Lalaing acknowledged in his diary that Heidelberg Castle and its furnishings completely matched the requirements of splendor, even royal splendor, a judgment based primarily on the fact that he found all apartments and halls lavishly hung with expensive tapestries. During the first half of the sixteenth century, the Counts Palatine kept buying complete tapestry sets of biblical and mythological stories directly from the Netherlands. The acquisitions of Electors Frederick II and Otto Henry, both great admirers and passionate collectors of every kind of woven splendor, added considerably to what their predecessors had brought together since the reign of King Rupert I at the beginning of the fifteenth century.

The collection was further augmented when, in the early 1560s, Elector Frederick III succeeded in encouraging refugees from religious persecution in the southern Netherlands to settle in Frankenthal, a small town halfway between Heidelberg and Worms. Among them came numbers of artists and craftsmen: famous painters such as Gillis van Coninxloo and Pieter Schoubroeck, goldsmiths, jewelers, and tapestry weavers, most of the last coming.
directly from Oudenaarde or having close
ties to that city. Those weavers quickly
installed new workshops in Frankenthal,
which for about half a century made the
town the most important center of tapestry
production in Germany. Under the guid-
ance of master weaver Paulus Rubentz, these
local workshops were soon, and at an
increasing rate, able to supply the Heidelberg
court with new, high-quality tapestries. In
an inventory of 1584, there are listed almost
450 figurative wall hangings, 263 of which
are explicitly described as tapetzen (tape-
stry) and 183 called Rücktücher (dossals). It is
a fair guess that thirty years later, in 1613,
when Frederick V took his wife, Elizabeth
Stuart, to Heidelberg, the tapestry stock of
the Counts Palatine well exceeded 500 pieces.
To satisfy his indulged wife’s expecta-
tions, to enable her to continue the royal
lifestyle to which she was accustomed, the
young Pfälzgrave accommodated his
beloved “Englisch klein und Perlein”
(English jewel and pearl) in a newly erected
palace, the “Englische Bau,” which included
a spectacular theater and ballroom on top of
the “Dicker Turm” (giant tower), and he
assigned Salomon de Caus to add an expan-
sive terrace garden, the famous Hortus
Palatinus (fig. 1). When she arrived, Eliza-
beth found that the interior of Heidelberg
Castle “was superb beyond description:
the ceiling was painted al fresco, the walls
were hung with tapestry; and a suite of ten
rooms, including the knight’s hall, the royal
saloon, the silver chamber, and ante rooms,
formed a complete Gothic palace.” Her
own apartment was lavishly furnished; it is
said that “two Rubens glowed upon her
walls. Turkey carpets were strewn upon the
floors of rooms hung with red and brown
gilded leather. She was surrounded by

Fig. 1. Jacques Fouquieres, View of the Hortus Palatinus and Heidelberg Castle, ca. 1620. Oil on canvas,
178.5 × 263 cm. Kurpfälzisches Museum der Stadt Heidelberg (G 1822)
wrought-iron work from Nürnberg, heavily
carved furniture covered with velvets and
silks or elaborately inlaid and many exquis-
site bibelots of ivory and goldsmith’s work.
Her table was adorned with massive silver
plate and Munich and Bohemian glass. . . .
The figures in the tapestries and on the
plate and furniture were not like those dis-
played in her father’s palaces.”13 Those were
the happy, lighthearted days of a dawning
new golden age, when art, literature, music,
and science flourished in Heidelberg,14
which unfortunately did not last even for a
decade. Frederick’s finally agreeing to
accept the crown of Bohemia in 1618 led
straight into the outbreak of the Thirty
Years’ War. It was during this short period
of lavish extravagance that the Heidelberg
tapestry collection reached its peak. At this
time, too, our story begins with a pro-
logue, staged in London on Saint Valen-
tine’s Day, Sunday, February 14, 1613: the
wedding day of Frederick and Elizabeth.

THE PALATINE WEDDING OF 1613
The marriage of the handsome Frederick V,
future elector of the Rhine and presumed
leader of the Protestant Union, and Eliza-
beth Stuart, the beautiful daughter of King
James I of England and Ireland (James VI of
Scotland), in London in 1613, was a spec-
tacular event,15 and it was treated as such by
the press. Publishing houses immediately
covered the story in great detail, spreading
it across all Europe in several languages, just
the way the international networks would
do today.16 To scholars of cultural history,
these texts together with their illustrations
offer an almost inexhaustible body of informa-
tion about early seventeenth-century
princely life and court ceremonies. To art
historians interested primarily in paintings
and sculpture, however, the reports are a
bit of a disappointment because even the
famous examples that once decorated the
palaces and chapels went uncommented on
in these accounts. If, on the other hand, we
shift our attention to the alternative picto-
rial medium that at the time actually mat-
tered most—tapestry—the texts become
more satisfactory.

In public opinion today, tapestry qualifies
as a minor or an applied art, inferior in sta-
tus to the fine arts of painting, sculpture,
and architecture, an attitude that is out of
step with the opinions prevailing in the six-
teenth and seventeenth centuries. To better
understand the phenomenon, it is necessary
to look at sociohistorical, artistic, and cul-
tural developments of the period. In the
first place, tapestries were not hung for art’s
sake, not even if they were designed by
famous artists and woven in top-quality
workshops. Instead, they were symbols of
power and wealth, of the most virtuous
princely magnificenza, as well as a means of
education and, as will be argued here, as
sophisticated statecraft and shrewd diplo-
macy.17 For centuries, tapestries were con-
sidered to be the most cherished possessions
of the nobility. They represented the richest
and most prestigious pictorial medium of
the time, and consequently they developed
into the artifacts most fit to exemplify the
prevailing princely self-images. Therefore,
the display of carefully chosen narrative sets
was a serious and well-planned visual state-
ment by their owners, a strong and widely
recognized act of selective propaganda that
had to be taken seriously by the audiences.
In fact, it is precisely because of their gener-
ally acknowledged public character that the
chroniclers of the Palatine wedding told
their readers about the tapestry decorations.

It goes without saying that such a note-
worthy royal ceremony required the use
of a vast number of tapestries to embellish
both the private lodgings and the official
sites related to the event.18 Right from the
start, when Frederick paid an informal call
on Elizabeth the day after his arrival and
reception in London, the princess and her
parents received him at Whitehall Palace,
where Elizabeth’s “apartments had been
remodeled in honour of his coming, and
hung with fresh tapestries of the history of
Abel” especially for the occasion.19 On Feb-
uary 7, 1613, the day of Frederick’s investi-
ture in the Order of the Garter, Elizabeth took up residence at Saint James's Palace in the apartments last occupied by her brother the late Prince Henry Frederick, which were also fitted with tapestries especially for her.29 For the wedding, Whitehall Chapel was decorated with at least two, possibly three, pieces from the famous Acts of the Apostle tapestries,30 a series originally designed by Raphael in 1515 for Pope Leo X for the Sistine Chapel. The full-size cartoons were initially woven in Brussels, the renowned center of tapestry production, in the workshop of the master weaver and entrepreneur Pieter van Aelst. Later the cartoons were sold, most likely to the workshop run by the Dermoyen family, although one of them was bought by a private collector from Venice and was subsequently lost.31 During the course of the sixteenth century, several more sets were woven from the Raphael cartoons—or from meticulous copies of them—in different Brussels workshops, including the set purchased by King Henry VIII of England in 1542;32 part of this set was hung in Whitehall Chapel on

Fig. 5. *Christ’s Charge to Peter* from Henry VIII’s set of the *Acts of the Apostles*. Tapestry design by Raphael, woven in an unidentified Brussels workshop, ca. 1540–42. Wool, silk, and gilt-metal-wrapped thread, 386 × 566 cm (after removal of outer borders). Formerly Kaiser Friedrich Museum, Berlin; present whereabouts unknown. Photograph: © J. Paul Getty Trust.
the day of the Palatine wedding. From the rather ambiguous description of the furnishings by an anonymous chronicler from the Palatinate, two scenes can be identified: the *Healing of the Lame Man* (fig. 4), with Saints Peter and John prominently in the center, was behind the altar; to the right was *Christ's Change to Peter* (fig. 5), which, probably because of the flock of sheep behind Christ, was misinterpreted as the “Good Shepherd.” The tapestry to the left, called the “Wedding at Cana,” cannot be linked beyond doubt to any of the remaining pieces in the *Acts of the Apostles* series.24

Frederick and Elizabeth probably learned even more about the clever use of figurative tapestries as means of sophisticated statecraft from the decoration of the new banqueting hall, an ephemeral structure built to host the state dinners that were part of the celebration of the betrothal as well as the wedding itself. There the throne canopy was lavishly adorned with golden tapestries, and the benches were covered with precious carpets. In addition, the master of ceremonies, Sir Lewis Lewkenor, ordered the display of a magnificent set of ten tapestries of the *Defeat of the Spanish Armada*, which represented one of England’s greatest victories at sea.25
These highly praised tapestries did not belong to the English monarch. They were made for Lord Charles Howard of Effingham, Lord High Admiral and commander of the English naval forces against the Armada. Queen Elizabeth I dearly admired the set, and, attending a feast at Lord Howard’s residence, wished to have it, but he was unwilling to share. The court officials who organized the wedding festivities now borrowed the Armada tapestries and had them taken to Whitehall Palace for the occasion. Three years later, in 1616, Lord Howard, who had fallen into adverse financial circumstances, sold the set to King James, who transferred it to the Royal Wardrobe in the Tower of London. On behalf of Oliver Cromwell, the set was hung permanently in the House of Lords, and it was lost in the Westminster Palace fire of 1694. The impression of the 1613 interior decoration of the improvised banqueting hall with its lavishly carpeted floor and benches, throne canopy, and the Armada tapestries hung closely around the walls must not have differed much from what is known of the furnishing of the House of Lords shortly before its destruction (fig. 6).

The Armada set illustrated with great care and accuracy the successive engagements and tactical maneuvers of the two fleets in...
the English Channel, from the first appearance of the Spanish ships thirty miles southeast of The Lizard in Cornwall to their defeat off the coast of Gravelines near Calais and their disastrous retreat around Scotland and Ireland and back to Spain. The tapestries were designed by the Dutch draftsman Hendrick Cornelisz Vroom, who also painted the cartoons, and they were woven over a period of four years, 1592–95, in the studio of the master weaver François Spiering of Delft. They cost the enormous sum of 1,582 pounds.30 The focus of Vroom’s compositions was the sailing formation of the ships, which were depicted from the open sea in a panoramic view and at a scale large enough for the inclusion of detailed events. As a guideline for his designs, Vroom received chart drawings by Robert Adams, Supervisor of the Queen’s Buildings and renowned painter-cartographer, who had sailed with the English fleet and witnessed its epic victory. His records are probably the best contemporary evidence of the two fleets’ sailing orders. Two years later, Adams’s charts were published by Augustine Ryther to illustrate the English translation of Petruccio Udallini’s treatise Expeditionis Hispaniorum in Angliam Vera Descriptio Anno Domini MDLXXXVIII (fig. 7).30

Thanks to John Pine’s engravings in his 1739 monograph The Tapestry Hangings of the...
House of Lords, we know the appearance of each individual tapestry in the set. Pine showed almost prophetic insight into the fate of the set in the preface to this ambitious publication when he wrote, “because Time, or Accident, or Moth may deface these valuable Shadows, we have endeavoured to preserve their likeness.”

Juxtaposing Pine’s engraving of the tapestry Sir Francis Drake Takes de Valdez’s Gal- leon, and the Bear and Mary Rose Pursue the Enemy (fig. 8) with Ryther’s engraving of Adams’s chart of the same episode (fig. 7), one admires the skill and ingenuity of Vroom’s translation of his models into large-scale tapestry cartoons. Although faithful to Adams’s minute cartographic records of the military strategies of attack and retreat, Vroom’s designs succeeded magnificently in converting Adams’s bird’s-eye layouts into vividly descriptive panoramic scenes. Most of the charts depicted two consecutive actions on one map, and Vroom followed that pattern. Occasionally, however, he emulated coastal scenes in his cartoons, pictured the ships as observed from open shore, and added picturesque topographical details of the distant coastline along the horizon. In addition, each tapestry was surrounded by a wide decorative border containing lifesize portraits of the commanders of the English fleet, each set in a medallion inscribed with the officer’s name and that of his ship; on each piece, the English coat of arms and the device DIEU ET MON DROIT hover above the battle scenes.

The idea of commemorating a military victory in the tapestry medium was not new, but one might wonder why the display of the Armada tapestries during a wedding ceremony was so important that the king would agree to borrow tapestries from the Lord High Admiral. Everybody knew that they were not the property of the crown. Further, we must remember that at the death of King Henry VIII in 1547 the stock of pictorial tapestry administered by the Royal Wardrobe contained more than 2,700 pieces, some of which had been designed explicitly to suit the size and needs of the old Banqueting Hall. Although the collection may have been depleted over the past decades, it definitely was not for a lack of choice that led to the king’s borrowing of the Armada set. So why would the master of ceremonies, Sir Lewis Lewkenor, and his officer of assistance, Sir John Finet, have proposed to James I to pick such a martial theme to frame a happy party gathered to enjoy the king’s only daughter’s wedding banquet? The answer is brief: The decision to display the Armada tapestries resulted from the highly stylized customs of diplomacy and its common code of conduct; it was meant and understood as a means of sophisticated statecraft.

When word started to spread that Frederick and Elizabeth, both representing powerful Protestant countries, were about to marry, Spain and the Habsburgs, and behind them the pope, became allies in trying to prevent the wedding. They ordered their respective ambassadors at the English court—Don Alonso de Velasco (May 1610–August 1613) and ambassador extraordinary Don Pedro de Zúñiga (July 1612–July 1613) from Spain, and Ferdinand de Boischat (January 1610–December 1615) from the Spanish Netherlands—to sabotage the negotiations. Surprisingly, they were supported not only by the king’s favorite and privy councillor Robert Carr, but also by Queen Anne, who would rather have had Elizabeth convert to Catholicism and marry a Spanish prince than see her daughter become Goddewife Palsgrave, forced to live at a shabby court “without enough tapestry to cover the bare walls.”

After these machinations failed, the ambassadors were not very well liked by the Protestant party supporting the match of Frederick and Elizabeth, and their participation in the wedding ceremonies probably lessened. On the other hand, as accredited diplomatic representatives of important European states, they could not simply not be invited, so they were asked, along with
other ambassadors in London at the time—Samuel Spifame, Seigneur de Bisseaux et Passy from France;14 Antonio Foscarini from Venice (July 1611–December 1615);15 and Noel Caron from the States-General—to join the party at Whitehall on two consecutive days. In the new banquet hall, the ambassadors had to sit together in a special loge closest to the royal couple and therefore right underneath the Armada tapestries. There is no doubt that everybody who experienced the feasting in this environment laden with meaning, Protestants and Catholics alike, clearly understood the underlying message of the Palatine wedding: the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth was not only an affair of personal affection, it also confirmed the alliance of two powerful Protestant states as part of a political strategy meant to secure the supremacy of the Protestant cause in central and northern Europe, of which at the time the defeat of the Spanish Armada had become the most proudly cherished turning point in history.

Since neither Don Velasco nor de Boischat was keen to confess to his sovereign that he had participated in an official royal event at which the most shameful and disgraceful defeat of his home country and its ruling family was celebrated in such a prominent way, both stayed home voluntarily. The Spanish ambassador excused himself because of sudden illness, a tactic that had worked for him before. But word spread early that “the Spanish was, or would be sick,” and that the ambassador of Archduke Albert of Austria, who governed the southern Netherlands, had also made a “sullen excuse.”14 To Sir John Finet, the apparently furious de Boischat produced a rather strange and embarrassing excuse: that he, being ambassador of a sovereign monarch—which, by the way, was not true—would not accept that the representative of Venice, “a meane Republique, governed by a sort of Burghers, who had but an handful of Territory,” had also been asked to the festivities.15 This was not a very compelling argument, but rather an obvious pretext not fit to fool anybody. Everybody at court immediately recognized this shallow excuse to be sheer rhetoric. Indeed the ambassadors of the doge of Venice were always very well received and respected at every princely court in Europe and beyond, and that included Habsburg territories such as Spain, Austria, and the southern Netherlands.14 One could even say that the demeanor of the Venetian ambassadors belonged among the most splendid performances at any stately court ceremony. Evidently, the subliminal message of the Armada tapestries lent for the Palatine wedding was well understood by its first and foremost addressees, Don Alonso de Velasco and Ferdinand de Boischat, and acted on properly by their absence. As a result, appearances were formally kept up and both sides saved face, avoiding all serious misunderstandings that might easily have ended in a diplomatic disaster.

FREDERICK V AND ELIZABETH STUART AS COLLECTORS OF TAPESTRIES

With Frederick and Elizabeth, the prospects of increasing the tapestry collection of the Counts Palatine were most favorable. Designated among the entourage to accompany the princess to her new home in Heidelberg were two “Bett- und Tapeterey verwalter” (bed and tapestry curators) as well as “zwey diener so Tapeterey uffhengen” (two valets specializing in the hanging of tapestries).15 There was no shortage of work for these specialists, given that on the occasion of Elizabeth’s wedding, the Dutch States-General had lavishly bestowed her with tapestries from the workshop of François Spiering of Delft: a ten-piece set of the Deeds of Scipio (see Ebelte Hartkamp-Jonxis, “Mannerist, Baroque, and Classicist,” fig. 2) and a six-piece set of the Story of Diana (fig. 9). The designs for the Deeds of Scipio are attributed to Karel van Mander II. The Diana set is most likely to be identified with the editio princeps of Spiering’s so-called small Diana series, which might have been designed by David Vinckboons.16
These tapestries were soon augmented by a set of ten panels of the *Story of Samson* that Frederick purchased from Dutch dealers who had come to the Palatinate: Daniel Steurbout, who had relatives in Frankenthal, and Bartolommeo Balbani, both from Antwerp. It turned out that they had deceived the elector by overstating the quality and inflating the price. The *Story of Samson* set was one of several reditions (see Nello Forti Grazzini, “On the Tapestries in Seventeenth-Century Milan,” fig. 1) of a series first woven in 1610 by the master weaver Jan Raes II in Brussels for Cardinal Scipione Borghese, nephew of Pope Paul V. The cartoons had been commissioned a half century earlier by Henry II of France but were left unfinished when the king died in 1559. They remained in Brussels until the early seventeenth century, when they came to the attention of the papal nuncio Guido Bentivoglio, who was acting as Cardinal Borghese’s agent in Flanders and brokered the deal. Steurbout and Balbani had bought their set from Frans Sweerts in Antwerp, a frequent business partner of the Raes family workshop, and they later resold it to Frederick V. This set matched in height and quality the *Story of Samson* tapestries now in the Philadelphia Museum of Art (figs. 10, 11).

To maintain their growing inventory, in 1616 Frederick and Elizabeth named the master weaver Justus Fankens (Josse van Kaens), from nearby Frankenthal, to be *tapisser de cour* at Heidelberg, and three years later one Pierre Bonjour assumed the same position, similarly holding the post of court tailor, which also put him in charge of the administration and preservation of the tapestry stock in the Tapezerey-Gewölb.

The prince and princess shared a great personal interest in tapestries and their use as meaningful room decorations. We can infer this from letters that Frederick wrote to his wife when he traveled without her, to keep her informed about his trips and related occurrences. For example, in 1620, when he was visiting the Grand Marshal of Bohemia, Baronet Bertold Bohobud of Leipa (Česká Lípa), he reported how richly his host’s palace was decorated with tapestries: “I visited the house of the Baron of Leipa, which is certainly very beautiful with a good number of tapestries, and none more beautiful. I can truly say that except for Heidelberg and Munich I know of few houses that have so many.” From Wolfenbüttel, Frederick wrote dully to his wife, that Duke Friedrich Ulrich of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel possessed fine paintings but no tapestries at all, an odd observation since his host’s ancestors had long ago established at their court a professional workshop run by Flemish master weavers that was still operating under the direction of Boldewin of Brussels during the first decade of the seventeenth century.

A particular highlight in the history of the electoral tapestry collection is indicated by two letters sent to Heidelberg by Frans Sweerts in the summer of 1618. In them Sweerts requested that his personal friend Jan Gruter, the learned librarian of the Bibliotheca Palatina, assist him in his efforts to broker tapestries for the elector. Sweerts was in possession of tempting pieces, among them reweavings of a new series designed by Peter Paul Rubens, the *Story of Decius Mus*, as well as yet another redition of Raphael’s *Acts of the Apostles*. While we do not know whether Frederick and Elizabeth were interested in Sweerts’s offer, it is certain that no such transaction was ever carried out. The troubles rising from the gathering storm of the Thirty Years’ War were to alter substantially and permanently the young elector’s preoccupations.

When Frederick was proclaimed king by the Protestant estates of Bohemia in 1619, the court relocated from Heidelberg to Prague. The new royal status was memorialized by a rectangular armorial tapestry and two table carpets, on both of which the Palatine and Bohemian coats of arms were combined with the Order of the Garter.
which King James I had bestowed personally on his son-in-law. When Frederick accepted the Bohemian crown, he led his country straight into the Thirty Years’ War. After his troops lost the decisive Battle at White Mountain in 1620, the unfortunate Winter King and his family had to leave Prague and flee to exile in the Netherlands, where his uncle Frederick Henry, Prince of Orange, was the stadholder. At first, the couple, now royal but nearly broke, lived in a town house in The Hague called the Wassenaer Hof, and later they moved during the summers to a small, newly built castle at Rhenen on the river Rhine. To decorate these lodgings with at least some degree of dignity, they had sent from Heidelberg the most valuable tapestry sets of the Palatine collection—valuable in the sense both of monetary worth and of historical and emotional significance because of their subjects, which were taken from the history of the ruling Wittelsbach family. The tapestries that remained in Heidelberg were completely lost in the ensuing three decades of wartime chaos. The latest biographical account of a Heidelberg tapestry weaver from this period deals with the tapissier de cour: soon after the capital of the Palatinate was conquered by Imperial and Bavarian troops in 1622, Justus Fankans returned to Frankenthal.
Fig. 10. Samson Offers Honey to His Parents from a set of the Story of Samson. Tapestry design by Gillisz Mechelaon, woven in the workshop of Jan Raes, Brussels, ca. 1625. Wool and silk, 396.2 x 467 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art (1945-82-1).

Fig. 11. Delilah Cutting Samson's Hair from a set of the Story of Samson. Tapestry design by Gillisz Mechelaon, woven in the workshop of Jan Raes, Brussels, ca. 1625. Wool and silk, 396.2 x 670.6 cm. Philadelphia Museum of Art, Gift of Clifford Lewis Jr. (1946-81-1). Photograph: Rich Echelmeyer

Tapestry in the Baroque
Yet neither financial hardship nor the tribulations that inevitably arose from exile could prevent the Winter King and Queen from the purchase of new tapestries on a large scale. The painter and master weaver Karel van Mander II, who, together with his knighted partner Nicolaas Snouckaert von Schraplau, had run a tapestry workshop in the former Saint Anna monastery in Delft since 1615, died in February 1623. Probably soon thereafter, Frederick V bought a set of cartoons of the *Story of Alexander the Great* from Van Mander’s estate for the sum of 2,000 guilders. The set consisted of nine pieces adding up to a total of more than 190 square ells for the main narrative scenes and another 67½ square ells for two different designs for the borders; it had already been used four times as a weaving model. Unfortunately, the *Alexander* series turned out to be a classic shelf warmer, and when, in 1624, the firm was finally taken over by the Spiering family, they found three complete sets still unsold. Today Van Mander’s *Alexander* tapestries are best known from a complete set of nine signed pieces woven between 1617 and 1619 that once hung in the Villa San Donato, near Florence, as part of the collection of Prince Anatole Demidoff until it was auctioned in 1880 and subsequently spread among various museums and institutions in Europe and the United States. We do not know why Frederick preferred acquiring the cartoons rather than the already finished and easily available tapestries from the Van Mander workshop, especially since he evidently never presented them to any other weaver for execution.

In addition, there was a very rich canopy draped over a bedstead, which Frederick presented as a gift to his uncle the stadtholder. On special occasions, the alliance between the two princes, both leaders of major Protestant states, was further displayed by the use of two table carpets that showed the coats of arms of both families. An anonymous dealer from Leiden delivered a six-piece set of the *Story of Joseph* for the substantial sum of 8,000 talers, which embellished the rooms of Rhenen Castle in 1633. And even after Frederick’s premature death in 1632, when the family’s already precarious financial situation deteriorated further, Elizabeth continued to buy tapestries. At least three expensive sets, which in 1661 qualified as “new tapezerey,” most likely were recent acquisitions and should therefore be associated with the patronage of the Winter Queen: nine hangings portrayed landscapes with hunting scenes, a set of eight represented the *Story of Tobias,* and an eight-piece set of the *Story of Cleopatra* hung in Elizabeth’s private dining room (fig. 12). The last was bought in The Hague, likely from Pieter de Cracht, a tapestry dealer from Amsterdam, who ran workshops in Gouda and nearby Schoonhoven. In 1646 De Cracht had taken over the tapestry workshop that belonged to his father-in-law, Jacques Nauwincx, who long had owned the cartoons of the *Cleopatra* series. But it was again Karel van Mander II, who had initiated the design of the set to be woven in his own studio in Delft; yet the project failed because of Karel’s death in 1623. His cartoons passed into the ownership of the Spiering workshop, where they were adapted by an unknown painter, who extended the series to a total of eight pieces. In 1631 the whole set of cartoons was owned by the Nauwincx studio, whence, shortly after 1645, Pieter de Cracht started to produce the *Cleopatra* series not only for the Winter Queen but also for many other customers.

**RAPHAEL’S ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND RUBEN’S STORY OF DECIUS MUS: AN OFFER ONE COULD NOT REFUSE?**

To date, more than fifty individual tapestries can be identified in the Palatine inventories and linked beyond doubt to acquisitions made by Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart. However, even though the purchase of Raphael’s *Acts of the Apostles* and Ruben’s *Story of Decius Mus* never materialized, the 1618 offer by Frans Sweerts to deliver to Heidelberg complete sets of those
tapestries marks the zenith of the history of the Palatine tapestry collection. Praise for Raphael’s series was boundless at the time, particularly at the English court. For the poet Henry Peacham, who had had a great affection for painting and the arts since he was a young boy, the Acts of the Apostles set that was purchased by Henry VIII and hung in Whitehall Palace was the work most likely to ensure the fame of that artist for eternity: “The fame of Raphael Vrheine at this time [1518] was so great, that he was sought for and employed by the greatest Princes of Europe, as namely, the Popes, Adrian and Leo: Francis the first, King of France: Henry the eight, King of England; the Dukes of Florence, Vrheine, Mantua, and divers others. Those stately hangings of Arras, containing the Histoire of Saint Paul out of the Acts (than which, eye never beheld more absolute Art, and which long since you might have seen in the banqueting house at White-hall) were wholly of his invention, bought (if I bee not deceived) by King Henry the eight of the State of Venice, where Raphael Vrheine died; I have no certainty: but sure I am, his memory and immortall Fame are like to live in the world for ever.”

Sweerts’s letters to Jan Gruter concerning the Acts and Decius Mus sets are also of interest as sources of factual material concerning tapestry production. First, Sweerts, in uncovering the swindlers Sturbout and Balbani, who had sold the Samson tapestries to the elector, revealed the pricing system of the Antwerp tapestry merchants: one square ell, roughly 70 by 70 centimeters, could be woven for 18, 20, or 24 guilders, depending on the quality of the weaving and the materials used. At the end of Sweerts’s second letter, there is an extraordinary detail. He wrote of a set of some “gouwden tapisseren” (golden tapestries) that Archduke Albert of Austria had recently bestowed on Archbishop Johann Schweikhard von Kronberg, the elector of Mainz, neighboring the Palatinate. If Frederick wished to draw level, and Sweerts of course hoped he would, the dealer would be happy to deliver exactly the same high quality for the breathtaking price of 66 guilders per square ell.

Second, and more important, Sweerts claimed that he owned the cartoons of Raphael’s Acts of the Apostles series: “Ick heb tot Brussel eenen patroon de Actis Apostolorum geschildert van Raphæl Urbini.” It is hard to decide whether he was referring to the original cartoons or to copies that had been used in the production of various later editions of the set. The phrasing, “geschildert” (painted) by Raphael of Urbino, should probably not be taken literally. In 1573, the original cartoons were described in a letter written to Cardinal Granvelle, archbishop of Mechelen and adviser to the Spanish Crown, as still in Brussels but as far too damaged to be used any longer for weaving. Leaving Sweerts’s letter aside, the next documentary evidence reveals that in 1623 the cartoons were in Genoa, probably in the possession of the nobleman Andrea Imperiale, and were sold to Prince Charles, the younger brother of Elizabeth Stuart, to be further used in the newly founded Royal Tapestry Manufactory at Mortlake. Interestingly, in the very same letter of July 18, 1618, Sweerts reported back to Gruter about his intention to sell the first two editions of Rubens’s Decius Mus tapestries to customers in Genoa.

The agreement for the weaving of the Decius Mus series was drawn up in Antwerp in November 1616 by Frans Sweerts and Jan Raes II on the one hand, and Franco Cattaneo, a merchant from Genoa, on the other. The contract covered the making of two sets of tapestries representing the “History of the Roman Consul Decius Mus,” who voluntarily lay down his life for the sake of his troops and his home country. The theme, borrowed from the Roman historian Livy and interpreted by Rubens as an exemplary act of patriotism, was not a common one in art. But when Sweerts first
took the initiative for having it designed, he might well have been inspired by his friend Gruter, who recently had published a critical edition of Livy. The Decius Mus cycle marks Rubens’s successful debut into tapestry design. The preparatory work lasted for almost two years but finally resulted in eight monumental cartoons, all painted exquisitely in oil on fine canvas by the artist and his workshop: six models for big hangings with scenic episodes of the narrative action and two entrefèttes. The cartoons would later become one of the greatest glories of the Princely Collections of Liechtenstein.

One might ask whether it is so unlikely an assumption that Sweerts could have sold the Acts of the Apostles cartoons along with sets of Rubens’s Decius Mus to his Genoese customers as part of the same deal. If he had done so, it would have meant that his
statement given to Gruter was correct and that he did indeed own the originals of the Acts cartoons in 1618. This is an issue not of mere academic interest but of major significance, especially for its consequences concerning the oeuvre of Rubens. Jeremy Wood has recently sketched the benefits to our understanding of Rubens's stylistic development as a draftsman if he had had the opportunity to study Raphael's original cartoons in Brussels before 1600 and before his own travels in Italy.17

Whatever the eventual results of this unexplored area might be, in retrospect the fact that neither Raphael's Acts of the Apostles nor Rubens's Decius Mus tapestries became part of the Palatine collection is sadly felt as a great opportunity lost.

TROUBLED FINALE
After the treaties of Münster and Osnabrück, which ended the Thirty Years’ War in 1648, Charles Louis, the eldest surviving son of the Winter King and Queen and heir of the electorate of the Rhine, finally returned to Heidelberg from The Hague. He took with him the major portion of what was left of his ancestors’ exiled tapestry collection, along with many paintings, the library, the renowned collection of antique coins and medals, and part of the Kunst- und Wunderkammer. The first shipment was sent to Frankfurt in September 1649.8 A perfectly preserved shipping note reveals the meticulous accuracy with which the transport was planned (fig. 13). Eleven huge chests were packed with textile furnishings (see appendix); eight with tapestry, two with throne and bed canopies, and one with “türkische täppich” (Turkish tapestries), a term that in the inventories of the Palatine collection refers to technique rather than to provenance. It was usually applied not to Oriental rugs but to all sorts of knotted

Fig. 13. Shipping note concerning the first transport of tapestries and other household stuff of the Elector Palatine Charles Louis from The Hague to Frankfurt in September 1649. Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich, Abt. III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Schatzakten, S 601, fols. 135v–136r
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hangings, carpets, and tablecloths. Yet, as a result of the Palatine War of Succession in 1693, most of these pieces would be destroyed, pillaged, or simply sold at an improvised auction by the trustees of the French king Louis XIV before the turn of the century. The loss of the collection was almost complete. Today only about twenty pieces exist that can be traced back to the once great Palatine collection, that is, less than 4 percent of the hangings listed in the preserved inventories.

For her part, Elizabeth, even though she had to fight hard with her son Charles Louis over this issue, held back more than 140 individual tapestries in the Wassenaer Hof in The Hague and in Rhenena Castle to meet her representational needs as a queen. In the letters to her son, who urged her to send these tapestries to Heidelberg as well, the Winter Queen stated very clearly that she would not back off. When Elizabeth gave a ten-piece set of the *Story of Abraham* as a wedding present to one of her younger sons, Prince Edward, who converted to Catholicism and married Anna Gonzaga, Charles Louis sullenly complained about his mother’s depriving him of his rightful heritage. Indeed, his anger seemed justified by the fact that the *Abraham* set, a reweaving of the famous series originally designed by Pieter Coecke van Aelst and woven in the workshop of Willem de Kempeneer on behalf of King Henry VIII, had been purchased shortly after 1556 by Elector Otto Henry to decorate his new palace at Heidelberg Castle. In his will, Otto Henry specified explicitly that all tapestries acquired during his reign were to be part of the inalienable assets of the electorate in perpetuity. Therefore, Elizabeth had no right to give away the *Abraham* set. The queen’s response was to accuse the new elector of stinginess, arguing that he would make a fool of himself if anybody realized how poorly he treated his mother. A second attempt by Charles Louis to recover tapestries was more successful: in 1655 Elizabeth agreed to send five “suits of hangings” and some paintings to Heidelberg. In the end, however, the Winter Queen’s headstrong persistence prevailed. She had “her” tapestries sent to London to furnish Exeter House, where she was to reside after her return to England in 1661. Among them were all the sets that she had acquired personally during exile and also the *Story of Scipio* set, the prestigious wedding present that she and her husband had received from the States-General in 1613. To her son she explained haughtily, “If I had as much means to buy hangings as my Lo[rd] Craven has, I should not haue bene so rigorous as to take what is my right.”

Obviously, even toward the end of her life, the ever status-conscious Queen of Bohemia was still keen on buying expensive tapestries of the highest quality, even though she could no longer afford them. William Craven was long a friend of Frederick and Elizabeth, and he remained a staunch supporter of the Palatine cause throughout his life. When King Charles II failed to provide an adequate residence for the queen of Bohemia after her arrival in London, Elizabeth lived in Craven’s house in Drury Lane.

The following year, Elizabeth died in the arms of her son Prince Rupert the Cavalier, who inherited the precious tapestries as part of his mother’s bequeathed “Meubles.” After Rupert’s death in 1682, they were owned by his mistress Margaret Hughes, a renowned stage beauty, who vies with Anne Marshall over the privilege of being the first woman to perform publicly on stage in the role of Desdemona in William Shakespeare’s play *Othello*. Prince Rupert and the actress had an illegitimate daughter, Ruperta, born in 1671, who later married Lieutenant General Emanuel Scrope Howe. In the end, it was from their household that what was left of Ruperta’s royal grandmother’s inheritance irretrievably vanished.

To date, not a single tapestry of the Winter King and Queen’s collection has surfaced again.

*Tales from the Tapestry Collection of Elector Palatine Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart*
Many friends and colleagues have provided insight and thoughtful comment throughout the genesis of this article. I must begin by thanking Wolfgang Metzger and Karin Zimmermann (Heidelberg), who alerted me to the letters of Frans Sweerts in the Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, while Krista De Jonge (Leuven), Harald Dórs (Heidelberg), and Daniel Lievois (Ghent) shared in the difficulty of their accurate transcription and interpretation. Maureen M. Meikle (Sunderland) kindly provided the information about the tapestries from the Royal Scottish Wardrobe at Dunfermline and Linlithgow. Further I am grateful to Guy Delmarcel and Koenraad Brosens (Leuven), Tom Campbell and Elizabeth Cleland (New York), Ebelte Hartkamp-Jonxis (Amsterdam), Wendy Hefford (London), Jean Vitter (Paris), and Dean Walker (Philadelphia) for their generosity in sharing their knowledge and experience in tapestry research and conservation.
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Appendix

1. Inventory of the first portion of tapestries shipped to Heidelberg by Charles Louis, The Hague, September 14/4, 1649; Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich, Abt. III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Schatzakten, S 601, fol. 137v–138r:

Verzeichnus der mobilien, tapecerereyen undt anders, so ihrer churfürstlichen durchlauft seindt nach Francheurth gesandt worden, den 14/4 Septembris 1649.


[Mark] Zehen stüch tapecerey, historia des Samsons, mitt seiden undt wullen eingewirckt.1


[Mark] Ein cammer von 5 stücken, hoch 2½ ellen, zusammen weit 28 ellen, seindt schön undt reich von seiden, jacht undt gartenwerck. //

2. Inventory of the tapestries shipped to England by Elizabeth Stuart, The Hague and Rhenen, 1661; Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich, Abt. III, Geheimes Hausarchiv, Korrespondenzakten, no. 1022½ (2), pp. 1–4.4

Verzeichnuß derienigen mobilien, welche Michael Alselier in s’Graffhenag, undt Antoni Alberts de Beer im hauff zu Rhenen, vermögn eines ieden inventory, in verwahrung gehabt, aber nicht nacher Heydelberg gekommen, sonderm alya verplieben, undt nachgehenden in anno 1661 nach Englandt überbracht worden.

Tapezereyen
1 Zwey stüch von der Medora undt Aneglica, von seiden gewirckt, welche vor diesem zu Heydelberg in der königin cammer geweßen, davon ist undt ein stüch in der englischen kirchen. (800)1
2 Sieben stuck tapezerey in dem gemacl an der königin anti cammer, da die trabanten stehn, historia Achabs undt Jesabel. (300)
3 Zwey fensterstuck, auf der historia Salomonis. (200)
4 Sieben stück rodgülken leder, darunter ein fensterstuck.


pp. 146–47. Prince Rupert named Lord Craven executor of his will and trustee to Margaret Hughes and their daughter. Craven had the right to sell most of the jewels and other household stuff and invest the money for the benefit of his protégés. For the account of the sale of Prince Rupert’s inheritance, see Eliot Warburton, Memoirs of Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers (London, 1849), vol. 3, pp. 558–60.


104. Lemberg, Eine Königin ohne Reich, pp. 82–86; Rebisch, Rupert von der Pfalz, p. 151.
5 Daß gülten leder uff der langen galerie, in der lengen 25 ellen, in der breitte 2½ ellen.
6 Einundzwanzig bletter gülten und silber leders, der grund colombine, wie in ihrer mayestäten tafelstuben, fünf halbe bletter von gleichem leder, undt vier schmale leisten, selbigen leders.
7 Sechs stück tapezereyen in einer cammer, von allerhandt jagten und fischereyen, uff jedem stück daß bayerisch wappen, in der hohe iedes 3 ellen, zusammen weit 20½ ellen.
E (1000)
8 Eine cammer von zehen stücken, Franz Spirings arbeit, von großem bildwerk, reich von seiden, iedes stück hoch 5⅛ ellen, zusammen weit 58¼ ellen. P (6000)
9 Ein cammer von acht stücken, noch new, die historia von Tobia, iedes stück hoch 4½ ellen, zusammen weit—. (2000)
10 Ein cammer von sieben stücken, groß bildwerk, so etwas alt und schadhaft, hoch ¾ ellen, zusammen weit 36⅓ ellen. b.b. (1200) //
11 Zwey schöne stück von kayser Augusto, mit seiden vermicht, hoch 5 ellen, zusammen weit 7½ ellen. E.F. (1000)
12 Ein stück allein von großem bildwerk, die historie von der königin von Saba, 4½ ellen hoch, 3½ ellen weit. (2000)
13 Ein stück allein die historia von Joseph, ist mit seiden vermicht, hoch 4½ ellen, lang 6 ellen. (200)
14 Ein stücklein, in der mitten Fama, und uff beiden seiten blumenpott, hoch 2 ellen, lang 3 ellen. (100)
15 Ein stück, darauff drey blumenpott, hoch 1½ ellen, lang 2½ ellen. (30)
16 Sechs fensterstücken, von zerstörung Troia, 2 ellen hoch undt zusammen lang 28 ellen. (400)
17 Ein new fensterstück von laubwerk, darinnen daß pfälzische und sächsische wapen, breit 1½ ellen, lang 5 ellen. (50)
18 Ein stück, so auch von Salomon und der königin von Saba, reich von gold und silber, breit ¾ ellen, hoch 2⅝ ellen. (400)
19 Ein cammer von vier stücken, so oben jägerey, undt allerhandt wilde thier, sind alle einer höhe, nemlich 4½ ellen, zusammen weit 24 ellen. (600) //
20 Acht stück newe tapezerey, so von einem von Schonhoven in dem Ha[al]ger erkauff worden, in ihrer mayestäten tafelsaal gehörig, historia Pompej und Cleopatrae.
21 Acht stück tapezerey, die historie von Elia, im vorhauff bey ihrer mayestät gemach, und acht stück tapezerey von grün und gelb gewirffeltem zeug, darunder gerechnet ein fensterstück und ein stück über dem camin. //
22 Zu Rhened seind vermög deß inventarij de anno 1633 geblieben und nicht nach Heydelberg gekommen alß:
23 Eine cammer von neun stücken brüsselische arbeit, so landtschaft und geiagt, ied-wedes stück hoch 5 ellen undt alle zusammen weit 44 ellen. A (4000)
24 Eine cammer von zehen stücken, die historia von Abraham, iedes stück hoch 5 ellen, zusammen weit 55⅓ ellen, ist etwa schadhaft. K (Prince Edward 4000)
25 Eine cammer von zwelf stücken, ver-misch mit seiden, von großem bildwerk, die erschaffung der welt und des menschen fall, hoch 5 ellen undt zusammen weit 53½ ellen. S (8000)
26 Zwey stück, uff einem stück die historie von Dido, Enea undt Achate, uff dem anderen ein pauquet mit einem harphenisten; sind an allen beiden stücken leisten mit sonnen, die stück mit goldt und seiden vermicht, iedes hoch 4½ ellen, zusammen breit 8 ellen. H.b. (1000)
27 Vier stück so von tournier, mit gold undt silber vermicht, iedes hoch 4 ellen, weit 15 ellen. (1000)
28 Eine cammer tapezerey, die historia von Jacob, 5 ellen hoch, bestehet in 8 stücken. (4000)
30 Blau und gülten leder zu ihrer mayestät cabinet. (400)
31 Fünf stück grob iagwerk. nro. 5 mit A.a. gezeichnet, hoch 5 ellen. (1000) //
32 An türkischen teppichen seint in dem Hag undt Rhened zurückgeblieben, alß: . . .
33 Ein türkischer teppich, 3 ellen breit und lang, von tapezerey, in mitten daß böhmisch undt pfälzische wapen, daruff der orden „HONY SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE“. (30) . . .
34 An sammeten und anderen teppichen, alß . . .
35 Zwey tischteppiche von tapezerey, in der mitten das churfälzische undt nassauische wapen, mitt gelb, grün und rodt seidenen franzen und mitt blauem schechter gefüttert. (60).
1. The set Frederick V bought from Steurbout and Balbiani.
2. See also Johann Kretzschmar, "Das kurpfälzische Schloss zu Rhenen, Provinz Utrecht," *Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Heidelberger Schlosses* 4 (1903), pp. 120–23.
3. The estimated value of the tapestry sets is given in thalers (*Reichsthalern*).
4. The *Deeds of Sipio* from the workshop of François Spiering, given to Frederick and Elizabeth in 1613 as a wedding present from the States-General. The dimensions (approx. 400 x 407 cm) fit with those of known pieces from the series; the entry proves that the newlyweds received a set of not just eight but, indeed, ten pieces.
5. The *Story of Cleopatra* from the workshop of Pieter de Cracht of Schoonhoven (formerly owned by Jacques Nauwincx). The set was bought by Elizabeth between 1650 and 1660.
6. The set was bought by Elizabeth between 1650 and 1660.
7. The *Abraham* set acquired by Elector Otto Henry that Elizabeth wrongfully gave to her son Prince Edward as a wedding present in 1645.
8. The set was bought by Elizabeth between 1650 and 1660.
Mannerist, Baroque, and Classicist: Narrative Tapestries and Related Paintings in Late Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Holland

Two tapestries in the exhibition “Tapestry in the Baroque: Threads of Splendor” and the term Baroque in the title of that magnificent show gave me reason to question the relationship of the Baroque style to Dutch tapestries. One tapestry was the Liberation of Oriane, from a set of the Story of Amadis of Gaule, woven in the workshop of François Spiering in Delft about 1590–95, after designs attributed to Karel van Mander I (1548–1606) (fig. 1). The second tapestry was Scipio and the Envoys from Carthage, from a set of the Deeds of Scipio, woven some fifteen years later, also by Spiering, but this time after designs attributed to Van Mander’s son, Karel van Mander II (1579–1623) (fig. 2). Surely, the title of the exhibition implies the Baroque era rather than the Baroque style, but the two are closely linked. In the essays in the accompanying catalogue, it is made clear that the exhibition was about more than Baroque in the sense of images characterized by extreme realism, dramatic effects, chiaroscuro, and strong movements and facial emotions. The fifty-eight objects in the exhibition, moreover, spoke for themselves. They presented an eloquent survey of stylistic developments between about 1585 and the second half of the eighteenth century, from Mannerism to classicism and Baroque and from that onward to rococo. Still, questions about style in the Baroque era kept circling in my mind.

This article deals with stylistic developments in narrative tapestries in the Dutch Republic from about 1590, when the late phase of Mannerism reached the Netherlands, to the 1650s, when classicism and Baroque were the prevailing pictorial styles. The tapestries will be discussed in relation to paintings, especially those of a monumental scale made for buildings of official character, some of those being constructed or modernized in that period.

The landscapes in early Delft tapestries such as the Amadis series and the closely related series of the Story of Diana (fig. 3) are related to small-format Antwerp paintings with stories from classical mythology and the Bible and similar paintings from the northern Netherlands. Comparisons between paintings of these subjects by Antwerp artists such as Hendrick de Clerck (ca. 1570–1629) and Hendrik van Balen I (1575–1632) and ones by painters in the north, like Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem (1562–1638), in his works from about 1600, Abraham Bloemaert (1566–1651) in the same period, and Joachim Wtewael (1560–1607), give evidence of their links.

It was not just the Antwerp pictorial tradition of rendering landscapes, however, that inspired the designs of contemporary Dutch tapestries with epic and mythological subjects, such as the Amadis and Diana.
series. Both the large and the small figures depicted on the tapestries point also to other sources. In the sixteenth century, Mannerism swept all over Europe, including important artistic centers such as Florence, Rome, Prague, and Antwerp, as well as Haarlem, Amsterdam, and Utrecht. The painting *Diana and Actaeon* (ca. 1590–1600) by Joseph Heintz the Elder (1564–1609), court painter to Emperor Rudolf II in Prague, for example, testifies to the international character of that style (fig. 4). Paintings like *Diana and Actaeon*, and in particular the work of Bartholomeus Spranger (1546–1611), Heintz’s colleague at the court of Rudolf II, put their mark on artists in northern Europe who were also experimenting with Mannerism. The meeting of northern European artists in several cities in Europe, particularly in Rome, and the rapid dissemination of prints made the style known among artists in cities like Prague, Antwerp, and Haarlem almost simultaneously.

During the last quarter of the sixteenth century, Haarlem saw quite an influx of artists, scholars, and entrepreneurs from the southern Netherlands. Van Mander and his son among them. In his paintings and
Fig. 2. Scipio and the Envoys from Carthage from a set of the Deeds of Scipio. Tapestry design attributed to Karel van Mander II, woven in the workshop of François Spiering, Delft, 1609. Wool and silk, 414 x 404 cm. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (BK-1972-77). Photograph: Bruce White

Fig. 3. The Story of Latona and the Lycian Peasants from a set of the Story of Diana. Tapestry design by Karel van Mander I, woven in the workshop of François Spiering, Delft, ca. 1593–1610. Wool and silk, 354 x 336 cm. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (BK-1969-2)
tapestry designs, Van Mander I created Mannerist effects not so much in the extreme musculature of the male body and the contorted poses of his figures like some of his Haarlem colleagues, but rather in elongated, elegantly turned figures with small heads and in the changeant coloring of their dresses, the latter particularly visible in Spiering’s wonderful transmissions of these designs into tapestries. Large paintings by Van Mander are not known, but through the Amadis and Diana series, it can be observed what they may have looked like. The scenes on the tapestries are composed in a somewhat rigid manner, as if Van Mander followed his own art theories like a pupil following the advice of an instructor. Meanwhile, the compositions exude a fairytale character that gives them an intimate charm in spite of their large size.

The Wedding of Peleus and Thetis by Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem is an example of a large painting made for public or semipublic spaces in this period (fig. 5). It was commissioned in 1593 by the city of Haarlem for the stadholder’s residence, the Prinsenhof. Cornelis Cornelisz did not show himself at his most extreme in this painting. It is, rather, a fine example of harmonious grouping, albeit in a Mannerist way. All figures are nude, a common feature of mythological and biblical paintings of the last decade of the sixteenth century, not only small paintings for private viewing, but also large canvases like this one. By contrast, in tapestries of similar subjects, all figures are fully dressed. It is hard to believe that propriety was more important in tapestries than in paintings, since mythological and biblical subjects in both media were displayed in public spaces. It is more likely that the painterly qualities of flesh tones were not easy to transmit to tapestries, because sketches and small-scale designs for these were executed in pen and wash. Some twenty years later, studio practices changed. Peter Paul Rubens and his collaborators developed the practice of painting modelli in oil on board and cartoons in oil on canvas.

The actual cartoons for the weavers were always executed in watercolor on paper, in Rubens’s case in the form of paper copies of the oil cartoons on canvas. Oil painting created opportunities for rendering the subtle differences in flesh tones that had not been possible in watercolor. We can see that for ourselves in series like the Story of Decius Mus.

The tapestry Scipio and the Envoy from Carthage shows a breaking away from the subdued, somewhat academic Mannerism in Dutch painting (see fig. 2), like that seen in the works of Van Mander I by his own hand and in tapestries after designs attributed to him, such as the Amadis and Diana series. But toward what style? The title of an exhibition in 2000 about Dutch seventeenth-century narrative paintings—generally denominated as history painting—was “Hollands classicisme in de zeventiende-eeuwse schilderkunst” (Dutch Classicism in Seventeenth-Century Painting), not “Dutch History Painting in the Age of the

Fig. 4. Joseph Heintz the Elder, Diana and Actaeon, ca. 1590–1600. Oil on copper, 40 × 49 cm. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (GG-1115)
Baroque." Judging from the paintings in that exhibition, it is evident that Dutch history paintings are often in a somewhat austere style with a quest for clarity, sometimes in a palette with almost metallic overtones. Indeed, as the title of that exhibition suggests, there are reasons to define them as classicist paintings. In the introductory essay in the accompanying catalogue, Albert Blankert stated that seventeenth-century Dutch classicism was a response to preceding styles in three guises and in three periods, the first, from about 1610 onward, being a reaction to Mannerism.10 Paintings from that phase of classicism show a change toward depicting large figures, not seldom larger than life, as Hendrick Goltzius (1558–1617) rendered them in his paintings, such as Minerva, dated 1611 (fig. 6). In this work Goltzius was clearly influenced by Rubens—not, however, by the Rubens in his most Baroque manner but rather by the Rubens in his classicist phase, directly after his return from Italy in 1608. Van Mander II’s debt to Rubens may have been indirect, that is through paintings by Haarlem–based artists, particularly those by the highly influential Goltzius, a close friend of his father. Van Mander II, who trained in the Spiering workshop as a cartoon painter and, consequently, as a designer of tapestries, apparently acquainted himself with the modern style of the time. Spiering, as a merchant and weaver with an international clientele, knew of the different tastes of his clients, some opting for tapestries in the old Mannerist style, others for ones in the modern, Baroque style with classicist undertones. The former style is typified by the 1610 edition of the Story of Diana to which the Story of Niobe belongs,11 and the latter by the Scipio tapestries that he wove the year before, in 1609 (see fig. 2). Classicism and Baroque may present themselves as opposite styles of each other, the first with a penchant for balanced compositions rendered in a monumental manner, the second showing bravura and
dramatic movements. But the visual differences are often not as manifest as the definitions of the two styles suggest. Moreover, Rubens was not alone in showing himself in a number of his works as rather a Baroque painter and in others as more of a classicist. In the Dutch Republic, various artists also painted in both styles.

There are no paintings or drawings preserved that can be firmly attributed to Karel Van Mander II. We know him only through his tapestries, of which he was both designer and cartoon painter and, from 1615 onward, also their weaver, having set up his own tapestry workshop in that year. Well known are the Scipio series attributed to him, as well as the series with episodes from Orlando Furioso probably after his designs and another one with the Story of Alexander the Great. It is obvious that if the style of the Scipio series can be considered a mélange of Baroque and classicism, the style of the Orlando Furioso series is quite Baroque. The tapestry Isabella and Rodomonte in the latter series, particularly the right half of the tapestry, is full of drama (fig. 7). There the Saracen Rodomonte is depicted waylaying the hermit escorting Isabella, who is accompanying the coffin of her fiancé, Zerbino. Isabella, on horseback, twists her upper body in a dramatic way in order to face Rodomonte, he looking fiercely up toward the hermit. This encounter would end with Rodomonte killing the hermit. The scene on the left side, a sequel, depicts Rodomonte taking from Isabella herbs that would make him invulnerable to sword and fire. He stands with his legs wide apart, his eyes fixed on Isabella, who kneels before him. But the way Isabella is rendered—her posture, the pattern on her dress and, particularly, her small head, adorned with a headdress—is reminiscent of similar figures in several of Spiering’s tapestries designed by Van Mander I. These details make us aware of the continuation of the Mannerist style in Dutch tapestries, popping up in them in particular details. The landscapes in the tapestries designed by Van Mander II generally consist of a vista in the far distance in the center and massive groups of trees as repousoirs.

In history tapestries of the 1630s and 1650s, I cannot recognize the two outbreaks of classicism as distinctly as Blankert described for Dutch painting. During these decades, the stylistic changes in tapestries are rather gradual.

A tapestry and a large painting, both dating to about 1630, may serve as an example of a fusion of classicism and Baroque. The tapestry presents Emperor Barbarossa and the Patriarch of Jerusalem Bestowing Haarlem with
the Augmentation of Its Arms (fig. 8). It was woven in 1630 in Haarlem in the workshop of Joseph Thienpont after a design by the Haarlem painter Pieter de Grebber (1600–1652/53), who also executed the painting. The tapestry was commissioned for the new burgomasters’ room in the Haarlem town hall, where it still hangs. The subject is an apocryphal story in Haarlem’s history. The German emperor Frederick I Barbarossa was believed to have bestowed Haarlem with a silver sword, the image of which the city was allowed to add to its coat of arms, which had previously borne only four stars. The painted version, in which Barbarossa and the patriarch of Jerusalem are handing the sword over to a young man personifying the city of Haarlem, is believed to date shortly after the tapestry (fig. 9). In the painting, also commissioned by the Haarlem city council, De Grebber chose to present more psychological interaction among the three dramatis personae, interaction that may be labeled Baroque. This makes the composition of the tapestry seem much more static than that of the painting. Thus, in my opinion, the tapestry is more an example of classicist style than is the painting.

The problem of stylistic classification is apparent in a different manner in the 1638–39 additions to the Genealogy of the House of Nassau, the famous set of woven portraits of members of the Nassau dynasty and their spouses, both seated on horseback, which were originally woven in Brussels about 1530 by Willem Dernoyen after designs by Bernaert van Orley. Copies of the set were
Fig. 8. Emperor Barbarossa and the Patriarch of Jerusalem Bestowing Haarlem with the Augmentation of Its Arms. Tapestry design by Pieter de Grebber, 1630, woven in the workshop of Joseph Thienpont, Haarlem, 1630. Wool and silk, 226 × 240 cm. Stadhuis, Haarlem. Photograph: Tom Haartsen, Ouderkerk aan de Amstel

Fig. 9. Pieter de Grebber, Emperor Barbarossa and the Patriarch of Jerusalem Handing over the Sword to a Young Man, Personifying the City of Haarlem, 1630. Oil on canvas, 168 × 196 cm. Frans Hals Museum, Haarlem (OKSX-4)
woven in Brussels about 1632 by Jan Raes; the person who commissioned them was Stadholder Frederick Henry. Six years later Frederick Henry had four new portraits on horseback added to the second edition; these were manufactured in the workshop of Maximiliaen van der Gucht in Delft. Depicted were Frederick Henry's father, Stadholder William I, his half-brother Philip William, and William I's consecutive successors, Maurice of Nassau and himself. On the tapestries, all but the unmarried Maurice were accompanied by their wives. Frederick Henry's court painter, Gerrit van Honthorst (1590–1656), was commissioned to make the designs and paint the cartoons. Supposedly Van Honthorst was not expected to make new inventions, as these tapestries should relate to the 1632 copies of the original set. These four tapestries are lost, as are the two weavings of the Nassau Genealogy and other later additions, but there is an extant painting by Jan Mytens (ca. 1614–1670) in which four tapestries of the series can be detected, of which at least two probably belong to the 1638–39 extension (fig. 10). The painting shows the marriage ceremony of Frederick Henry's daughter Louise Henriette of Orange and Frederick William I, Prince Elector of Brandenburg, which took place in 1646 in a room in the Oude Hof (Old Court) at the Noordeinde.
in The Hague. On the side walls of the room, two tapestries with couples on horseback are clearly visible. It may be assumed that they portray Frederick Henry’s parents, William of Orange and Louise of Coligny, in one, and himself and his wife, Amalia of Solms, in the other, not only because of the prominent place of these two tapestries in the room—flanking the young couple and their close relations—but also because of the dresses of the women on horseback. Those seem more modern than is to be expected in portraits of earlier members of the Nassau dynasty. With their narrow bodices, horizontal necklines, long, narrow sleeves, and wide skirts, they look rather as though they were tailored in the 1630s. Of course, one should be prudent in identifying a particular fashion in a portrait of a portrait, the more so since some of the dresses on women
participating in the ceremony in Mytens's painting show similarities with those on the tapestries except but for their sleeves, which are shorter and wider. But the trees and the sky in the tapestries are also different from what one would expect from exact copies of sixteenth-century tapestries.

How should the 1638–39 set be described? As Baroque tapestries? Possibly, but if so, based on a Renaissance vernacular. A similar evolution can be observed in the late seventeenth-century reeditions woven at the Manufacture Royale des Gobelins of sixteenth-century tapestries, such as the famous Scipio series after the d'Albon edition that was based on the editio princeps from 1532–35 after designs by Giulio Romano and Giovanni Francesco Penni.

While the identification of the layers of design is a relatively minor problem in the case of the Nassau Genealogy, the problem posed by a series of the Story of Antony and Cleopatra is more complex. Few of the tapestries in the series were finished in 1623, the year Karel van Mander II, its designer, cartoon painter, and weaver, died. By 1623, not only had Van Mander woven just a small number, he had neither painted all the cartoons nor even finished all the designs. The series was rewoven from 1631 onward, probably until the 1650s. It also contained more subjects than those for which Van Mander had made designs, judging from the still-existing pieces of various editions, which add up to nine different sets. Some tapestries are clearly in Van Mander's vernacular—the ones that possibly originate from the Van Mander workshop (fig. 11).
Others seem to be based on his designs or are new inventions that are more or less his style. All the presumably post-1631 tapestries are in a style that seems to have moved on from an earlier one. Is it possible to determine the specific hand of a designer in a situation in which the works are not based on firsthand inventions? It has been suggested that Salomon de Bray (1597–1664) had a hand in designing the later editions that were woven in the Nauwinck studio in Schoonhoven. This has been proposed on stylistic grounds and on the facial types that occur both in De Bray’s paintings and in this series of tapestries, as well as in another, the Story of Iphigenia and Orestes. Unfortunately, no archival sources to support this attribution have been found. We will return to the latter series shortly.

Another problem that we are faced with while trying to characterize the Story of Antony and Cleopatra series is the borrowing of certain details from other series. For instance, the attendant and the basin from which he fetches wine at the lower left of the Banquet of Cleopatra (see Hanns Hubach, “Tales from the Tapestry Collection of Elector Palatine Frederick V and Elizabeth
Stuart," fig. 12) occurs in various sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Brussels tapestries. Of course, borrowing details from other tapestries—both contemporary and earlier ones—is a workshop practice with which we are quite familiar.

A set of the *Story of Antony and Cleopatra* was apparently in the Huis Ter Nieuwburgh, a country house that Frederick Henry had built in Rijswijk, near The Hague. It appears in an engraving by Jan van Vianen (fig. 12). The engraving, made on the occasion of the Treaty of Rijswijk in 1697, shows the assembly chamber of the French ambassadors. On the mantel can be discerned a lost painting, the *Offer to Venus* from 1642 by Christiaen van Couwenbergh (1604–1667), to its left and right and on the right wall of the room, four tapestries from the *Story of Antony and Cleopatra* can be identified. The subjects of neither the painting nor the tapestries seem appropriate to illustrate negotiations for peace in Europe at that time. We should keep in mind, however, that in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Dutch stadholders and the States-General apparently never had tapestries woven in the Netherlands with subjects with distinctive mythological or historical references pertinent to contemporary events. The stadholders instead decided on tapestries with the stories of Aeneas and Dido, Cyrus, Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Hannibal, Scipio, and, as we see, Antony and Cleopatra, subjects that were part and parcel of the taste of the European
Fig. 15. Orestes’s Revenge on Aigistos from a set of the Story of Iphigenia and Orestes. Tapestry design attributed to Salomon de Bray, woven in the De Cracht workshop, Gouda or Schoonhoven, ca. 1648–52. Wool and silk, 372 × 339. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (BK-1955-100-B)

elite. The commissions of tapestries depicting postclassical historical events by the States-General were, incidentally, for use as diplomatic gifts rather than for their own benefit.

The paintings in the Oranjezaal (Hall of Orange; fig. 13) of Huis Ten Bosch in The Hague are not only the most important ensemble of history paintings in the Netherlands, they are also as Baroque as the Protestant north would go. However, the hall itself, a creation of the Haarlem architect Pieter Post (1608–1669), is unthinkable without the example of the Roman Pantheon, that archetype of classical buildings. The architect and painter Jacob van Campen (1596–1657) orchestrated the painting program, honoring and commemorating Stadholder Frederick Henry. The commission for this painted memorial came from Amalia of Solms after her husband’s death in 1647. Most painters of the hall were Dutch, like Jacob van Campen himself, Caesar van Everdingen, Jan Lievens, Pieter de Grebber, Gerrit van Honthorst, Salomon de Bray, and Christiaen van Couwenbergh. The most prominent painting in the hall and most prominent exponent of Baroque style—the Triumph of Frederick Henry—was executed by Jacob Jordens (1593–1678) from Antwerp. In spite of the somewhat overwhelming Baroque impression the paintings in the Oranjezaal present, they can be considered a somewhat classicist ensemble, if only because of the pictorial program. The nine paintings in the lower
Greber and Van Honthorst designed some, as we have seen, and Van Couwenbergh probably did also, while some Dutch tapestries may be related to Salomon de Bray.20

The Rijksmuseum has six tapestries in its collection from a set of the Story of Iphigenia and Orestes woven by Pieter de Cracht, whose workshops were in Gouda and nearby Schoonhoven (figs. 14, 15). Documents from 1648 pertaining to their weaving are preserved, when De Cracht sold a set of eight tapestries of that subject to the Prince Elector of Brandenburg. That weaving may well have been the editio princeps. Friso Lammertse has likened the figures in the two large canvases by Salomon de Bray in the Oranjezaal to characters in a stage play, adding that De Bray may have been inspired by figures in tableaux vivants, which were put on to add luster to royal visits to Dutch towns.21 That theatrical aspect is also very present in the Iphigenia and Orestes series. But how should we label the tapestries—as classicist or Baroque? Elsewhere, Lammertse observed that categorizing Salomon as a classicist is not always applicable. He made this statement in relation to Salomon’s painting Jael, Deborah, and Barak (1635), observing its somewhat compact composition, the half figures, and the rather strong light–dark contrast, which he considered to attune rather to the Baroque style of the Utrecht followers of Caravaggio.22 Light-dark contrasts are very present in the Iphigenia and Orestes series, more than in any other Dutch tapestries, as are the somewhat compact compositions. The head of Jael, incidentally, is almost copied in that of a soldier in his Triumphal Entry with Musicians (1649) in the Oranjezaal, as well as on the tapestry Orestes and Pylades before Iphigenia.

The Amsterdam town hall, constructed between 1647 and 1655 from plans by Jacob van Campen, is the most prominent in the array of new buildings of that time. It included decorations with a specific program for its interior. Van Campen envisaged a gathering of architecture, sculpture, and history painting. Both the exterior and the

Fig. 16. Jacob Vennecool, The West Wall of the Magistrate’s Court in the Amsterdam Town Hall, 1661 or shortly before. Etching, tipped-in sheet approx. 59.1 × 45.5 cm. In Afbeelding van ‘t Stadt Huys van Amsterdam (Amsterdam, 1665–68). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1935 (35.45.2)
interior are preserved in an almost unaltered state. An engraving by Van Campen’s draftsman Jacob Vennecool from 1661 or shortly before shows the design for the west wall of the magistrate’s court, the Vierschaar, in which death sentences were pronounced (fig. 16). In the engraving, the lower section of the wall has reliefs of the Judgment of Solomon, flanked by others with scenes of justice in classical antiquity, sculpted by Artus Quellinus (1609–1668). These were executed according to plan, but the niches above these were not filled by paintings, as the engraving may suggest. Instead, in 1666 the niches were opened. One of the intended paintings may have survived: God Delivering the Last Judgment, painted by Van Campen (fig. 17), the central image in Vennecool’s engraving. There are no traces of paintings with the two flanking scenes—representations of the chosen and the doomed, who are being directed toward heaven and hell; they were never executed or have been lost.

Apparently the niches were not always open to the public eye, for two Italian visitors, who saw the town hall in 1677, noted that the magistrates’ court was “vaga, nobile e suntuosa per le tapezzerie, per le dorature e per le pitture, e per i marmi” (beautiful, noble and sumptuous for the textile hangings, for the gilding and for the painting, and for the marbles). The painting the brothers De Bovio noted was presumably that of the ceiling, and the marbles they were impressed with, the high reliefs by Quellinus. In a room in which every decorative element carries images conforming to the room’s judicial function, it is to be expected that the representations on the textile hangings—probably tapestries—were also governed by that plan. In that case, the designs for the center painting and for the two flanking paintings may have been adapted to be executed as tapestries. No sources have come to light, however, that relate to the costly enterprise of having tapestries especially woven for the Vierschaar. Although they would have been

Fig. 17. Jacob van Campen, God Delivering the Last Judgment, ca. 1650–55. Oil on canvas, 328 x 203 cm. Sint Joriskerk, Amersfoort, on loan from the city of Amersfoort. Photograph: after Albert Blankert et al., Hollands classicisme in de Zeventiende-eeuwse schilderkunst, exh. cat. (Rotterdam, 1999), p. 81
quite unsuitable for the room, it is possible that the tapestries the De Bovio brothers saw were ones of Landscapes. Tapestries with such rather unpretentious subjects did furnish a number of public spaces in the Netherlands from the 1650s onward. For instance, tapestries with landscapes and classical ruins hung on the walls of the Assembly Hall for the States of Holland, built and decorated in the 1650s and 1660s, at the Binnenhof—the Inner Court—the main complex of governmental buildings in The Hague, a room in which the painted decorations show images that bear a relation to its function (fig. 18). The architect of the hall was Pieter Post. There are documents preserved that pertain to the weaving of the tapestries by Maximiliaen van der Gucht in Delft, but unfortunately none in which a designer is named.27

After the grand buildings initiated by Stadtholder Frederick Henry and the Amsterdam city administration, few important edifices for governmental use were constructed in seventeenth-century Holland. Rooms in official buildings were no longer hung with narrative tapestries, as had been done earlier in the century. Instead, wooded landscapes, generally from stock, decorated the walls in both public and private interiors.28 The once-flourishing tapestry industry in Holland languished, producing only these.
In sum, Dutch narrative tapestries were produced between about 1590 and 1635. There is quite a difference in style between the tapestries designed by the two Van Manders, the father working in the early 1590s in the Mannerist tradition and the son influenced by Rubens’s style of the 1610s and that of his Haarlem followers. From the 1610s until the 1650s, history tapestries contained features from both Baroque and classicism. These tapestries cannot be viewed independently from the buildings then being built and the decorative programs being created for those buildings, the more so since a number of painters who were involved in the execution of these programs also designed tapestries.

With thanks to Wouter Kloeck and Hillie Smit, who made valuable suggestions for this article.


4. The shrubs in the foreground of these tapestries with mythological and epic stories set in landscapes do not originate from painted examples but from actual tapestries, that is, from sixteenth-century verdures. These shrubs, however, are less prominent components of the tapestries than they are in their models.

5. Van Mander advocated in his *Grondt der edel vry schilder-const* (Basic Principles of the Noble Art of Painting) of 1604 that the chief moment of the story rendered in a painting should be in the center, while the other figures should encircle that.


7. 7. See note 3 above. The *Story of Niobe* is cat. 52c in Hartkamp-Jonxis and Smit, *European Tapestries in the Rijksmuseum*, p. 217.


9. Six tapestries with the *Deeds of Scipio* and one with the *Triumph of Scipio* in Rome from various editions by Spiering after designs by Van Mander II are preserved; see Hartkamp-Jonxis and Smit, *European Tapestries in the Rijksmuseum*, cat. 53, p. 217.


12. For the *Orlando Furioso* and *Alexander* series, see ibid., cats. 54, 55, pp. 221–25.

13. The set was commissioned by Count Henry III of Nassau. It came into possession of William of Orange by descent, and he sold it for financial reasons to a distant relative in Germany, where the tapestries remained most of the 230 years of their existence. In the early 1630s, the tapestries were for some time in Brussels, when Count Nassau-Siegen lived there in Habsburg service. It seems that they were lost in the fire of Dillenburg.


15. See ibid. For the document pertaining to a set of eight Antony and Cleopatra tapestries that Nauwincx the Amsterdam merchant supplied to Jan van Os in 1631, see G. T. van Ysselsteyn, Geschiedenis der tapijtwervening in de Noordelijke Nederlanden: Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der kunstnijverheid (Leiden, 1936), vol. 2, no. 459.


20. Stylistic similarities between De Bray’s paintings and a number of mid-seventeenth-century tapestries with figures by the Van der Gucht workshop are quite striking, particularly in the facial types of the figures. In a lecture in 1964, Theo Lunsingh Scheurleer suggested Van Couwenbergh as the designer of the series the English Hunts, of which a set of three tapestries is in the collection of the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (BK-1959-41-A–C); see Hartkamp-Jonxis and Smit, European Tapestries in the Rijksmuseum, cat. 63a–c, pp. 251–61, esp. p. 253. Walter Liedtke elaborated further on Van Couwenbergh’s activities as a designer of tapestries; see Liedtke, Vermeer and the Delft School, pp. 59–63.

21. Friso Lammertse, cat. 7, in Albert Blankert et al., Hollands classicisme, p. 93.


23. Katherine Fremantle, The Baroque Town Hall of Amsterdam, Utrechtse Kunsthistorische Studiën 4 (Utrecht, 1959), p. 39, n. 6. In 1661, Vennecool published thirty engravings of the Amsterdam Town Hall, preceded by a description of the building by an unidentified author: Afbeelding van ‘t Stadt Huys van Amsterdam, in dartigh coopere plaatzen geordineert door Jacob van Campen; en geteekent door Jacob Vennecool . . . (Amsterdam, 1661). On page 6 of the description, it is stated that the wall with the three paintings—as illustrated in the engraving—was broken through in order to give more light to the staircase behind it.

24. Apparently after the decision to open up the wall, Van Campen took the painting to his estate, Randenbroek, near Amersfoort. The composition differs slightly from the image in the engraving, however, so it is uncertain whether this is actually the painting for the central niche in the Vierschaar or another version. See Albert Blankert et al., Hollands classicisme, pp. 80–82.

25. Fremantle, The Baroque Town Hall of Amsterdam, p. 76.

26. In seventeenth-century Italy, the terms tappezerie and arrazzi were both used. With thanks to Nello Forti Grazzini, who informed me about this by email. It seems unlikely that the textile hangings the De Bovio brothers saw were decorated with paint, for each time the textiles were removed and rehung the painted surface would suffer considerable damage. Large-scale embroidered wall hangings with figure scenes were quite unusual in seventeenth-century Holland. If the tappezerie in the Vierschaar were silk hangings, it is inconceivable that their pattern included representations of the Last Judgment and the chosen and the doomed. In that case, the silk fabric must have been patterned on the loom with an unrelated design, such as flowers or flowered stripes.

27. The hall was built in 1652–55 and decorated in 1655–65. The paintings on the ceiling, the ones on the upper part of the walls, and those on the mantelpieces of the two chimneys were executed by various artists, albeit following Post’s designs. Koen Ottenheym assumes that Post also designed
the cartoons for the tapestries; see Ottenheym, “De schilder-architecten van het Hollands classicisme,” in Albert Blankert et al., Hollands classicisme, p. 48.

28. The stadholders and their courtiers, as well as prosperous Dutch burghers, kept furnishing their premises with history tapestries, but these were presumably made in Flanders. Unfortunately, none of these tapestries from the stadholders’ collections seem to have been preserved. Descriptions in the inventories of the houses of the Dutch branch of the Nassau-Orange family, however, point to the Flemish origin of the tapestries, although few of the inventories explicitly name the place of manufacture. A set of tapestries with the Story of Meleager that hung in a room in Het Loo Palace in 1713 is described as from Ouden- aarde; see Drossaers and Lunsingh Scheurleer, eds., Inventarissen van de . . . Oranjies, vol. 1, p. 674, no. 712. For Flemish history tapestries in the houses of Dutch burghers, see C. Willemijn Fock, “‘Kleet den wandt van ’t graf palais in tapijt: onzie geen kosten.’ Tapijten in het burgerinterieur ten tijde van de Republiek,” Textielhistorische Bijdragen 37 (1997), pp. 41–76, esp. pp. 42, 51, 59, 62–66, 67–70.
On the Tapestries in Seventeenth-Century Milan: Some New Findings

The importance of Milan and its state as a center of the production of tapestries and of their importation from France and Flanders between the end of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth under the Visconti and the Sforza has been unfailingly celebrated by tapestry historians. In the bibliography of Late Renaissance and Baroque tapestries, however, the same town and territory fall into shadow: for the seventeenth century, Italy is listed because of the manufactories active in Florence and Rome and the collections of the courts of Modena, Parma, and Mantua, of the popes and the cardinals in Rome, and of the great families of Genoa, but Milan is not mentioned. This eclipse appears fully justified from the point of view of production if we consider that the making of tapestries ceased completely in the territory of Milan soon after the death, in 1535, of Francesco II Sforza, the last duke of Milan, and the closing, probably about 1545, of the Milanese manufactories of Antonio Maria Bozzolo, which had produced tapestries for the cathedrals of Milan and Monza. Milan had become an Imperial and then a Spanish dependency, and tapestry production would never again be resumed there. This is confirmed by the fact that, and also explains why, on November 7, 1607, the Milan Cathedral chapter, which was discussing eventually commissioning a new set of wall hangings with the insignia of the Beatus (not yet Saint) Carlo Borromeo, noted that there was no weaver active in Milan; this implied that a Flemish weaver would have to be summoned or that the cartoons of the tapestries would have to be sent to Flanders, which would mean extra expenses (so the set was probably not made). And it also explains why Girolamo Borsieri, in his Supplemento della nobiltà di Milano of 1619, celebrated the products of various branches of the applied arts practiced in Milan at that time without any mention of tapestry making, since there was nothing to say.

The absence of production would not necessarily mean that tapestries were not appreciated, imported, collected, and used in seventeenth-century Milan. However, this aspect of the subject, which is the topic of this paper, has been neglected by tapestry historians because of the scarce information available and because the few, little-known tapestries from that time surviving in Milanese and Lombard museums, palaces, and churches have probably seemed too meager a starting point for research. Such studies may well have seemed less attractive because of the absence of a well-identified and lasting princely court that promoted artistic patronage and on which the studies could center (the short-lived courts of the temporary Spanish governors of Lombardy that were sent, one after the other, from Madrid did not merit this role). Another deterrent is the scarcity of published documentation on the artistic collections and guardarobe (wardrobes) formed in or taken to Milan by the Spanish governors or owned by the principal citizens of the capital and the other towns of the state? But then, one might have thought, what hope was there of

discerning flourishing collections of tapestries amid the traditionally offered scenario of economic, demographic, and social crisis that characterized seventeenth-century Lombardy, especially during the forty years between 1620 and 1660, when the history of the Duchy of Milan was a sequence of disasters: the Great Plague of Milan, the military assault by the French and the Piedmontese, the abandonment of agriculture and the closing of the urban manufactories, the general impoverishment increased by the heavy taxation by the Spanish. And under such conditions, what Milanese person or institution had the means and the will of purchasing such expensive objects as tapestries, which were traditionally meant as a display of their owners’ wealth, power, and grandeur and an expression of personal or family pride?

Aware as I am of these problems, I have tried not to be discouraged by such forbidding issues and pursued my subject anyway. As this paper will show, the field chosen for this hunt will reveal itself not to be completely empty of prey.

Until now, the few known examples of tapestries to have survived in the Milanese territory from the seventeenth century derived from ecclesiastical contexts. The most widely studied example of an imported set, which was also the subject of an important exhibition in 1987, is a Flemish twelve-piece set commissioned by Cremona Cathedral, the Story of Samson (fig. 1). Though in poor
condition, it is complete and still in the cathedral. In 1629 the cathedral chapter of the church commissioned the weaving from the Brussels manufactory directed by Jan Raes, who owned the cartoons, as we know from the exchange of letters in 1610–11 between the apostolic nuncio Guido Bentivoglio, in Brussels, and Cardinal Scipione Borghese, in Rome. The cartoons had been painted for Henry II of France by the little-known Flemish artist Gillio Meche-laon, of Mechelen, but were not yet woven at Henry’s death in 1559. Raes used them for the first time for multiple editions of the Samson, the editio principis being the one made for Cardinal Borghese. One of these sets was the one ordered by the Cremona Cathedral chapter. Apparently the Samson designs had already circulated in Brussels, for the scene Delilah Cutting Samson’s Hair, of which one is in Cremona (fig. 1) and two others are in Philadelphia (see Hanns Hubach, “Tales from the Tapestry Collection of Elector Palatine Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart,” fig. 11) and Bucharest, had already appeared in a smaller version in the lower border of a Brussels tapestry from a Story of Cyrus of about 1580 (figs. 2, 3).

The Story of Samson for Cremona, which was finished by Raes in 1630 and arrived in Lombardy the following year after a trip through Germany and Switzerland prolonged by the plague, was thus neither a unique set nor one based on specially painted cartoons. Nevertheless, it was a decidedly expensive and imposing work of art, suitable in its dimensions, subject matter, and style to hang along the central nave of Cremona Cathedral during the main religious celebrations, beneath the dramatic sixteenth-century frescoes of the Passion of Christ painted by Allobello Melone, Gerolamo Romanino, and Giovanni Antonio Pordenone.

The list of the tapestries that entered other churches in Lombardy in the seventeenth century is short. Milan Cathedral, where no new tapestries were acquired during the whole period, instead in 1627 and 1640 restored its Milanese and Flemish sets
of the previous century. In 1620, Vigevano Cathedral inherited a Late Renaissance Story of Alexander the Great set of ordinary quality. It was made in Oudenaarde and was bequeathed to the cathedral by the colorful Muley-Xeque, prince of Morocco, called the Infante of Africa, who spent the last years of his life in Vigevano. The tapestries are still there, in the Museo del Duomo, in very ruined condition. Novara Cathedral (Novara is now in Piedmont but was once in the Duchy of Milan) inherited in 1617 a Story of Nebuchadrezzar set from Bishop Carlo Bascapè, and in 1653 a Hunts set from Bishop Antonio Tornielli, both probably of late sixteenth-century style, and both lost sometime between 1764 and 1819.

In 1634–35, a tapestry of the Birth of the Virgin (fig. 4) was woven in Florence for Como Cathedral, where it completed a spurious group of tapestries of the Story of the Virgin collected by the cathedral over the previous century. This tapestry, still in situ, is the only one known in seventeenth-century Lombardy for which a cartoon was especially commissioned from a local painter, Giovan Battista Recchi. His cartoon, for which a related but not identical painted modello survives in Dijon (Musée Magnin), was a copy with few variations of an altarpiece painted in 1611 by Morazzone for the church of Sant’Agostino in Como.
A set of four tapestries of the *Story of Constantine*—*Constantine before Galerius* (fig. 5), *Constantine Proclaimed Imperator by the Army, Battle of the Milvian Bridge*, and *Triumph of Constantine*—now in the Museo Diocesano in Milan represents a different case. It was presented in 1671 to the Basilica of Sant’Ambrogio in Milan by Canon Boisio. The canon’s appreciation of the tapestry medium had probably been influenced by frequent viewing of the collection of hangings of the Trivulzio princes (see below), in whose palace he had served as tutor. The *Constantine* tapestries, signed by the Brussels weavers Gerard van der Streek en and Willem van Leeuwen and made about 1660–65 from cartoons by the Rubenesque Flemish painter Abraham van Diepenbeeck, were reweavings of a series of which other versions are known (the wider one in the Museo de Tapices de la Seo, Saragossa). The Milan set represents the only identified group of tapestries of mature Baroque style that became the property of a church in the Duchy of Milan during the seventeenth century. However, a most important Baroque religious set was in Milan in the same years. In 1672, the painter Andrea Pozzo, a Jesuit, proposed a plan to decorate the Milanese Jesuit church, San Fede, for the Feast of the Immaculate Conception. The plan included an unspecified number of gold-woven tapestries in the *Triumph of the Eucharist* series designed by Rubens, probably from one of the fine editions that, following the editio princeps, were produced by the Brussels weavers François van den Hecke and his son Jan-François. It is impossible to know which set was the one shown in Milan and whether it is still extant or whether it is a documented but lost set. Possibly it was the property of the Spanish governor Gaspare Téllez Girón, duque de Osuna, who offered and financed the temporary decoration, so it was not officially listed in church documents.

Let us turn now to private collections, focusing on those in Milan. But first it is important to note that if, during the seventeenth century, the capital of Lombardy was greatly affected by the already mentioned negative economic trend, it was also the seat of a circle of noble families favored by the Spanish dominion, with which they were allied, and which committed their members to the key roles in local political power, represented by the Senato and the Consiglio Segreto. Sometimes the fortunes of these aristocratic dynasties had grown under the Sforza and were successfully maintained
under the Spanish rule. Sometimes they were formed more recently: under the Spaniards, the noble status and the sumptuous way of life of the old nobility could also be achieved by other families whose wealth, gained by commerce and banking, was used to buy feudal titles sold by the Spanish government. Superb new palaces, some still extant, were built in seventeenth-century Milan by old and new nobles, and their names surely represent an index of the most powerful citizens of the time: Arese, Triulzio, Cusani, Visconti, Borromeo, Durini, Archinto, and others. It was obviously in these palaces that the tapestries were owned and used, and the inventories of the goods of these families should be searched for records and lists of hangings, although the scarcity of documentation available in most cases does not help to locate the woven hangings or to understand how they were dispersed.

Let us glance through the available data. In 1649, Archduchess Maria Anna of Austria, newly wedded to Philip IV and thus queen of Spain, stopped in Milan with Philip’s brother the king of Hungary during a journey from Vienna to Madrid. A historical source reports that the Milanese were unhappy not to be able to welcome such important visitors with the appropriate “osequii, apparati, et donativi” (homages, displays, and presents) owing to “forze” (forces) missed in those “tempi infelici” (unhappy times). A feast was organized in the palace of the most powerful citizen, the conte Bartolomeo Arese, where a large display of paintings and precious textiles embroidered with gold hung on the walls and a fountain of wine were used to impress the royal visitors, but apparently no tapestries were part of the decoration. The council that organized the queen’s visit, the Deputati per le Accoglienze, ordered that during her stay, the wealthiest citizens of Milan should “haver ben coperto di panni et addobbato di razzi fini et altri ornamenti proporzionali tutta la facciata della casa loro con ordine e decoro conveniente” (have the entire facade of their houses well covered with textiles and decorated with fine tapestries and other hangings, with suitable order and decorum). Thus, tapestries that could be displayed were known to exist, but who were their owners, and how large, valuable, and up-to-date were the collections?

Some palaces might have been decorated with tapestries purchased in the sixteenth century. The Castaldo, marquises of Cassano, for example, probably still had the forty-seven tapestries with figures, foliage, or coats of arms made for General Giovanni Battista Castaldo in the mid-sixteenth century. And the descendants of Fabio Visconti Borromeo could display a Story of Hercules bought by their ancestor in 1569, which was probably one of the reweavings, made in Brussels or in Oudenaarde, of a Hercules set made for Mary of Hungary, some elements of which survive in the Patrimonio Nacional, Madrid. Inventories dated 1622 and 1658 of the properties of the Stampa marquises of Soncino list six heraldic tapestries with figures and Stampa–Soncino heraldic devices, but they were made in 1544–57. A 1631 inventory of the property of Giovan Paolo II Sforza, marchese di Caravaggio, lists three sets of tapestries—two Stories of Hercules and a Story of a Roman Emperor—but the Hercules sets were mentioned in a 1536 inventory of the goods of his ancestor Giovan Paolo I. The testamentary inventory of the conte Antonio Trotti, of July 1681, reveals a large collection of tapestries, but one that, judging by the subjects, probably consisted mainly of Renaissance or Late Renaissance hangings: a Story of Massinissa and Sofonisba in eight pieces, a Story of Moses in seven pieces, a Story of Solomon in six pieces, a Story of Hercules in nine pieces, nine tapestries with “large figures,” others with landscapes or large animals, and seventeen with animals and small figures.

The Archivio di Stato di Milano has the entire archive of an illustrious Milanese family of the seventeenth (and eighteenth) century, the Trivulzio counts of Melzo and princes of Mesocco, a collateral branch
descended from the main, interrupted line of the marquises Trivulzio, whose most famous member was Marshal Gian Giacomo Trivulzio. Marshal Trivulzio ordered a set of the Months that was woven in 1569 in Vigevano from cartoons by Bramantino; these tapestries are now in the Castello Sforzesco, Milan. The inventories of the princes Trivulzio, on whose art collection no study exists, enable us to examine the history of a sizable guardaroba that included tapestries, apparently the largest in Milan, from 1609 until its sale in 1770–71. At the mid-seventeenth century, it belonged to Prince Cardinal Teodoro Trivulzio (1596–1656), who was appointed by the court of Spain to the posts of viceroy of Saragossa (1641) and of Sardinia (1649), where he took his tapestries. Just before his death, he was for a few months governor of Lombardy, the only Milanes to occupy that seat throughout the entire seventeenth century. It would not be useful to detail here the dozens of tapestries mentioned in the various inventories, many of which are mentioned simply as landscapes, animals, and so forth. Let us simply note that the most valuable tapestries owned by Prince Cardinal Teodoro, then by his son Ercole Teodoro (1620–1664) and his nephew Antonio Teodoro (1649–1691), were an eight-piece set of the Story of Samson, mentioned in 1609; a thirteen-piece set of the Story of Aeneas and Dido, mentioned from 1612 on; the twelve-piece set of the Trivulzio Months retrieved from a member of the Arconati family in 1620; and a nine-piece set of the Story of Moses, mentioned from 1649 on. After the death of Prince Antonio Tolomeo Trivulzio Gallio, the collection was sold in 1770–71 to finance a hospital and hospice, the Pio Albergo Trivulzio (which still exists), and the tapestries entered other collections and left Milan, so they cannot be identified today. The exception was the set of Trivulzio Months, which was bought by a member of another branch of the Trivulzio family and remained in Milan; in 1935 the Civiche Raccolte d’Arte of Milan acquired the Months. But the attributions given the pieces at the time of the 1770–71 sale, though surely inaccurate by modern standards of scholarship, may reveal something about them. The Aeneas tapestries were declared to be after Raphael, so they were probably one of the large mid-sixteenth-century Brussels sets based on designs by Perino del Vaga, about 1530, for the lost Navigazione di Enea tapestries commissioned by Andrea Doria, and on others added by a Flemish cartoonist about 1545. The Moses set, said to be after Giulio Romano, might have been a reedition of the Raphaelesque and Giu- liesque Brussels Renaissance Moses set made for Ferrante Gonzaga about 1545–50 and now in the Château de Châteaudun, whose cartoons were still being copied in Brussels at the end of the sixteenth century in the manufactury of Maarten Reybout II (a set of Reybout-woven Moses tapestries is at Chartres); and at mid-seventeenth century in the manufactories of Albert Auwerckx and Hendrik Reydams I. The Samson set, already in existence in 1612, was confusingly declared in 1770–71 to be “after Giulio Romano,” or “after Rubens,” or “after a good painter,” which might suggest that a High Renaissance cycle of cartoons was reweoven at the beginning of the seventeenth century, possibly a Samson set by Jan Raes, a replica of the one purchased by Cremona Cathedral. Thus, the Trivulzio collection did not constitute a display of up-to-date taste in Baroque Milan, since it was apparently made up of Late Renaissance tapestries or of seventeenth-century hangings woven from older cartoons.

These examples speak to us of Milanese old-fashioned collections of tapestries that were not augmented during the seventeenth century by newly bought pieces of more modern appearance. This could have been the result of a lack of funds, of artistic tastes that were not up-to-date, or of a lack of interest in tapestries, which their owners had to view as simply a critical mass of hangings to be exhibited together on special occasions instead of as specific works
of art to be appreciated individually for their pictorial content and the quality of their manufacture. An exchange of letters in 1668–69 between Raffaele Mansi, a merchant in Lucca, and Giovanni Ponsampieri, a merchant in Milan, recently reported by Giacinta Cambini, corroborates this Milanese indifference to tapestries.29 Mansi had purchased in Antwerp and sent to Milan a large, fine Brussels set of the Story of Aurelianus and Zenobia by Gerard Peemans—a frequently woven Baroque series from cartoons by Justus van Egmont—which the owner judged a “robbia di ogni bellezza e bontà” (thing of all possible beauty and excellence). Ponsampieri was charged to try to sell it in Milan where, as Mansi wrote, there surely did not lack for “personaggi grandi” (important people) who might like to buy the set. On the contrary, as the letters between the two merchants show, not only did the tapestries remain unsold, but no Milanese was even interested in them. A desolate Mansi wrote, “Space sentire che non pur anche vi fosse riuscito di trovare qualche buon rescontro alle n.re tappezzarie di per esse assai preziose che non averiamo mai creduto che in una citta simile non si avesse da trovar persona che vi attendesse” (it is disagreeable to hear that you did not succeed in finding any good response to our tapestries, which are so valuable that we would never have thought that in such a town it would be impossible to find anybody interested in them).30 It is true that subsequently Mansi’s tapestries could not be sold in Genoa or Rome, but at least in those cities the owner opened negotiations with some potential buyers; not a one had come out in Milan. In the end, Mansi kept the tapestries for himself, and today they may be admired in the Museo Nazionale di Palazzo Mansi in Lucca.

At this point one might wonder whether anybody in mid-seventeenth-century Milan was interested in new and up-to-date tapestries. One person, almost unknown among tapestry historians, comes to light: Giovann Battista Durini (1612–1677). His documented collection of hangings has survived for the most part, and individual pieces can be identified. The Durini of Monza, near Milan, were bankers and traders and were among the few families whose wealth and power grew under Spanish rule, so much so that they became part of the aristocratic cream of the capital.31 The attainment of an aristocratic status was achieved by Giovann Battista by the acquisition in 1648 of the title conte di Monza. That year the architect Francesco Maria Richini finished building a sumptuous Baroque Milanese palace for the conte di Monza and his brothers, which still stands in the street later called the via Durini. In the succeeding years Giovann Battista applied himself to the decoration of the palace: Baroque frescoes by Ercole Procaccini, Johann Christoph Storer, Giovanni Stefano Danedi called Montalto, and Michelozzo Gherardini covered the vaults of the main halls and rooms of the apartments on the ground and first floors; and an imposing collection of paintings was hung on the walls. But some rooms were decorated with tapestries, about seventy in number, many of them probably bought by Giovann Battista for the palace between 1646–48 and his death. In 2001, Cristina Geddo published two previously unknown inventories of the goods and furnishings of the palace, dated 1708 and 1734 (henceforth 1708 Inventory and 1734 Inventory), and used them to identify the collection of paintings formed by Giovann Battista and members of his family before and after him.32 These inventories, especially the later one, also describe the tapestries (the lists of tapestries in both inventories are given in the appendix to this paper). Among them, Geddo could identify those whose Durini provenance was already known that later went to the Civiche Raccolte d’Arte in Milan.33 But there is still work to be done on the inventories, which I will do here: many more tapestries need to be identified and some iconographic problems posed by some of the Durini hangings in the Civiche...
Fig. 6. Judgment of Solomon from a set of the Story of Solomon. Tapestry design by Anthonis Sallaert, woven in the workshop of Jacob van Zeuven, Brussels, ca. 1650–60. Wool and silk, 400 × 193 cm. Whereabouts unknown. Photograph: after Pietro Cattaneo, Album secondo di tredici magnifici anazzi eseguiti su disegno di Pietro Paolo Rubens e di Jordaens, già appartenenti alla nobile famiglia Durini (Milan, 1863), no. 1v

Raccolte d’Arte should be reconsidered and may now be resolved.

From the end of the seventeenth century on, this family art collection was gradually divided and dispersed. In 1921, when the principal Durini palace in Milan was sold, all the tapestries were already gone. On the basis of later destinations and their present locations, it has been possible to identify three groups of them:

—Thirteen tapestries, probably sold by Count Carlo I Durini (1814–1891), became the property of the Milanese dealer Pietro Cattaneo, who offered them for sale in 1863. This dealer (assisted by the connoisseur Abbot Luigi Malvezzi) was apparently the first person in Italy, possibly even in Europe, to prepare catalogues (Albums) in which every tapestry to be sold was reproduced and described. He published three Albums of tapestries between 1861 and 1864; the second one, dated 1863 (one

Fig. 7. Judgment of Solomon from a set of the Story of Solomon. Tapestry design by Anthonis Sallaert, woven in the workshop of Jacob van Zeuven, Brussels, ca. 1650–60. Wool and silk. Once in Alcalá de Henares; destroyed. Photograph: Royal Museums of Art and History, Brussels, Photographic Archive of Flemish Tapestries, no. 1625.53
copy is in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris; another—hard to identify because it lacks a title page and is bound with the Album of 1861—is in the library of the Palazzo del Quirinale, Rome), is the one that interests us here: *Album secondo di tredici magnifici arazzi eseguiti su disegno di Pietro Paolo Rubens e di Jordaens, già appartenenti alla nobile famiglia Durini* (henceforth Cattaneo Album). This catalogue enables us to account for thirteen of the tapestries once in the Durini collection, although after 1863 the whereabouts of all but one are unknown.

—Four complete tapestries and the fragments of three others became the property of the painter Alessandro Durini (1818–1892), whose son Antonio (1853–1934; founder of the Fondazione Alessandro Durini), exhibited them from 1911 on in a public museum opened in a Durini palace in the via Guastalla in Milan. In 1939 the contents of this palace were offered to the

---

**Fig. 8. Solomon Receiving Gifts from Illustrious Visitors from a set of the Story of Solomon. Tapestry design by Anthonis Sallaert, woven in the workshop of Jacob van Zeunen, Brussels, ca. 1650–60. Wool and silk, 400 × 190 cm. Whereabouts unknown. Photograph: after Cattaneo, *Album secondo di tredici magnifici arazzi*, no. vi**

**Fig. 9. Solomon Receiving Gifts from Illustrious Visitors from a set of the Story of Solomon. Tapestry design by Anthonis Sallaert, woven in the workshop of Jacob van Zeunen, Brussels, ca. 1650–60. Wool and silk. Once in Alcalá de Henares; destroyed. Photograph: Royal Museums of Art and History, Brussels, Photographic Archive of Flemish Tapestries, no. 1625.55**
commune of Milan, so the tapestries became part of the Civiche Raccolte d’Arte.\textsuperscript{13}

— The third group, which I only recently identified through a deliciously casual encounter with two of the tapestries under restoration in the Laboratorio di Restauro dei Tessili in Venaria Reale (Turin), is composed of eight tapestries, of which four were certainly part of the seventeenth-century Durini collection, the other four only possibly. Their recent history does not go earlier than the year 1981, when a Milanese lady, Erminia Pensotti (whose connection with the Durini family I could not trace), sold them with the help of a dealer to their present owner, who housed them where they may be admired in the enchanting context of the restored Abbazia di San Girolamo, also called Abbazia della Cervara, overlooking the beautiful seascape off Liguria between Santa Margherita and Portofino.\textsuperscript{16}

Let us now consult the list of the tapestries in the 1734 Inventory to identify the sets and subjects mentioned, as well as the surviving pieces. Seven tapestries in a set of the *Story of Solomon* hung together in a room in the Palazzo Durini significantly called the Rubens Room. Thanks to the reproductions of the entire set in the Cattaneo Album (where they were declared to be copied from cartoons by Peter Paul Rubens, probably according to a traditional claim on the part of the Durini), it can be identified as an edition of a series whose cartoons were painted about 1640–50 by the most prolific and recognizable Flemish cartoon painter of the Baroque age, Anthonis Sallaert (1580/85–1650), a follower and collaborator of Rubens and Anthony van Dyck. The cartoons were the property of the Brussels manufactory directed by Jacob van Zeunen (doc. 1644–80), who copied them on the looms many times.\textsuperscript{17} The Durini set is (or was) also signed with the Brussels marks and the initials (I.V.Z.) or name (IAC.US VAN ZEUNEN) of this weaver. The borders that surround these pieces with festoons and putti were apparently designed by Sallaert and were also used by Van Zeunen on the only other complete *Solomon* set known, a set once in Alcalá de Henares that was destroyed during the Spanish Civil War of 1936–37 but of which photographs exist.\textsuperscript{18}

Let us connect mention of the tapestries in the 1734 Inventory (given here in translation; see the appendix for transcription of the original) with the subjects in the series and their reproductions in the Cattaneo Album. Measurements are expressed in *quadretti*, which correspond to Flemish square aunes, or ells; one *quadretto* is about 490 square centimeters.

— “A piece of Flemish tapestry showing the judgment of Solomon, of 15 *quadretti*”: the *Judgment of Solomon*. The Cattaneo Album
(no. 1v) shows the Durini piece cut at the sides (fig. 6). The complete scene was represented in the tapestry once in Alcalá de Henares (fig. 7), and is in a hanging preserved in the Hôtel de Ville of Roulers (Roeselare), Belgium.  
—"Another . . . of 15 quadratti representing Solomon with a scepter in his hand, and treasure at his feet": Solomon Receiving Gifts from Illustrious Visitors. In this case, too, the reproduction of the tapestry in the Cattaneo Album (no. vi) shows the piece cut at the sides (fig. 8). The complete scene was in the panel once in Alcalá de Henares (fig. 9), and in a reweaving with the borders cut, sold at Sotheby’s, London, in 1986.  
—"Another . . . representing our Lord granting Wisdom to Solomon, of 42 quadratti": Solomon’s Dream of God Granting Him Wisdom. On the basis of the reproduction of the Durini tapestry in the Cattaneo Album (no. iii, 400 × 355 cm), we can assume this piece is the same as a tapestry
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Fig. 13. Anointment of Solomon from a set of the Story of Solomon. Tapestry design by Anthonis Sallaert, woven in the workshop of Jacob van Zeunen, Brussels, ca. 1650–60. Wool and silk, 400 × 400 cm. Whereabouts unknown. Photograph: after Cattaneo, Album secondo di tredici magnifici arazzi, no. II

Fig. 14. Solomon Inaugurates the Temple of Jerusalem from a set of the Story of Solomon. Tapestry design by Anthonis Sallaert, woven in the workshop of Jacob van Zeunen, Brussels, ca. 1650–60. Wool and silk, 400 × 270 cm. Whereabouts unknown. Photograph: after Cattaneo, Album secondo di tredici magnifici arazzi, no. VII

now in the collection of Reza Shahvandi, Milan (fig. 10), although it lacks the Brussels mark it had in 1863. A scene of the same dimensions was documented by the corresponding tapestry once in Alcalá de Henares. A replica with borders cut was sold at Sotheby’s, London, in 1987; another, with the border decorated with flowers, was offered for sale three times by Christie’s, London, in 1990 and 1997. —“Another . . . of 21½ quadretti representing Solomon with the Queen of Sheba”: taking account of the small dimension of the inventoried piece, this tapestry, whose subject was wrongly described in 1734, must be the one representing Bathsheba before David, who promises her that her son Solomon will be his successor on the throne of Israel, that was reproduced in the Cattaneo Album (no. 1; fig. 11). The same scene, slightly enlarged on the right, was represented on the corresponding tapestry once in Alcalá de Henares, and on another preserved in the Museu Episcopal, Vich
Fig. 15. Samson’s Marriage from a set of the Story of Samson. Tapestry design by an artist in the circle of Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the workshop of Filips Wauters, Antwerp, 1660–75. Wool and silk, 360 × 520 cm. Private collection. Photograph: after sale cat. of Villa La Tana, Bagno a Ripoli (Florence), by Semenzato, January 19, 1994, no. 41

Fig. 16. Samson’s Parents Sacrificing a Lamb from a set of the Story of Samson. Tapestry design by an artist in the circle of Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the workshop of Filips Wauters, Antwerp, 1660–75. Wool and silk, 375 × 325 cm. Whereabouts unknown. Photograph: after Cattaneo, Album secondo di tredici magnifici annuzzi, no. XIII
Fig. 17. Destruction of the Palace of the Philistines and the Death of Samson from a set of the Story of Samson. Tapestry design by an artist in the circle of Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the workshop of Filips Wauters, Antwerp, 1660–75. Wool and silk. Museu Episcopal, Vich (4132). Photograph: Royal Museums of Art and History, Brussels, Photographic Archive of Flemish Tapestries, no. 1550.155

Fig. 18. Destruction of the Palace of the Philistines and the Death of Samson (fragment of the left side) from a set of the Story of Samson. Tapestry design by an artist in the circle of Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the workshop of Filips Wauters, Antwerp, 1660–75. Wool and silk, 355 × 310 cm. Private collection, Abbazia della Cervara, Santa Margherita Ligure. Photograph: © the owner

Fig. 19. Destruction of the Palace of the Philistines and the Death of Samson (fragment of the right side) from a set of the Story of Samson. Tapestry design by an artist in the circle of Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the workshop of Filips Wauters, Antwerp, 1660–75. Wool and silk, 355 × 120 cm. Civiche Raccolte d’Arte, Milan. Photograph: after Nello Forti Grazzini, Museo d’Arte Applicata: Anazzi (Milan, 1984), p. 152, pl. 98
Fig. 20. Samson Killing the Lion from a set of the Story of Samson. Tapestry design by an artist in the circle of Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the workshop of Filips Wauters, Antwerp, 1660–75. Wool and silk, 356 × 263 cm. Private collection, Abbazia della Cervara, Santa Margherita Ligure. Photograph: © the owner

Below left
Fig. 21. Samson Fights the Philistines with the Jawbone of a Donkey from a set of the Story of Samson. Tapestry design by an artist in the circle of Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the workshop of Filips Wauters, Antwerp, 1660–75. Wool and silk, 355 × 362 cm. Civiche Raccolte d’Arte, Milan. Photograph: after Forti Grazzini, Museo d’Arte Applicata, p. 141, pl. 85

Below right
Fig. 22. Samson Carrying the Doors of Gaza from a set of the Story of Samson. Tapestry design by an artist in the circle of Peter Paul Rubens, woven in the workshop of Filips Wauters, Antwerp, 1660–75. Wool and silk, 355 × 254 cm. Civiche Raccolte d’Arte, Milan. Photograph: after Forti Grazzini, Museo d’Arte Applicata, p. 145, pl. 89
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Fig. 23. Minos, King of Crete, Frees Theseus and the Other Young Athenians from a set of the Story of Theseus. Tapestry woven in the workshop of Filips Wauters, Antwerp, 1660–75. Wool and silk, 375 x 470 cm. whereabouts unknown. Photograph: after Cattaneo, Album secondo di tredici magnifici azazzi, no. x

(Barcelona), finished with a different border composed of a dense flower frieze. 43

“Another . . . of 42 quadretti illustrating Solomon standing before his throne, with a box of jewels, and weapons at his feet”: Solomon Welcomes Hiram, King of Tyre reproduced in the Cattaneo Album (no. v; fig. 12), with a slightly larger scene than on the corresponding tapestry once in Alcalá de Henares.

“Another . . . of 33 quadretti illustrating Solomon’s anointment as King, cut, at the fireplace”: Anointment of Solomon, reproduced in the Cattaneo Album (no. ii; fig. 13). The piece once in Alcalá de Henares showed a scene slightly enlarged at right.

“Another . . . of 24 quadretti illustrating Solomon, who admires the temple”: Solomon Inaugurates the Temple of Jerusalem, reproduced in the Cattaneo Album (no. vii; fig. 14). A reweaving of the scene with the same borders but with the scene enlarged at right was published by Heinrich Göbel, who wrongly considered it the Durini version. 44 A piece of the same dimensions and with identical borders as the Durini version was in Alcalá de Henares. A fourth weaving with flower frieze borders is in the Museu Episcopal at Vich. 45

According to the 1734 Inventory and the Cattaneo Album, the Durini Story of Solomon did not include the scene of the Meeting with the Queen of Sheba designed by Sallaert for the series, which in fact completed the Solomon set once in Alcalá de Henares, and which is recorded also on a tapestry, with different borders, that we examined about thirty years ago in the shop of the Milanese tapestry dealer Elio Cittone.

Two other sets probably purchased by Giovan Battista Durini, according to the 1734 Inventory, were mingled and distributed among a hall and two rooms of the Palazzo Durini. It is not clear whether their mixing was intentional or just the product of confusion. At any rate, the tapestries of these sets were
Fig. 24. *The Fight between Theseus and Taurus before Minos and Ariadne* from a set of the *Story of Theseus*. Tapestry woven in the workshop of Filips Wauters, Antwerp, 1660–75. Wool and silk, 375 × 525 cm. Whereabouts unknown. Photograph: after Cattaneo, *Album secondo di tredici magnifici arazzi*, no. xii.

(and are) very similar in their measurements, colors, the medium quality of their weaving, and the design of their borders. An analysis of the surviving pieces from these two sets reveals no city marks or weaver's signatures, but the tapestries were probably made in Antwerp, possibly by Filips Wauters.

One is a Story of Samson, all of whose panels can now be identified. The borders simulate architectonic frames, with Solomonic columns on the sides, upper architraves with blank ovals in the center, lower plinths covered with festoons with ovals at the center. These borders follow the fashion of the architectural frames introduced into tapestry cartoons by Rubens (especially those for the Triumph of the Eucharist series), so they accord well with the figurative style of the scenes, which was strongly influenced by Rubens to the point that some figures and groups are copied from Rubens's prototypes. In 1984 and 1984–85, I studied the three complete pieces and two fragments of this Durini set that are now in the Civiche Raccolte d'Arte, identified another piece from the set in private hands, and linked them with other Samson tapestries copied from the same or similar cartoons preserved in Vienna, Malbork, and elsewhere, which demonstrated the wide dissemination of the cycle. The Durini Samson may now be reconstituted in its entirety, with the help of the 1734 Inventory, the Cattaneo Album, and the pieces in the Abbazia della Cervara. The chronology of the set (the tapestries in the Civiche Raccolte d'Arte have been dated about 1680) should also be reconsidered. The cartoons, apparently painted in Antwerp by a close follower of Rubens, might have been prepared when the master was still alive or soon after his death, maybe about 1640–50. They were not necessarily painted for a manufactory in Antwerp, but sooner or later they arrived there. Production of sets of Samson in the workshops directed
Fig. 27. Theseus, Leaving Athens for Crete, Offers Phoebus an Olive Branch from a set of the Story of Theseus. Tapestry woven in the workshop of Filips Wauters, Antwerp, 1660–75. Wool and silk, 375 × 325 cm. Whereabouts unknown. Photograph: after Cattaneo, Album secondo di tredici magnifici arazzi, no. 1x

Fig. 28. Theseus, Leaving Athens for Crete, Offers Phoebus an Olive Branch from a set of the Story of Theseus. Tapestry woven in the workshop of Pieter van Sinay, Brussels, ca. 1610–20. Wool and silk, 340 × 375 cm. Private collection. Photograph: Royal Museums of Art and History, Brussels, Photographic Archive of Flemish Tapestries, no. 1625.129
Fig. 29. *Combat of Theseus against Periphetes* from a set of the *Story of Theseus*. Tapestry woven in the workshop of Filips Wauters, Antwerp, 1660–75. Wool and silk, 373 × 269 cm. Private collection, Abbazia della Cervara, Santa Margherita Ligure. Photograph: © the owner.

*Below left*

Fig. 30. *Aegaeus, King of Athens, Recognizes His Son Theseus during a Banquet* from a set of the *Story of Theseus*. Tapestry woven in the workshop of Pieter van Sinay, Brussels, ca. 1610–20. Wool and silk, 340 × 435 cm. Private collection. Photograph: Royal Museums of Art and History, Brussels, Photographic Archive of Flemish Tapestries, no. 1625.128

*Below right*

Fig. 31. *Aegaeus, King of Athens, Recognizes His Son Theseus during a Banquet* (fragment) from a set of the *Story of Theseus*. Tapestry woven in the workshop of Filips Wauters, Antwerp, 1660–75. Wool and silk, 361 × 125 cm. Civiche Raccolte d’Arte, Milan. Photograph: after Forti Grazzini, *Museo d’Arte Applicata*, p. 140, pl. 83.
by the members of the Wauters family, especially Filips and Michiel Wauters (who probably copied two different but similar series of cartoons), is documented between 1676 and 1704, though it might have begun earlier. The Durini set was made in this context, probably in the manufactory directed by Filips Wauters. If its first owner was Giovan Battista Durini, who died in 1677, it might have been made about 1660–75.

These are the components of the set as they are mentioned in the 1734 Inventory:

In the Great Hall facing the garden of the Palazzo Durini:
—“Another piece [of Flemish tapestry] of about forty quadretti representing various people at table”: Samson’s Marriage (fig. 15). I previously identified and published this piece, which then passed through the art market twice, as an element of the Durini Samson. Definitive proof of this provenance is now provided by its reproduction in the Cattaneo Album (no. VII, considered from a Story of Jason).

—“Another . . . of about 23 quadretti illustrating the sacrifice of a lamb”: Samson’s Parents Sacrificing a Lamb. This piece, whose present whereabouts is unknown, may be seen in the Cattaneo Album (no. XIII; fig. 16).

In the room “where the chapel’s tribune is”:
—“A piece of Flemish tapestry, vividly colored, with columnar frames, of 30 quadretti,
representing Samson destroying the temple": *Destruction of the Palace of the Philistines and the Death of Samson*. The Civiche Raccolte d’Arte has a fragment of the right side of the scene with the side border (fig. 19), which I could compare with complete weavings of the subject, such as the one in the Museo Episcopal, Vich (fig. 17). Now the missing main part of the Durini tapestry, which fits perfectly with the fragment, has come to light in the Abbazia della Cervara (fig. 18); this piece is completed on the right side with a column cut from another tapestry that was once in the Durini collection (a piece from the *Story of Theseus*).

—“Another . . . of 16 quadretti representing Delilah under a canopy, which is not complete”: *Samson Betrayed by Delilah*. As the inventory description shows, the present fragmentary condition of this piece, which is in the Civiche Raccolte d’Arte (355 × 250 cm), is the same as described in 1734. The complete scene of the cartoon is represented in a replica sold on the art market.40

In another room:

—“Another piece of Flemish tapestry of 21 3/4 quadretti representing Samson dismembering a Lion”: *Samson Killing the Lion*. I had already suspected that a tapestry of this subject that was on the art market in 1988 was a reweaving, with a different border, of a subject in the Durini *Samson*.41 This is confirmed by finding the tapestry from the Palazzo Durini with same scene in the Abbazia della Cervara (fig. 20).

—“Another . . . of about 40 quadretti, illustrating Samson, when they removed his eyes, cut to fit the fireplace”: *Blinding of Samson*, in the Civiche Raccolte d’Arte of Milan (355 × 454 cm).42

—“Another . . . of about 25 quadretti, illustrating Samson who kills the Philistines”: *Samson Fights the Philistines with the Jawbone of a Donkey*. This piece, too, is in the Civiche Raccolte d’Arte of Milan (fig. 21).43

—“Another . . . of about 25 quadretti illustrating Samson who carries the doors of the Town*: *Samson Carrying the Doors of Gaza.* This piece is also in the Civiche Raccolte d’Arte (fig. 22).44

Thus the Durini set of the *Story of Samson* is known in its entirety, although the second piece listed disappeared after 1863. But, as the 1734 Inventory reveals, these eight panels hung in the Palazzo Durini alongside eight other tapestries composing another narrative whole. The theme of that set was not recognized by the recorder of the inventory, who also mistook one of the panels as a scene from the *Story of Samson*. This confusion continued until recently, even for the present author, who, but with reservations, explained as *Samson* subjects a panel and a fragment from this different set, now in the Civiche Raccolte d’Arte, Milan.45 Another error is the Cattaneo Album’s presenting some illustrated pieces as part of a *Story of Jason* from cartoons by Jacob Jordaens.

As the rediscovered tapestries of this third Durini set now demonstrate, their theme was the *Story of Theseus*, based on the life of the mythical Greek hero as narrated in Plutarch’s *Life of Theseus*.46 The series, of which several sets were made, was identified and briefly discussed by Jean-Paul Asselberghs, in an entry devoted to a tapestry of the series exhibited in 1971.47 That tapestry, with five others indicated by Asselberghs, formed the oldest and most sumptuous *Theseus* series known, which, as the signatures on the tapestries show, was made in the Brussels manufactory directed by the merchant weaver Pieter van Sinay (doc. 1614–38). The scenes, of a transitional style between Late Renaissance and Baroque, might have been painted by an unidentified Flemish cartoonist about 1610–20, apparently the same painter who prepared the cartoons for a *Story of Alexander* series recorded in four tapestries in the Museo Civico of Fabriano, dated about 1620.48 The cartoons for the *Story of Theseus* were later transferred to Antwerp, where the Durini edition was most probably woven, possibly by the same Filipus Wauters who also made the *Story of Samson* finished with nearly identical borders.49
Let us present the tapestries of the Durini Theseus set, according to the order of their mention in the 1734 Inventory:

In the Great Hall facing the garden of the Palazzo Durini:
—“a piece of Flemish tapestry of about 36 quadretti, illustrates a Sultan, and an Emperor with various figures”: Minos, King of Crete, Frees Theseus and the Other Young Athenians (from Plutarch, Life of Theseus, 19). This tapestry, not charming, is known only by its reproduction in the Cattaneo Album (no. x; fig. 23). Another weaving of this subject was sold in Venice in 1900 (see note 58).
—“Another . . . representing a bearded man with scepter in hand, and a galley, of about 39 quadretti”: The Fight between Theseus and Taurus before Minos and Ariadne (from Plutarch, Life of Theseus, 19). The medium-quality Durini tapestry, known by its reproduction in the Cattaneo Album (no. xii; fig. 24), compares with the finer piece of the same subject made by Pieter van Sinay (fig. 25). That was sold by Galerie Giroux, Brussels, in 1951; was exhibited at Château de Culan, France, in 1971; and appeared on the market again in the year 2000.69
—“Another . . . of about 33½ quadretti illustrating a battle on a bridge”: Combat of Theseus against the Amazons (from Plutarch, Life of Theseus, 27). The Durini piece is reproduced in the Cattaneo Album (no. xi; fig. 26). The corresponding tapestry by Pieter van Sinay was exhibited in 1967 at the “Foire des Antiquaires de Bruxelles.”68 A third weaving was sold in Venice in 1900 (see note 58).
—“Another . . . of about 23 quadretti illustrating the adoration of an Idol”: Theseus, Leaving Athens for Crete, Offers Phoebus an Olive Branch (from Plutarch, Life of Theseus, 18). The Durini tapestry showing this unpleasantly designed image was published in the Cattaneo Album (no. ix; fig. 27) and may be compared with the more finely woven version of the same subject by Pieter van Sinay (fig. 28), sold by the Galerie Giroux, Brussels, in 1951.64

In the room “where the chapel’s tribune is”:
—“Another . . . representing Samson with sword in hand in act of killing another, of about 17½ quadretti, not complete”: misunderstood as part of the Story of Samson, this tapestry represents the Combat of Theseus against Periades (from Plutarch, Life of Theseus, 8). In good condition, it is now at the Abbazia della Cervara (fig. 29). The same image appears, without variations, in the tapestry by Pieter van Sinay sold by Galerie Giroux in 1951.65
—“Another . . . of about 30 quadretti representing various figures, among which one with a basket of fruit in hand, and this piece is in the place of the bed”: Aegeus, King of Athens, Recognizes His Son Theseus during a

Fig. 34. Hunt with Diana and Her Nymphs from a set of Landscapes with Hunts and Mythological Figures. Tapestry by an unknown weaver, Brussels, about 1580–1600. Wool and silk, 340 × 325 cm. Private collection, Abbazia della Cervara, Santa Margherita Ligure. Photograph: © the owner
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Banquet (from Plutarch, Life of Theseus, 12). The complete tapestry with this subject made by Pieter van Sinay (fig. 30), sold by the Galerie Giroux in 1951, enables us to identify the left portion of the design, a waiter carrying a basket of fruit and the back of King Aegeus seated, in the fragment of the Durini tapestry from the same cartoon, which is in the Civiche Raccolte d’Arte, Milan (fig. 31), and which until now has been incorrectly considered a remnant of a Samson tapestry.

In another room:
—“A piece of Flemish tapestry of 21½ quadretti with two large figures on it, that is a Lady and a kneeling man”: Theseus Finds the Sword Left by His Father, Aegeus, under a Rock (from Plutarch, Life of Theseus, 3 and 6). This tapestry (fig. 32), showing the beginning of the Story of Theseus, is one of the Durini hangings that entered the Civiche Raccolte d’Arte, Milan, where it has until now been misunderstood as a subject of the Story of Samson.

—“Another . . . of about 25 quadretti representing two figures, and a labyrinth”: Theseus before Ariadne, Who Gives Him a Ball of Thread (from Plutarch, Life of Theseus, 19). This tapestry, which in the background shows the battle between Theseus and the Minotaur in the Labyrinth, is preserved, in good condition, in the Abbazia della Cerva (fig. 33). The same image is enlarged in the tapestry copied from the same cartoon by Pieter van Sinay. A third weaving was sold in Venice in 1900 (see note 58).

The three tapestry series mentioned so far—Solomon, Samson, and Theseus—are the ones, probably bought by Giovan Battista Durini, whose descriptions in the 1734 Inventory are sufficiently detailed to enable us to recognize each piece. It is not as easy to identify the same sets in the earlier 1708 Inventory. Eight tapestries “with figures and two columns” divided between the audience chamber and the guardaroba were from the Samson or the Theseus sets, but the other one of the two is apparently missing; and seven tapestries with “figures” in a room of the countess mother’s apartment should be the Solomon set. But the Palazzo Durini contained more hangings. Let us note among the ones listed in the 1708 Inventory, in the guardaroba, twenty-two Flemish tapestries “with figures and wooded landscapes” and seven more “with wooded landscapes,” and in an upper guardaroba at the top of the palace, eleven Flemish tapestries with figures, one the property of conte Carlo Francesco Durini (1634–1694; brother of Giovan Battista). The 1734 Inventory mentions in a room eight pieces, probably from the twenty-two of 1708, now specified as “Brussels tapestries, with landscapes and wild animals,” of various dimensions: quadretti 38½ (two pieces), 33½ (one), 23½ (two), 18½ (one), 18¾ (one), 5 (one cut piece); in the Chamber of the Stuccos were hung “five large tapestries with figures, of about 100 quadretti.”

These descriptions are generic, but they do not eliminate the possibility of identifying four tapestries at the Abbazia della Cerva that arrived along with the four from the Samson and Theseus sets whose Durini provenance is certain. Two, pertaining to a single set of Landscapes with Hunts and Mythological Figures, bear no marks but were evidently made in Brussels about the end of the sixteenth century. One shows a Hunt with Diana and Her Nymphs (fig. 34), the other a Hunt, with a Love of Love, both measure 340 by 325 centimeters, so their areas would match those of the two Brussels pieces “with figures and wooded landscapes” (1708), or “with landscapes and wild animals” (1734), measuring 23½ quadretti, that were in the Palazzo Durini. Thus a door is left half open (but no more) for the possibility that the two tapestries in the Abbazia della Cerva not so far mentioned also come from the Durini. These depict Augustus Reconciled by Octavia with Antony and a Combat between Romans and Germans (fig. 35) and are components of a well-known Baroque series of the Story of
Augustus, whose cartoons were designed by the Flemish painter Justus van Egmont in 1659. Various sets were copied from those cartoons in Antwerp, from 1660 on, in the manufactories directed by Jan Frans Cornelissen, Filips Wauters, and Anna Maria Wauters: one of them might have reached Giovan Battista Durini’s palace before 1677, when the count died, and have been registered in 1734 as the group of five large tapestries with “figures.” If so, the set of Augustus might have been the third set made for Giovan Battista Durini by the Antwerp manufactory of Filips Wauters (but, as the 1708 Inventory indicates, narrative tapestries were also introduced into the palace by his brother Carlo Francesco).

These last hypotheses apart, the inventories of the Palazzo Durini and the three securely identified sets that were housed there contrast with the rarefied picture we are disposed to of the collections of tapestries in seventeenth-century Milan, and reveal Giovan Battista Durini to have been a notable fan of Flemish hangings and, further, the only Milanese known to have decorated his mansion with à la page Baroque tapestries designed by Rubens’s pupils and followers. Durini’s tapestries were stock series, or copied for him from already existing cartoons, but they were chosen according
to a conscious and modern taste, a taste manifested also in the frescoes and paintings he commissioned and purchased.

In the last quarter of the seventeenth century, there was in Milan at least one other buyer of good-quality Flemish tapestries, whose name and hangings ought to be mentioned here. We are referring to the conte Filippo Archinto (1644–1712), the member of a Milanese family that was already important under the Sforza and whose wealth and power were maintained under the Spaniards. Conte Filippo’s mother was a member of the Arese family, and he married a Stampa, who was also the daughter of a Visconti, which is to say that he was directly related to some of the principal Milanese families of his time. A jurist, for some years he performed important political missions in the service of the Spanish court. In 1678 he was in Brussels as a member of the council that ruled the southern Netherlands; from 1678 to 1680 he was Spanish ambassador to the court of Emperor Leopold I in Vienna; in 1680–81 he was in Brussels again, as counselor to the governor of Flanders, Alessandro Farnese. From 1681 on, he was back in Milan, where he took his political career to a more local stage as a member of the senate. As a reason for this return, we might suspect a conflict with Spanish politics.

During his second period in Brussels, Archinto ordered a group of four (?) large and fine Heraldic Tapestries (fig. 36), with the measurements of wall hangings (about 365 x 310 cm each), which survive and bear the signatures of the cartoonist David Teniers III (1638–1689) and of the weaver Hieronymus Le Clerc (1643–1722), and the dates 1680 and 1681. One after the other, beginning about 1860, three of the tapestries left the Archinto residences in Milan. One, dated 1680, became part of the Misia Sert collection and was then sold in Paris (1974) and in Monaco (1987 and 1993), and since 1995 has been at the Louvre. Another, dated 1681 (not signed by the weaver), was published in 1923 as the property of Marczell von Nemes, who had it until 1931. The third (fig. 36), dated 1680, just recently left the collection of an Archinto heir; offered for sale in 2004, it was the property of a Milanese dealer before entering a private collection in Houston, Texas. A fourth piece, dated 1681, should still be with an Archinto descendant.

Here, at last, we meet a group of tapestries from a cartoon that was painted specifically for the Milanese patron, who, when he was in Brussels, probably specified...
the iconographic information to be conveyed, selected the image proposed by the painter, and likely controlled the making of the tapestries. Each piece shows, inside an architectonic frame, a simulated tapestry displayed by flying putti, a device invented by Rubens for the *Triumph of the Eucharist.* In each simulated wall hanging, a large coat of arms of Filippo Archinto, with the Archinto as well as the Arese, Stampa, and Visconti blazons, is supported by a trophy of weapons flanked by Turkish prisoners and surmounted by a personification of Fame offering a laurel crown; *Laus et laurus archintaea* was the family motto. The prisoners—a motif apparently taken from works of art celebrating the Battle of Lepanto of 1571—and also some ancient Roman weapons on the right remind us that, as an ambassador in Vienna in the years immediately preceding the expiration of the truce between the Holy Roman Empire and the Turks, Archinto was well aware of the fear of an attack from the East (which in fact came in 1683) and surely supported the idea of an anti-Turkish Crusade promoted by Pope Innocent XI, to which Madrid and Vienna adhered, but not Paris. So, as I believe, the anti-Turkish content of the tapestries should be read also as political manifestos against France.

While in Brussels, Filippo might have also acted as tapestry adviser to other Milanese collectors; this might explain the making of the beautiful *Heraldic Tapestries* ordered by the conte Pirro Visconti Borromeo Arese (1666–1704), probably designed by David Teniers III and woven in Brussels by Hieronymus Le Clerc, showing Pirro's coat of arms among putti and personifications of Fame, before a wide landscape. Two of them, once in the Palazzo Visconti Borromeo Arese, better known as the Palazzo Litta, in Milan, left Italy in the nineteenth century: one was exhibited in Brussels in 1905 and was sold by Sotheby's in 1988; the other is at the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco.

A document recently brought to light by Koenraad Brosens shows that in 1683 Filippo Archinto planned (from Milan, evidently) to commission a suite of *Landslces with Animals and Figures* from cartoons “wijlen den ouden Teniers” (by David Teniers I [1582–1649]). It is not known whether these tapestries were made. But it is certain that another, very important chamber was ordered by Archinto, probably about 1680, when he was still in Brussels or just after his return to Milan. This was a set of eight *Teniers* tapestries (figs. 37, 38), designed by David Teniers II and personalized with Archinto’s arms and motto, *Laus et laurus archintaea,* in the upper borders. Later preserved in the Palazzo Archinto in the via Olmetto in Milan, these tapestries were sold about 1860 by a descendant (the conte Giuseppe or his son Luigi Archinto) to the Milanese dealer Pietro Cattaneo, the same person who obtained some of the Durini tapestries. Cattaneo published the Archinto collection in the third of his illustrated catalogues of tapestries offered for sale: *Album di ventiquattro arazzi disegnati da G. Romano e Davide Teniers già appartenenti al conte Giuseppe Archinto, Milanese, e ora posseduti da Pietro Cattaneo* (Milan, 1864). Alas, no copy of this publication seems to have survived in any of the most important European or American libraries in which I have searched for it.

Thanks to the coat of arms and to the work of tapestry historians, the Archinto *Teniers* tapestries have not fallen into oblivion and some of their routes of travel after 1861 are known. Sold by Cattaneo, they were taken to England as the property of Lord Overstone, who died in 1883, then of his daughter Lady Wantage. Four were sold by the dealer Joel Duveen to Edward Cecil Guinness, later Lord Iveagh, who placed them in Farmleigh House, Dublin, where they are still preserved in a hall and a corridor as a loan from the Beneficiaries of the Third Earl of Iveagh Estate and Will Trust. These are the *Village Feast*, the *Gypsy Fortune-Teller*, the *Return from Harvest,* and the *Milking Scene.* Two were illustrated by H. C. Marillier in 1932; difficult-to-read
images of the tapestries in situ are published on the official website of Farmleigh House (for copyright reasons, the managers of the house cannot furnish new photographs of them). The other four tapestries of the set—the *Pastoral Scene* (fig. 37), the *Fish Quay*, the *Winter Scene*, and the *Sportsmen Resting* (fig. 38)—all published by Marilier,93 were sold by Christie’s in 1929 with the collection of the Earl of Crawford and Barcarres and arrived in New York with French & Co.; they were then bought by William Randolph Hearst, with whose collection they were exhibited and offered for sale in New York by Gimbel Brothers in 1941;4 their present location is unknown.

Signed by Jacob van der Borch “a Castro” (ca. 1655–1693) and bearing also, in a laudatory inscription on the *Village Feast*, the names of the painter David Teniers II (1610–1690) and of his protectors Archduke Leopold Wilhelm of Austria and Don Juan José of Austria, governors of Flanders in 1648–56 and 1656–58, respectively, the Archinto set reproduces the older cycle of *Teniers* cartoons painted for the Brussels
manufactories, which, as Brosens rightly argues, was a work by the same David Teniers II and not by one of his imitators, as is commonly thought. Furthermore, the Archinto Teniers set, probably not the editio princeps of the series, is the earliest Teniers set to have survived. And such a modern work of art was made for a Milanese!

In terms of their style (though rooted in the seventeenth-century Flemish genre painting of David Teniers II) and in terms of their lighthearted secular and antiheroic atmosphere, the diffusion of the late seventeenth-century woven Teniers announced, in Brussels, the spirit of the eighteenth century, when the Teniers tapestries would be produced and distributed everywhere in Europe. This same message found its way to Milan precisely through the set purchased by Filippo Archinto. At the end of the seventeenth century, this enlightened collector put himself forward in Milan as a new kind of tapestry buyer, not satisfied with already-made or old-fashioned Flemish pieces but as an aware patron of original and up-to-date tapestries. For this, as well as for his political
position—apparently more in favor of Austria than of Spain at a time when conflict between the two was going to explode—manifest also in his *Heraldic Tapestries*, we feel that he represents the different historical, social, and cultural phase that was opening in Milan, which, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, would come under Austrian rule.

This paper is the fruit of research whose initial stimulus came from my encounter with the tapestry *Solomon's Dream*, once in the Durini collection, which I saw in a private collection, and from later useful exchanges with Dr. Cristina Geddo, who was studying that collection. The tapestries at the Abbazia della Cervara were first called to my attention by Roberta Genta of the Laboratorio di Restauro dei Tesori at Venaria Reale (Turin); their examination in situ was enabled by the tapestries’ (and the abbey’s) gentle and collaborative owner, who prefers not to be named. Dr. Ingrid De Meuter, Curator of Tapestries and Textiles at the Royal Museums of Art and History, Brussels, was very helpful when I consulted the Photographic Archive of Flemish Tapestries at the museum. Julia Cummins from Farmleigh House provided useful information on the Archinto *Tenieri* tapestries that are there. It was an honor to collaborate with Tom Campbell, as a member of the team of tapestry historians involved in the *Tapestry in the Baroque: Threads of Splendor* exhibition and catalogue, and then in the related colloquium at The Metropolitan Museum of Art.


2. New information on the tapestries presented by Francesco II Sforza in 1533 to Vigevano Cathedral (and now preserved in part in the local Museo del Duomo) and on other tapestries bought by the duke in 1534 to decorate the rooms prepared in the castles of Vigevano and Milan for his new wife, Christina of Denmark, niece of Emperor Charles V, are given by Rossana Sacchi, *Il disegno incompiuto: La politica artistica di Francesco II Sforza e di Massimiliano Stampa* (Milan, 2005), vol. 1, pp. 265–71, 300–304.

3. Antonio Maria Bozzolo was known for his documented (but lost) tapestries made in 1533–34 for Milan Cathedral (see Forti Grazzini, *Arazzi e arazzi in Lombardia,* pp. 29–30), but recently discovered documents show him at work in 1526–37 on the tapestries of the *Story of Saint John the Baptist* for Monza Cathedral, now in the Museo del Duomo, Monza; D. Mirabile, "La committenza della famiglia Rusca nella Lombardia del Rinascimento," *graduation thesis, Università degli Studi di Milano, 2005; Silvio Leydi, "Giuseppe Arcimboldo à Milan: Documents et hypothèses," in Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, ed., *Arcimboldo 1526–1593*, exh. cat., Musée du Luxembourg, Paris, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (Milan, 2007), pp. 41–43; Leydi, "Giuseppe Arcimboldo à Milan: Documents et hypothèses. Inventaire des documents d’archives relatifs à la période milanaise," in ibid., pp. 297–98. It is not known whether it was Bozzolo or another weaver who made the latest tapestries of the *Story of Saint John the Baptist in Monza*, apparently to be dated ca. 1550–60, but the chronology of the entire set should now be cautiously reconsidered.


5. Girolamo Borzieri, *Il supplemento della nobiltà di Milano* (Milan, 1619), which was a sequel to Paolo Morigli, *La nobiltà di Milano* (Milan, 1615); see the modern edition of the two books collected in one: Sala Bolognese (Bologna), 1979.

6. This field has already been touched upon by the present author; Nello Forti Grazzini, *Arazzi a Milano: Le serie fiamminghe del Museo della Basilica di Sant’Ambrogio* (Milan, 1988).

7. The same problems exist in the study of seventeenth-century Milanese collections of paintings, although much more has been written about them; see Alessandro Morandotti, *Il collezionismo in Lombardia: Studi e ricerche tra ‘600 e ‘800* (Milan, 2008), esp. pp. 1–50: "Milano tra età spagnola e dominio austriaco: Componenti sociali e circolazione artistica" and "Magnasco a Milano: La realtà della città e il panorama del collezionismo privato tra ‘vecchia’ e ‘nuova’ nobiltà."


11. See Dolcini, ed., *Arazzi della cattedrale di Cremona*, figs. on pp. 122–23 (Cremona), p. 76, fig. 5i
del potere e consenso politico nella Milano di Carlo V (Florence, 1999), pp. 128, 209 n. 68.
23. Leydi, Sub umbra imperialis aquilae, p. 209.
24. The inventory, which I consulted in a private library and which does not bear the name or signature of the notary, lists the properties and goods (the tapestries are on p. 40) of the late conte Antonio Trotti, inherited by his son Gian Galeazzo, whose tutor was his uncle the archbishop of Milan. Many paintings are also listed.
26. The inventories I have consulted are those of the tapestries divided between Prince Teodoro Trivulzio and his brother conte Alfonso in 1609 (Archivio di Stato di Milano, Trivulzi, Archivio Milanese, 179); the “Inventario di tutte le Robbe et Mobili in questa Casa di Milano” (Prince Teodoro’s palace), 1612 (ibid., 211 bis); the “Minuta d’inventario dei mobili della Contessa Ottavia Marliani Trivulzio,” 1615 (ibid., 211 bis); the note of the acquisition of the Trivulzio Months by Prince Teodoro Trivulzio, from an Arconati, on November 2, 1620 (ibid., 244); the “Inventario dell’Em.mo Card.le Principe Trivulzio,” 1649, with his tapestries at fol. 188 (ibid., 211 bis); the “Inventario delle Robbe del Em.mo S.re Cardinal Principe Trivulzio Viceré di Sardegna fatto in Cagliari,” March 15, 1650, with the tapestries at fol. 205 (ibid., 211 bis); the “Inventario degli Mobili che sono al presente nel Palazzo dell’Em.mo Card. Principe Trivulzio e del S. Principe suo figliolo,” 1650 (ibid., 211 bis); the inventories of the goods of Prince Antonio Teodoro Trivulzio (the nephew of Prince Cardinal Teodoro) in his palace of Porta Tosa in Milan, 1665 (ibid., 214), 1676 (ibid., 212), and 1691 (ibid., 214, Reg. 7; another copy in ibid., 212); the lists and valuations, by the painter Perona, of the tapestries sold in 1770–71 (ibid., 216), among which were the Months, bought by the marchese Teodoro Gioiogio Trivulzio, on May 18, 1770 (ibid., 176).
29. Giacinta Cambini, “Gli arazzi fiamminghi di
30. Raffaele Mansi to Giovanni Ponzanieri, February 20, 1669; ibid., p. 383.
32. On the frescoes and paintings as well as transcriptions of the inventories, see Cristina Geddo, "Collezionisti e mecenate a Milano tra Sei e Settecento: I Durini conti di Monza," Artes 9 (2001), pp. 41–124; and p. 64, n. 5 for a bibliography on the architecture of the palace. The palace was sold by the Durini in 1921, and it is now the property of the conti Caproni di Taliedo.
33. The 1708 Inventory (Archivio di Stato, Milan, Notarile, ser. 33960, no. 65, notary Giuseppe Lechi, August 14, 1708) was written at the death of conte Giacomo Durini (1647–1707), son of Giovanna Battista; the 1734 Inventory (Archivio di Stato, Milan, Notarile, ser. 42546, no. 1757, notary Francesco Isola, April 29, 1734) was written at the death of Giovanna Battista Durini II (1685–1734), nephew of Giovanna Battista I. They are transcribed in Geddo, "Collezionisti e mecenate a Milano," pp. 71–89, 89–104.
34. The inventories do not specify, except in one case, who bought the tapestries, but the Baroque style and date of the main Flemish sets with figures reflect the taste and fit with the chronology of Giovanna Battista Durini, their probable buyer. However, it must be noted that a group of eleven Flemish tapestries with figures are said, in the 1708 Inventory, to have been bought by conte Carlo Francesco Durini, Giovanna Battista’s brother. Some older sets of Landscapes and Hunts, probably of Late Renaissance appearance and date, might have been bought by Giacomo Durini I (ca. 1573–1639), a rich banker and merchant, who was Giovanna Battista’s father.
37. This abbey’s name is well-known to art historians through the Cervara Polyptych by Gerard David, originally made for the abbey church and now divided among Genoa, Paris, and New York; see Claro di Fabio, ed., Il Polittico della Cervara di Gérard David, exh. cat., Musei di Strada Nuova, Genoa (Cinisello Balsamo, 2005).
41. In it, a woman seated on the left wearing a cuirass with a helmet, sword, and shield and with symbols of the vanity of terrestrial riches beneath her feet is being presented to the kneeling Solomon by God the Father. She appears to have been partially inspired by the personification of "Fortezza, & valore del corpo congiunto con la prudenza, & virtù dell’animo" described by Cesare Ripa in his Iconologia, o vero descrizione di diverse imagini cavate dall’antichità, e di propria invenzione (Rome, 1603); reprint, Hildesheim, Zürich, New York, 1984), p. 186: "Donna armata di corazza, elmo & scudo, nella destra mano habbia una spada ignuda . . . & sopra l’elmo habbia una corona di lauro con oro intrecciata . . ." The stars on her mantle symbolize knowledge of the secrets of the universe offered to Solomon by God, while the radiant eye on the point of her sword represents the knowledge of divine things that Solomon received, together with the virtues of Prudence and Simplicity symbolized by the snake and the dove on the woman’s shield. The image confirms Anthonis Sallaert’s passion for allegorical representation that is manifest in the many tapestry series he designed and demonstrates that Ripa’s Iconologia was his main source for allegories and personifications.
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Appendix: Tapestries Listed in the 1708 and 1734 Inventories of the Palazzo Durini, Milan


Nella stanza d’audienza dell’Ill.mo Conte Gio. Batt.a, che guarda verso strada . . .
—5º 5 pezzi di tappezzeria di Fiandra a figure con due Colonne . . .

Nella stanza seguente alla sod.a [the second room after the count’s bed chamber] verso strada, dove si fa guardaroba
—Pezzi nº 3 di tappezzeria di Fiandra a figure uniformi all’altri pezzi, che si trovano nella stanza d’audienza dell’Ill.mo S.r Conte Giovanni Batt.a
—Altri pezzi nº 6 di tappezzeria di Fiandra a figure e boscagge . . .
—Altri pezzi di Tappezzeria di Fiandra uniforni alle sedette a figure, et a boscagge . . .
—Altri pezzi nº 10 di Tappezzeria di Fiandra uniformi alle sedette di figure, et boscagge . . .
—Uno strato di Tappezzeria di Fiandra . . .
—Un pezzo di tappezzeria di Fiandra a figure rota . . .
—Numero sette pezzi di tappezzeria di Fiandra a boscagge . . .

Segue il quarto dell’Ill.ma S.ra Contessa Madre . . . Nella stanza seguente [after the p.ma stanza a mano dritta in cima del scalone] . . .
—Numº sei pezzi di tappezzeria di Fiandra a paesi

Nella stanza seguente che serve d’Anticamera all’Ill.ma Sig.ra Contessa Madre . . .
—Nº sette di tappezzeria di Fiandra a figure . . .

Nella guardaroba di sopra in cima del Palazzo
—né 4 pezzi di tappezzeria di Fiandra vecchi a boscagge . . .
—Altri pezzi nº 11 tappezzeria di Fiandra a figure uniformi all’altri pezzi che si trovano nella stanza dell’alcova, quali tutti pezzi erano del fu Ill.mo S.r Conte Carlo Franc.co Durino . . .
—né 4 pezzetti di tapezzaria di Fiandra a boscagge . . .
Excerpts from the posthumous inventory of the conte Giovan Battista Durini II (1685–1734), compiled January 19–April 13, 1734, Archivio di Stato, Milan, Notarile, ser. 43546, no. 1575, notary Francesco Isola, April 29, 1735; as transcribed in Cristina Geddo, “Collezionisti e mecenate a Milano tra Sei e Settecento: I Durini conti di Monza,” Artes 9 (2001), pp. 89–104:

Nell’anticamera seguente de’ Paggi da dove si passa per andar alla galleria, e quarto verso il giardino . . .
—Nº 6 pezzi di tappezzeria di fiamma stoffa mezzana a figure grandi in piedi quadretti nº 130 circa . . .

Nel Salone verso il giardino
—Un pezzo di tappezzeria di fiamma di quadretti circa 36 esprime un Soldano, et un Imperatore con varie figure
—Alto pezzo come sopra di quadretti circa quaranta rappresentante diverse persone a tavola
—Alto pezzo come sopra rappresentante un barone col scetro in mano, et una galleria di quadretti 39 circa
—Alto pezzo come sopra di quadretti circa 33½ esprime una battaglia sopra un ponte
—Alto pezzo di tapezeria come sopra di quadretti circa 23 esprime l’adorazione di un Idolo
—Alto pezzo come sopra di quadretti 23 esprime il sacrificio di un agnello . . .

Nella stanza che segue al Salone verso il giardino alla dritta cioè nella St.a di Rubens
—Un pezzo di tapezeria di fiamma rappresentante il giudizio di Salomone di quadretti 15
—Alto pezzo come sopra di quadretti 15 rappresentante Salomone col scetro in mano, e tesorò ai piedi
—Alto pezzo come sopra rappresentante nostro Sig.re che dà la Sapienza a Salomone di quadretti 42
—Alto pezzo come sopra di quadretti 21½ rappresentante Salomone con la Regina Sabha
—Alto pezzo come sopra di quadretti 42 esprime Salomone sotto al trono, con una Cassetta di giote, et armi ai piedi
—Alto pezzo come sopra di quadretti 33 esprime Salomone unto Re tagliato nel sito del Camino
—Alto pezzo come sopra di quadretti 24 rappresentante Salomone, che rimira il tempio . . .

Nella Camera de’ Stuchi . . .
—Cinque pezzi di tapezeria figurata grande in piede di quadretti circa 100 . . .

Nella Camera seguente dove v’è la Tribuna della Capella . . .
—Un pezzo di tapezeria di fiamma colorito a vivo con frizzi a colonato di quadretti 30 rappresentante Sansone, che rovina il tempio
—Alto pezzo di tapezeria come sopra rappresentante Sansone con la spada in mano in atto di uccidere un alto di quadretti 17½ circa non intiero
—Alto pezzo come sopra di quadretti 16 rappresentante Dallila sotto baldacchino, qual non è intiero
—Alto pezzo come sopra di quadretti circa 30 rappresentante diverse figure, fra le quali una con un cesto di frutta in mano, e d.o pezzo è nel sito del letto
—Due pezzi di tapezeria figurata grande, vechia e smarrita di quadretti 15 circa cioè quadretti 7½ per caduno . . .

Nella prima Camera alla sinistra della Sala verso il Giardino
—Un pezzo di tapezeria di fiamma di quadretti 21½ con sopra due figure grandi, cioè una Donna ed un huomo in genochio
—Alto pezzo di tapezeria di fiamma di quadretti 21½ rappresentante Sansone, che sbrana un Leone
—Alto pezzo di tapezeria come sopra di quadretti 40 circa esprime Sansone, quando li cavano gli ochi tagliato per il sito del camino
—Alto pezzo di tapezeria come sopra di quadretti 25 circa esprime Sansone, che amazza i Philistei
—Alto pezzo di tapezeria come sopra di quadretti 25 circa esprime Sansone, che porta le porte della Città
—Alto pezzo di tapezeria come sopra di quadretti circa 25 rappresentante due figure, et un laberintho . . .

Nella Stanza seguente, qual resta vicina al Gabinetto dalla parte del Sig.r Dugnano
—Un pezzo di tapezeria di Brusselles a paesi con selvatici di quadretti 23½
—Alto pezzo di tapezeria come sopra di quadretti 18½
—Alto pezzettino come sopra di quadretti 5
—Alto pezzo grande di tapezeria come sopra di quadretti 38½
—Alto pezzo grande come sopra di quadretti 38½
—Alto pezzo grande come sopra di quadretti 13½
—Alto pezzo più piccolo come sopra di quadretti 23½
—Alto pezzo come sopra, quale non resta in opera di quadretti 18½ . . .
An Altar Frontal for the Jesuit Church in Rome after an Unknown Design by Rubens

The subjects of this study are two unknown altar frontals, or antependia, woven in Brussels by the same workshop in 1636 and 1644 for two Jesuit churches in Italy (figs. 1, 2). Our initial examination of the earlier-woven altar frontal (fig. 1), now in a private collection, led to a number of important observations. The format leaves no doubt that the tapestry was designed as an antependium. The dimensions (91 by 295 cm), particularly the narrow height, indicate that it was meant to hang in front of an altar as decoration on specific occasions. Antependia executed in tapestry were not uncommon at the time, but few examples survive.² In the present instance, however, the quality of execution is extraordinary: the weaving is extremely fine and contains a large quantity of gold and silver threads.

The beautiful design of the subject depicted, the Circumcision of Christ, not a common theme in tapestry, also attests to its quality. It was executed with great care and features splendid details, such as the softness of Mary’s facial features and the characteristically rustic appearance of the shepherds (figs. 9, 7). These aspects indicate that the tapestry was not simply a routine workshop piece, but rather an important and costly commission.

The style of the work suggests that it was designed during the first half of the seventeenth century, probably by a South Netherlandish artist, in all likelihood one active in Antwerp. Identifying the designer was our first step, so one by one we considered various artists of the time and place—Peter Paul Rubens, Anthonis Sallaert, Jan Boeckhorst, Jan van den Hoecke—but none of these is known to have produced designs for an altar frontal. We ended up with Cornelis Schut. Thanks to the study by Gertrude Wilmers, we have a fairly good idea of this painter’s oeuvre, which includes a painting depicting the Circumcision that is in Sint Carolus Borromeus, formerly the church of the Antwerp Jesuits (fig. 3).² That scene combines the Circumcision with the Adoration of the Shepherds, an aspect so prominent that the painting is often catalogued as an Adoration in publications other than Wilmers’s.³ The work was produced after Schut’s return from Italy in 1631, sometime around 1640. The composition of the painting is in the opposite direction from that of the antependium, but there are a number of striking similarities—as well as notable differences—between the works in the various figure groups, details, and overall sense of space. The last is for the most part a result of the considerable difference in the works’ dimensions: the painting is 200 by 420 centimeters, while the antependium, as noted, is 91 by 295 centimeters. Additionally, while there are obvious similarities in composition and iconography, the style of the two works differs significantly.

Wilmers refers to a document in the city archives of Brussels that mentions two versions of the same subject, the Circumcision, woven by De Clerck as antependia.⁴ The document, recently reexamined, is dated July 27, 1644, and concerns a petition addressed to city authorities by the weaver.
Jan de Clerck (De Clerc, Le Clerc; ca. 1600–1672), in which he requested privileges. He mentioned two antependia that he had woven and, in support of his request, explained that he had made a piece depicting the Circumcision for the Jesuit fathers in Rome and that this work was highly appreciated. Indeed, three days earlier he had shown the Brussels authorities a similar work that he had made for the Jesuit society in Genoa after they had been informed of the antependium in Rome. Without doubt, these were prestigious commissions of which the weaver was rightly proud. The additional information in the document—which Alphonse Wauters did not mention—is that the work had been delivered to the Jesuits in Rome eight years earlier, or in 1636, a point that will prove highly important in the discussion that follows. It is notable that also in 1636, De Clerck was admitted as a master in the weavers’ guild. He may have used the Rome antependium to support his candidacy for that position. Unfortunately, there is no mention of the designer of that tapestry.
Knowing that a depiction of the Circumcision was delivered to the church of Il Gesù in Rome in 1636, it was next necessary for us to see whether it was still there, whether we could determine how it looked then, and whether it could be the first edition. The tapestry is no longer in the church, but we know it was there at some point: on September 27, 1639, Cardinal Antonio Barberini, nephew of Pope Urban VIII, organized a celebration of the Jesuit order’s hundredth anniversary, and Antonio Gerardi published an account of the event that included a description of the church. An abridged version of Gerardi’s account was also published in Dutch. In both versions, the antependium is described and praised. In the Italian version, we read (here in translation): “In the middle of this scene rose the altar covered in a magnificent frontal, woven of silk and gold for use as a tapestry, representing the Mystery of the Circumcision of the Lord, with the liveliness of design and fineness of workmanship that you expect from the hand of the renowned Jan Paul Rubens, fame of the painters over the mountain range, and of Flemish artists, who are not equaled; it

beguiled the eye, even from close by, to believe that it is a woven piece and not painted: rather this is not the merit of the weaver, but of nature itself, so alive are the images.” In the Dutch version, the refinement of the pattern and weaving is also praised, and it is also remarked that even from nearby the viewer would think he was looking at a painting. As we shall see, this mistake about the medium has persisted up to the present. However, the Dutch description gives information that does not appear in the Italian edition, namely, that the piece was woven in Brussels two or three years earlier; and for some unspecified reason, the reference to Rubens was replaced by a more general allusion to Netherlandish artists.

The occasion of Pope Urban VIII’s visit to Il Gesù on October 20, 1639, is also recorded in a painting by Andrea Sacchi, Jan Miel, and Filippo Gagliardi (Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica, Palazzo Barberini, Rome). It is a panoramic view of the decorated church, but in it the main altar is too small and insufficiently detailed to identify the antependium. Investigations in the Barberini Archives in the Vatican Library produced no trace of the tapestry, which
suggests that Antonio Barberini was not the patron. This is in contrast to the other tapestries and rich fabrics in the church, which came from his collection. Rather surprisingly, none of these tapestries depicted a religious subject. Hence, the antependium on the main altar was clearly a special case.

Who did pay for this tapestry cannot be established with any certainty. Nor did additional research in the Jesuit archives produce absolutely conclusive results. The antependium is mentioned twice in the accounts of the sacristy: first on December 15, 1637, when 114 scudi were paid for the “frontale, tessuto di fiamma”; and then several months later, on March 11, 1638, when a certain Carmella received 128.80 scudi for “delle spese e fatiche fatte intorno al frontale di fiamma della Circoncisione” (for the expenses and hard work concerning the Flemish frontal of the Circumcision). The size of the sums is considerable, as well as logical given the richness of the tapestry. When compared to the amounts Barberini paid for his tapestries, it seems possible that the sums in question could be purchase installments, made with the help of Carmella, about whom nothing else is known.

In later descriptions of Il Gesù, among others Filippo Titi’s of 1674 and Giuseppe Vasi’s of 1763, the antependium is not mentioned at all, but it is mentioned in inventories of the church, the last time in 1840. Later in the nineteenth century, the main...
altar created by Giacomo della Porta was replaced by a new one. The tabernacle found a new home in Ireland, but the fate of the antependium remained a mystery until now.

Could the antependium shown here in figure 1 be the same one described by Gerardi? The chance is great. In 1878, Monseigneur Xavier Barbier de Montault described a tapestry depicting the Circumcision in the private collection of a Mr. Falconi in Rome (here in translation): “The scene takes place in a stable. Saint Joseph has just circumcised the Infant Jesus, whom the Virgin has held on her knees during the ritual operation. Two women bring some water to wash the blood that has flowed. The angels, holding the instruments of the future Passion, seem to say to Christ that that is the beginning of his sufferings and the spilling of his blood. The shepherds draw near to worship the incarnate Son of God. It must be admitted that they are rather late, because this is the eighth day, and the angel informed them the same night the Savior came into the world in a stable in Bethlehem.” From this description—particularly the mention of the angels with the instruments of the Passion, the presence of two women, and the shepherds at the manger—there is no doubt that that scene corresponds to the one depicted in the present tapestry. Since the tapestry described was then in Rome and since there had recently been significant changes in Il Gesù, it is highly likely that Barbier de Montault was referring to the antependium, which had been sold from the reserves of the church. We cannot provide conclusive proof, such as comparing the dimensions of the altar with those of the tapestry. But it seems quite unlikely that there were that many other tapestries with the same subject—at

Fig. 7. Detail of the left side of fig. 1

Fig. 8. Detail of the left side of fig. 2
Fig. 9. Detail of the center of fig. 1

Fig. 10. Detail of the center of fig. 2
least none that we know of. We may further assume that the version made for Il Gesù in Rome was in all probability the antependium under discussion here.

To test our hypothesis, it was necessary to investigate the version woven in 1644 for the Jesuit church in Genoa (fig. 2). Wilmers refers to a photograph of an antependium with a Circumcision that dates to 1967 in the documentation on file at the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence. In it, we see a composition very similar to the one in the earlier tapestry. In addition, the similarities between this image and the painting by Schut in the church of Sint Carolus Borromeus in Antwerp are even greater (fig. 3).

In the Kunsthistorisches Institut photo archives, the tapestry depicted is catalogued as Flemish, about 1665, and in the church of Santi Ambrogio e Andrea in Genoa, and the name of the cartoon painter is listed as Jean de Clerc. There ensued a difficult, time-consuming search that lasted two years and produced no results. No one recognized the antependium from the black-and-white photograph, not even the sexton of the church. How this could have happened recently became evident. The people responsible for the church inventories thought they were looking at a painted canvas, and thus our inquiry about an arazzo, or tapestry, was consistently met with incomprehension. This substantiated Gerardi’s statement about the possibility of confusing the tapestry with a painting. With the help of Italian friends, however, the work was finally recognized. Seeing it for the first time was a shock. The poor quality of the photograph had not prepared us for the tapestry’s striking freshness, which can be explained by the fact that since its purchase in 1644 the antependium has been placed before the altar every year only for the period from Christmas Eve until the Feast of the Circumcision on January 2. The quantity of the metal-wrapped thread used is also noteworthy and forms a remarkable contrast to the intense, well-preserved colors. Another important discovery is the
name of the weaver, *Ian de Clerc*, in gold (fig. 5). That gilt-metal-wrapped thread was used for the signature is exceptional given the cost of the thread, and it is even more surprising since its location—the upper left-hand corner—makes it invisible to the viewer. During our examination, we discovered the year 1644, also woven in gold, under the protective cloth that was applied later (fig. 6). Both the name and the year correspond to the information in the 1644 De Clerck petition in Brussels, leaving no doubt about the direct connection between the two. The difference in the spelling of the weaver’s name is interesting in itself. It has been assumed that Jan de Clerck and his son Jeroen (Hieronymus; 1643–1722) used the same signature and initials;26 until now, no single work has been securely attributed to the father. Further, the name woven into the tapestry is *Ian de Clerc*, not *Ian le Clerc*,27 which is what the son used—in other words, father and son may not always have used the same signature.

On the reverse, painted on the lining of the tapestry, we find the date 1645, the arms of the Pallavicino family, and a depiction of the Evangelist Luke.28 Members of that family were responsible for the construction of the church of Santi Ambrogio e Andrea and later for commissioning its decorations, including two paintings by Rubens.29 One of these, for the main altar, was a Circumcision, delivered in 1605. In the context of our investigation, this is not without importance, for we know from Jan de Clerck’s petition that the antependium in Genoa was made following the success of the version in Rome. Were the clerics themselves familiar with the first version and therefore decided to order one for themselves? Or was the Genoa version acquired thanks to members of the Pallavicino family in Rome?

Does the representation of Saint Luke at the back of the antependium indicate that it was given to the church by someone from the Pallavicino family with the first name Luca? No such family member has been found. Perhaps, then, it refers to the Gospel according to Saint Luke in which the Circumcision of the infant Jesus is briefly described (2:21). The event took place on the eighth day after the Nativity, or January 2. The representation of the Circumcision of Christ was very specific to the Jesuit congregation because at the moment of the ritual he received the name Jesus, which the Jesuits would adopt as the name of their order.

The connection between the Jesuits and the iconography of the Circumcision is supported by the engraving made after Schüt's
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blood spilled during the Circumcision and the river of blood that would flow at the end of Christ’s life for the salvation of humanity. That is, the instruments of the Passion complement the message of the Circumcision. While this may seem obvious, the two themes were apparently combined here for the first time. According to Wilmers, the complexity of the composition is typical of Schut’s work; Rubens’s inventions generally exhibited greater clarity. However, the well thought out iconography is characteristic of Rubens’s Jesuit advisers, bearing some resemblance to the thirty-nine ceiling paintings Rubens executed for the church of Sint Carolus Borromeus in 1620–21. We know that Rubens was highly innovative, and he did combine the Circumcision with large angels hovering above the scene in the painting preserved in Genoa. However, there are simply no concrete indications that he was responsible for the new iconographic combination of the Circumcision with the Adoration of the Shepherds.

The similarities between the altar frontal in Genoa and the painting by Schut in Antwerp (figs. 2, 3) are greater than the ones between the altar frontal made for Rome and the Schut painting, and the differences between the two altar frontals are considerable (figs. 1, 2). The tapestries were certainly not made from the same cartoon. This is noteworthy because the design and execution of cartoons were expensive affairs, and it was in the weaver’s best interest to reuse them, especially when the subject was not particularly popular and there was little demand for it. Why, then, was it necessary to make a new cartoon? Here it is possible to put forward different hypotheses. Since the two weavings were separated by a period of eight years, the original cartoon may not still have existed or was not available to the weaver or his patrons. Or perhaps it was no longer in the artist’s studio; perhaps the artist himself had died by 1644. With no surviving cartoon, the question also arises as to how the com-

Fig. 14. Peter Paul Rubens, preparatory sketch for the Adoration of the Shepherds. Oil on panel, 46 × 34 cm. Rubenshuis, Antwerp (S 123). Photograph: © Collectiebeleid Musea Antwerpen

painting (fig. 4). There the composition was extended vertically, with the monogram of Jesus—the sign of the Jesuits—added above the hovering angels bearing the instruments of the Passion, and the landscape in the background was replaced by an architectural ruin. The final line of the inscription beneath refers to the painting’s destination in the Houtappel Chapel in the Antwerp Jesuit church, Sint Carolus Borromeus. Further, according to the inscription, there is a clear connection between the drops of
position was transferred. Here, too, there are various possibilities. The same artist may have been asked to make a new cartoon on the basis of the modello, but given the differences between the two compositions this seems unlikely. More probably, another artist was asked to make a cartoon on the basis of sketches of the antependium made by artists in Rome or on the basis of information that was still available in the weaver's studio.

The most significant differences in the compositions of the antependia are the following:

—The left sides, which feature the shepherds, differ in the numbers of shepherds and their poses, gender, and dress. In the Genoa panel there is also a figure in the left background. Only the kneeling figure behind the low wall at the right of the group of shepherds is similar in both panels (figs. 7, 8).

—The angels with the instruments of the Passion above Mary differ in number, in position, and in the location of the instruments. The column and the cross with the Crown of Thorns have switched places in the two tapestries. The center scenes are otherwise quite similar, except for the pose of the angel on the left and Joseph's posture and garments; in particular his legs are different, and he wears a different kind of shoe in each scene (figs. 9, 10).

—The right sides of the tapestries (figs. 11, 12), with two assisting maidservants, also vary, but to a lesser degree. In the Genoa version, the head of a third woman is visible between the two, which are not quite as close to each other as they are in the Rome version. The shape of the pitcher on the ground between the maidservants and Joseph differs, as does its location.

—The ox and the ass at the far right of each tapestry indicate that, in contrast to what was usually the custom with Circumcision
scenes, the event is taking place at a manger and not in the Temple. The animals also vary between the antependia, as for example in the hooves of the asses and the heads of the reeling oxen.

In addition to the compositional differences between the tapestries, there are also significant variations in style, which must be attributed to the two different cartoons used by the weaving atelier:

—Small differences between the placement of elements in the Genoa and Rome tapestries, such as the angel’s foot in the left foreground or the upraised hoof of the ass (figs. 9 and 10, 11 and 12), lend the Genoa version a greater dynamism. This kind of contrived pose is characteristic of the style of Cornelis Schut. The Rome version, by contrast, is more balanced, primarily because of the arrangement of the shepherds on the left (figs. 7, 8). It is extended rather than compact, so that the whole is in equilibrium.

—The freshness of the colors used in the Genoa antependium is striking, but so are the more extreme color contrasts, which lend the whole a rather hard appearance. The palette is quite rich, a quality that also stands out in the Seven Liberal Arts, Schut’s most important tapestry design.46 The difference is particularly noticeable, for example, in the clothing of the woman to the right of Joseph (fig. 12). The fall of the folds is much straighter, more sculptural, less fluid than in the Rome version (fig. 11).

—A comparable stiffness can be observed in the elaboration of the faces in the Genoa version (fig. 10). They are all less modeled, a quality that is most noticeable in the central figure group consisting of Mary and the infant Jesus. In the Rome version, the flow of lines is softer, suppler (fig. 9).

Another striking difference between the tapestries is that the Rome version does not feature either the name of the weaver or the date. The border consists simply of a surround in chapeau (basket weave), weaving in relief by introducing gilt-metal-wrapped thread raised over various warp threads and which was not unusual during this period. (It can also be found on the Story of Noah by Guillaume van Corten Berg.) The blue selvage in which the identifying data are woven on the Genoa piece is absent from the Rome piece; whether it was ever present can no longer be determined. In addition to the selvage, now covered, as already mentioned, the tapestry in Genoa has borders in chapeau both inside and outside a frame of trompe l’ceil wood molding (fig. 6).

We can conclude from these differences and the great similarities between the antependium in Genoa and the painting in Antwerp that Cornelis Schut is undoubtedly the author of the second cartoon. Wilmers proposed a date of about 1640 for the painting on the basis of the date of completion of the Houtappel Chapel, but without conclusive proof. We know that the cartoon had to have been executed before 1644, since the tapestry was finished in July. Hence, it is very probable that the painting and the cartoon date from the same period and that the painting dates to a few years later than has been proposed. Perhaps the Antwerp Jesuits were asked to evaluate the cartoon, and their enthusiasm was so great that they commissioned a painting of the same theme from Schut. Given the difference in dimensions—the painting is 200 by 420 centimeters, and the antependium in Genoa is 101 by 277 centimeters—it is unlikely that the painting served as a cartoon for the weaving. However, we know that a second painting of the same subject by Schut must have existed.48 It was sold in 1779 as confiscated property after the Jesuit order was suppressed in 1773. The dimensions of this work were 121 by 290 centimeters—closer to those of the antependium.

According to Wilmers, Schut was the author of the cartoons for both of the antependia. However, on the basis of the evidence presented here, the differences between the two tapestries are too great for this to have been the case. We must look to
the possible link with Rubens, who died in 1640 and would therefore have been unable to make the second cartoon.\textsuperscript{39}

Comparison with tapestry series designed by Rubens is difficult because of the considerable differences in format. Instead of the usual 4–5-meter height in which his creations were executed, we are confronted with a height of 90 centimeters, which gives the work in question an entirely different aspect. Nevertheless, there are definite similarities between the palette of the Rome antependium and the colors used by Rubens for his \textit{Triumph of the Eucharist},\textsuperscript{10} designed in 1625–27, and both differ considerably from the palette normally employed by Schut.

We should point out that there is no correspondence between the Rome antependium and the only known composition by Rubens featuring a Circumcision. As noted earlier, the painting hangs in the church of Santi Ambrogio e Andrea in Genoa and dates to 1605.\textsuperscript{31} The painted scene takes place in a traditional temple instead of in a stable. The only similarity to the antependium is the employment of larger angels, albeit without the instruments of the Passion. However, according to Professor Gauvin Bailey (Clark University, Worcester, Mass.), it is precisely the act of combining the Circumcision with the instruments of the Passion that would have been an innovation typical of Rubens. Could the Jesuits in Genoa have decided to opt for an antependium known to have been designed by Rubens in order to place it under an altar featuring his painting of the same theme? We must remember that in 1639, Gerardi attributed the work in Rome to Rubens.

Even more important for an attribution to Rubens or his studio are figures in the Rome antependium that have been discovered in preparatory drawings or finished paintings by Rubens. The most striking of these are the following:

—The same reclining ox also appears in Rubens's \textit{Adoration of the Shepherds} in Rouen, painted in 1621.\textsuperscript{32} In a drawing with a similar composition, the animal is in the same position (fig. 13). Further, in 1620 a nearly identical composition was published as an engraving, which would have contributed to its dissemination.\textsuperscript{13}

—In the group of shepherds, we find similarities to the \textit{Adoration} in Rouen (note 32). The young shepherd with bowed head and his hat in hand resembles the young shepherd in the tapestry. The older shepherd and Joseph, both in the middle ground, have bearded faces that resemble the two older shepherds of the antependium. A similarly bearded shepherd in an attitude of prayer, with his head bowed like the kneeling shepherd in the antependium, is found in a sketch made by Rubens for another \textit{Adoration of the Shepherds} (fig. 14).

—We also find similarities between an angel in the tapestry and an angel painted by Rubens between 1616 and 1620 in the \textit{Ecstasy of Mary Magdalen}, now in Lille.\textsuperscript{14} The supporting angel assumes a tense pose resembling that of the kneeling angel on the far left in the antependium.

—But the most eye-catching similarity by far is between three sketches of women's heads made by Rubens (figs. 15–17) in preparation for the San Ildefonso Altarpiece, now in Vienna,\textsuperscript{15} and the principle female heads of the antependium. In one of the drawings, the woman has a delicate, finely chiseled face like that of Mary (figs. 15, 9). The heads in the other two drawings—one frontal and the other in profile—resemble the rounder faces of the two maidservants standing right in the antependium (figs. 16, 17, 11). The heads in the drawings and tapestry are by no means identical, but they are so closely related that, in all probability, the same hand that executed the drawings also contributed to these areas of the tapestry cartoon. In fact, one of the women's heads in the \textit{Assumption of the Virgin} in the Cathedral of Antwerp, which dates to 1626–27, closely resembles that of Mary and one of the maidservants.\textsuperscript{16}

New research into Rubens's studio and its workings, conducted on the occasion of the
exhibition in 2007–8 at the Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium in Brussels, has shown that Rubens was involved with several extensive projects in the years 1635–40, and that in order to fulfill his obligations, he relied on the studios of his artist friends. Preparatory head studies like the ones shown here ensured that Rubens’s studio functioned efficiently—particularly important when it was necessary to bring in independent artist “subcontractors” at various stages of the production process, as it was during the 1630s.

We are aware, of course, that an attribution solely on the basis of stylistic traits is not without risk, but if one takes into consideration the qualities of the presumed cartoon along with the prestige of the commission and the richness of the weave, it is hard not to conclude that, for such an important work, the patron must have relied on a Flemish artist of stature—and in 1636, few designers of tapestry come to mind who would have met this qualification.

My investigation would not have been possible without the help of countless colleagues and friends: David Fransen, Simon Fransen, Gertrude Wilmers, Pascal Bertrand, Francesca Cecchi, Nathan Levi, Lucia Meoni, Florence Patrizi, Laura Zaccagnini, Robert Bireley, Antien Knaap, Gauvin Alexander Bailey, Joost Van der Auwera, Arnout Balis, Nora De Poorter, Mark Vanderven, Hans Vlieghe, Martine Vanwelden, Irene Schaudies, and many others.
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36. For an illustration of the Assumption of the Virgin, see Rubens, p. 208.

The Sun Also Riseth:  
The Barberini Apollo Series as an Allegory of Rise, Fall, and Return

Cardinal Francesco Barberini (1597–1679) had an extraordinarily close relationship with the private tapestry manufactory that he founded in Rome in 1627, and all the series produced on the Barberini looms bore personal associations to the cardinal and his family. The splendid pastoral Stories of Apollo, a five-panel cycle designed by Clemente Maioli and woven from 1659 to 1665, is no exception. While legible and enjoyable on a straightforward narrative level (Apollo’s myths do, after all, include some great stories), the images also mobilize a web of poetic and philological allusions of the sort that were accessible and appealing to members of the hyper-erudite circles that gathered around Cardinal Barberini. This essay, the first sustained art historical treatment of the series, argues that, through such a web of allusions, the tapestries allegorize the cardinal as the Greco-Roman sun god Apollo. Even more specifically, the contextually based reading provided in this essay interprets the program’s iconographic choices, collectively, as a commentary on Francesco Barberini’s own personal experience of fall, exile, and return to power.

While the choice of Apollo as a subject for a princely decorative cycle is hardly unusual, the combination of scenes chosen for the Barberini tapestries is. The subjects of the panels, in the order in which they were woven, are Apollo and Daphne (1659–60), Apollo Exchanging Gifts with Mercury (1660–61), the Flaying of Marsyas (1661–62), Apollo and the Muses on Mount Parnassus (1662–63), and Latona Cursing the Lycian Peasants (probably 1663–64; figs. 1–5). Some of these themes, like Apollo and Daphne, are fairly common in seventeenth-century art; others, like the unpleasant theme of Latona Cursing the Lycian Peasants, are relatively rare. The combination of the five is unique and, knowing what we know about Cardinal Barberini’s patterns of art patronage, must be deliberate and adherent to an internal logic. Apart from the obvious, that they all treat Apollonian themes, the unity of the tapestry scenes is difficult to pinpoint. It is often imprecisely called the Metamorphoses, a name that would imply that the series had a unifying source in Ovid’s first-century narrative poem of the same name. Yet though most of them are Ovidian, not all of them are. Nor does the Barberini series have a discernible mytho-narrative unity: the stories are isolated from one another and are not connected by any sort of sequential flow. Yet the selection of stories cannot have been random: Francesco Barberini cared too much about art and knew too fully its symbolic potential to see a sloppy job done with the program. In fact, he would have been even more attentive than usual: Not only was tapestry the most expensive and labor-intensive of the monumental media, but the cardinal’s private ownership of the only manufactory in Rome was also an important component of his public image. Not random at all, the choices of the Apollo scenes do adhere to an iconographic unity, but one that was imposed on the myths from outside. The unity emerges when one recognizes the
tapestry cycle as an allegory that uses the exploits of the sun god as a vehicle to comment on political and personal events of the 1640s and 1650s.

Of the several authors who have treated the series, only Candace Adelson and Pascal-François Bertrand have bothered to speak about any meaning beyond the primary, narrative level. Adelson offered a few sentences in her 1994 Minneapolis catalogue, speculating that the tapestries may have been intended as “a compliment to the young King Louis XIV.” And Bertrand included a short paragraph in his 2005 book, reading the series as an allegorical tribute to Urban VIII and his papacy. I share Bertrand’s conviction that the key to the series lies in its Roman, Barberinian context rather than in the world of Louis XIV. But unlike Bertrand, I believe that they
allegorize the pope’s cardinal nephew rather than the pope himself. I offered some initial thoughts on this interpretation in the Metropolitan Museum’s 2007 exhibition catalogue *Tapestry in the Baroque: Threads of Splendor.*13 This essay expands on those thoughts and considers the *Stories of Apollo* as a strategic attempt on the part of Cardinal Francesco Barberini to take possession of the unruly political and personal narrative that fate had dealt him in the wake of the death of his uncle Pope Urban VIII.

**THE CARDINAL NIPOTE**

Francesco Barberini had an extraordinary career. In August 1623, the twenty-five-year-old saw his uncle elevated to the papacy as Urban VIII. Francesco was sum-
moned to Rome that day and was made a cardinal two months later. As the eldest and most capable of the pope’s nephews, he assumed the quasi-official position of cardinal nipote (cardinal nephew) in the papal court, a position that mingled aspects of a prime minister and a secretary of state with those of a gatekeeper, sidekick, hatchet man, and sounding board. The cardinal nephews were the closest things the Baroque popes had to sons, and these protégés were heirs to the ecclesiastical and political legacies of their uncles. At the pinnacle of power for years or even decades (the average seventeenth-century pontificate lasted nine years; Urban VIII’s lasted twenty-one), each cardinal nipote had, upon his uncle’s death, to carefully negotiate his passage.

Fig. 3. Apollo Exchanging Gifts with Mercury from the set of the Stories of Apollo. Tapestry cartoon by Clemente Maioli, woven in the Barberini workshop under the direction of Maria Maddalena della Riviera, Rome, 1660–61. Wool and silk, 420 × 470 cm. Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica, Rome
from absolute power to a secondary role in a new pope's Rome. He was not powerless: an ex-nipote could still command the loyalty of his uncle's "creatures" in subsequent conclaves. And all cardinal nephews were aware that if they handled things cleverly, they could become "kingmakers" or even viable candidates themselves at some point in the future. But at the same time, they were also aware of certain dangers. Enemies who dared not speak while the pope was alive often came forward once he was dead, using the nephew as the focus for grudges they had silently nursed during the pontificate. New cardinal nephews, moreover, could often regard their immediate predecessors as dangerously powerful. The stories of Francesco Barberini's three immediate predecessors are instructive: Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini was exiled to Ravenna during
the Borghese pontificate; Scipione Borghese suffered a forceful eclipse of his role at the papal court under the Ludovisi; and Ludovico Ludovisi was, in turn, sent off to Bologna during the early years of the Barberini pontificate. As Ludovisi’s uncle Pope Gregory XV had warned him, “[T]here is no position more difficult or more dangerous than that of a cardinal nephew after the death of his uncle. I have seen—many times—those who, even though they were considered prudent and shrewd, nonetheless took a bad slip while descending the stairs.”

For Cardinal Francesco Barberini, who had to descend them upon Urban’s death in 1644, the metaphoric stairs were greased by the unpopularity of his uncle’s government at the end of the pontificate and bananas peeled by the election of Innocent X Pamphili (r. 1644–55), a pope who was determined to distance himself from the regime of his predecessors. Openly hostile toward the Barberini nephews, Innocent ordered investigations into Urban’s nepotism and into the nephews’ administration of the army during the ongoing War of Castro. Things got bad enough that in early 1646

Fig. 5. Apollo and the Muses on Mount Parnassus from the set of the Stories of Apollo. Tapestry cartoon by Clemente Maioli, woven in the Barberini workshop under the direction of Maria Maddalena della Riviera, Rome, 1662–63. Wool and silk, 420 x 280 cm. Collection of Yves Mikaeloff, Paris. Photograph: Research Library, The Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles (97.P.7), © J. Paul Getty Trust
Cardinal Barberini fled in disguise to France, where he joined his brothers under the protection of their old protégé Cardinal Jules Mazarin, now first minister to Louis XIV. It was not clear whether the exile would be temporary or permanent. Despite all, though, Cardinal Barberini managed a comeback through the forceful intervention of the French and through dogged diplomacy of his own. In 1648 he returned to Rome, where Innocent X restored his confiscated property and curial offices. He continued to work on ingratiating himself with the new regime, carefully building a Barberini-Pamphili alliance. This process would conclude, definitively and triumphantly, in June 1653. On the fifteenth of that month, Cardinal Francesco’s nephew Maffeo Barberini the Younger married Innocent X’s granddaughter Olimpia Giustiniani. And eight days later, on the twenty-third, the pope elevated Maffeo’s brother, Carlo Barberini the Younger, to the cardinalate. Cardinal Antonio Barberini, the most controversial of the family members and the one to tarry longest in France, returned to Rome a few weeks later, on July 12. The Apollo series was the first new commission the Barberini tapestry manufactory took up in the wake of this impressive comeback.

THE GODS OF PAPAL ROME

Even during the Counter-Reformation, few at the papal court were troubled by the use of pagan gods to allegorically demonstrate points about good rulership, dynastic destiny, and even Catholic faith or the Church’s role in the world. Greco-Roman paganism was, of course, so thoroughly eclipsed as a belief system that its protagonists were regarded not as rival deities but as readily legible symbols. The moderns referenced ancient literary texts like Ovid’s Metamorphoses as sources of moral wisdom, reading in them lessons that paralleled and prefigured the messages of the Christian exegetes. As Cardinal Silvio Antoniano put it in a letter to the cardinal nipote Pietro Aldobrandini, “[M]yths, even though

Fig. 6. Domenichino and assistants, Apollo Killing the Cyclopes, 1616–18. Fresco on canvas mounted on board, 316.3 × 190.4 cm. National Gallery, London (NG6290). Photograph: © National Gallery, London
they are false, have regard and relation to the truth.” 17

As rulers, the Baroque popes naturally met comparison to Jupiter, king of the gods. While the analogy is fairly self-evident, the title the Baroque popes employed, Pontifex Optimus Maximus (abbreviated as P.O.M.), resonated directly with Jupiter’s standard Capitoline appellation, Jupiter Optimus Maximus. 18 The identification of the pope with Jupiter was repeated in panegyric poetry as well as in the visual arts, with one of the grandest Baroque examples found in the loggia vault (1624–25) that Giovanni Lanfranco frescoed for Cardinal Scipione Borghese at the Villa Borghese in Rome. Borghese was the cardinal nipote of Paul V, whose suffering under Gregory XV was alleviated by Gregory’s early death and the election of Maffeo Barberini as Pope Urban VIII. In the ceiling fresco, best titled the Reunion of the Gods, Lanfranco’s Jupiter presides over a scene of reconciliation and the restoration of order to the heavens. On an allegorical level, the king of the gods is meant to be legible as the newly elected Urban VIII, and the concord of the heavens as an expression of the return of tranquility (from Scipione’s point of view) that accompanied Urban’s election. 19 Several years later, planning the ceiling of the gran salone in the Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane, Pietro da Cortona initially intended to allegorize Urban again as “a majestic Jupiter, to indicate by that image the majesty and felicity of the reigning pontiff.” 20 Though the pope rejected the idea, the fact that Cortona felt comfortable suggesting it indicates the currency of this convention.

Just as the pope was often compared to Jupiter, the cardinal nipote was often compared to Jupiter’s loyal son and oft-time agent Apollo. In Lanfranco’s Villa Borghese ceiling, the figure of Apollo, prominent in the foreground in Jupiter’s orderly empyrean, has been read as representing Scipione Borghese. 21 Nor would this have been the first instance of Paul V’s nephew self-identifying as Apollo: at his Quirinal

Fig. 7. Impresa of Maffeo Barberini, ALIUSQUE ET IDEM. Engraving in Giovanni Ferro, Teatro d’imprese (Venice, 1623), vol. 2, p. 659. Photograph: © Board of Trustees, National Gallery of Art, National Gallery of Art Library, Washington, D.C.

villa across town, Scipione had a garden casino dedicated to Apollo’s Muses and another dedicated to Aurora, the goddess of dawn who heralds Apollo’s arrival. In the ceiling fresco that Guido Reni painted in the latter pavilion (now known as the Casino Rospigliosi-Pallavicini), Aurora scatters flowers as Apollo pilots his solar chariot across the sky. Together they bring a lux borghesiana to the world and symbolize the dawn of a new golden age under the administration of Pope Paul V and his Apollonian nephew. 22 Guercino expressed the same metaphor in the Aurora fresco that he painted for Borghese’s successor and
persecutor, Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi, in the Casino Ludovisi on the Pincio.\textsuperscript{33}

Another important precedent for the Barberini Apollo series was the Sala di Parnaso, a commission of Pietro Aldobrandini, the cardinal 

nipote of Pope Clement VIII. At his Villa Belvedere in Frascati, he built a pavilion dedicated to Apollo as a pendant to the villa’s chapel, the symmetry indicating the importance of Apollo in the cardinal’s representational system.\textsuperscript{34} The interior featured a sculpted Mount Parnassus with Apollo and the Muses and ten scenes from the life of Apollo frescoed by Domenichino and his assistants from 1616 to 1618 (fig. 6). Art connoisseur and Aldobrandini courtier Giovanni Battista Agucchi devised the program.\textsuperscript{35} In early 1611, shortly after Cardinal Aldobrandini’s return from the exile that he had suffered under Scipione Borghese, Agucchi authored a celebratory text about the villa, the Relazione della Villa Belvedere. Predating the Sala di Parnaso by five years, the Relazione obviously does not mention it; but it does explain (among other things) the personal relevance of other frescoed rooms to the patron or to the Aldobrandini family in general. Agucchi specified, for instance, that one room’s sequence of God’s Creation of the Plants and Animals, the Temptation of Adam and Eve, and the Expulsion from the Garden of Eden refers to the pleasures of the villa’s gardens and how easy it is to lose such pleasures.\textsuperscript{36} The reference to Pietro Aldobrandini’s exile here is only barely veiled. Though the Sala di Parnaso would not be painted until five years later, it is hard to imagine Agucchi’s passing up the opportunity to insert erudite references to his patron while programming the Apollo cycle there. And, indeed, scholars have consistently pointed to the room as an allegory of the cardinal.\textsuperscript{37} The full meaning of the Sala di Parnaso has yet to be satisfactorily expounded, but the idea of Apollo as the cardinal nipote is an obvious starting point for any responsible interpretation.

The examples of Apollo imagery cited above, only a few of the most prominent ones from the patronage of the papal nephews who directly preceded Francesco Barberini, should suggest that by the time the last commissioned his own Apollo series in 1656, the allegorization of the cardinal nipote as Apollo was conventional. Incidentally, the Aldobrandini frescoes, aside from their influence in the establishment of the convention, may have held even more specific
formal inspiration for the Barberini project. Maioli’s tapestry designs repeat the compositional pattern of Domenichino’s scenes, deploying relatively small figures within the expansive pastoral settings of the “classical landscape.” Suggestively, three of the narrative scenes in the Sala di Parnaso are treated as fictive tapestries, painted as if concealing (nonexistent) windows. Domenichino called attention to this material illusion by scalloping the upper borders of these scenes in imitation of the effect of a textile suspended from a row of hooks, and by showing one scene (Apollo Killing the Cyclopes, fig. 6) playfully swept aside by a chained court dwarf. Yet the Barberini project trumps the Sala di Parnaso’s fictive tapestries with the real thing, tapestry being a medium far more expensive and magnificent than fresco.

PARNAISSUS ON THE QUIRINAL: THE APOLLONIAN BARBERINI

Cardinal nephews did not, of course, have a monopoly on Apollonian imagery. During the same years that Pietro Aldobrandini, Scipione Borghese, and Ludovico Ludovisi were developing a tradition of self-identification with the sun god, the Barberini family had been developing its own independent tradition. Well before he was elected pope, the literary-minded Cardinal Maffeo Barberini had adopted Apollo’s laurel and sun as his own heraldic devices, adding them to the three bees of his coat of arms. Apollo is an appealing role model in general, but there are also certain apian connections, coming from a range of classical sources, that rendered his attributes particularly well suited to Maffeo Barberini. According to Varro, the bees are the “birds of the Muses,” an Apollonian epithet that became commonplace through subsequent use. And the art of beekeeping, according to Nonnus and others, was introduced to mankind by Apollo’s son Aristeas. Finally (and significantly, for its source in the Homeric Hymn to Mercury), the Thraeae, a trio of bee-maidens who reside on Apollo’s Mount Parnassus, make a tidy parallel to the Barberini coat of arms.

Self-fashioning as he forged his career at the Roman court, Maffeo Barberini adopted Apollo and devised a set of personal impresse that mobilized Apollonian texts and images. One of his favorite impresse featured the rising sun, along with the motto Alisique et idem (Another and yet the same), a phrase from Horace’s Carmen Saeculare that riffs on the rising sun to suggest rebirth and the cyclical nature of things. The metaphor parallels that of the book of Ecclesiastes (1:5), which states, “The sun also riseth, and the sun goeth down, and hasteth to his place where he arose.” As the impresa appears in Giovanni Ferro’s 1623 Teatro d’imprese, the cartouche at the center is glossed by figures and symbols in the margins, including at top a figure of Apollo and his handmaiden Clio, the Muse of History (fig. 7). The symbol of the sun, one of the most forcefully positive available in heraldry, appears again and again in Barberini projects, both public and private, including Gian Lorenzo Bernini’s baldacchino in Saint Peter’s Basilica, the Fontana della Barcaccia in the Piazza di Spagna, and the facades of the family’s palaces in Rome and Palestrina. And Apollo’s sacred plant, the laurel, appears as often in the commissions of the pope and his nephews: laurel branches wrap around the tortile columns of the baldacchino, garlands of laurel decorate the tomb of Pope Urban VIII nearby, and allegorical figures hoist a thicket of laurel branches into place to frame a trio of oversized bees at the center of Pietro da Cortona’s Divine Providence ceiling in the Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane.

This family palace, an engine of self-representation that panegyrists compared to the Ovidian “Palace of the Sun,” not only included Cortona’s fresco but also featured a ceiling by Andrea Camassei of Apollo and the Muses on Mount Parnassus. Now lost, Camassei’s Parnassus is recorded in a print that illustrated the Aedae Barberinae ad Quirinalem...descriptae, the extended description of
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the palace that Girolamo Teti published in 1642 (fig. 8).\(^8\) A practiced panegyrist, Teti repeatedly made the easy connection between Apollo’s role as the leader of the Muses and Cardinal Francesco’s role as a patron of arts and learning. Teti referred to the cardinal’s library on the top floor of the palace as “the residence of the muses,” and invoked Mount Parnassus in his description of the piano nobile’s Oval Salon, where an informal academy of literary-minded men convened.\(^9\) They called themselves the Purple Swans (Pupurei Cycni) after Apollo’s sacred bird and with the color purple acknowledging that a majority of the members were cardinals.\(^9\) The swan appears at Apollo’s side in the Aliusque et idem impresa (fig. 7), and two swans decorated the pediment over the main entrance to the Oval Salon.

As a cultural leader, patron of the arts, and enthusiastic participant in literary and poetic activities, Cardinal Francesco Barberini was a naturally Apollonian figure. Moreover, as cardinal nipote, he was heir to a set of associations built up by his predecessors: a “New Apollo,” ex officio. And at the same time, as a Barberini and as a resident of the newly constructed “Parnassus on the Quirinal,” he was heir to a family iconography that emphasized Apollo. Finally, and not insignificantly, the cardinal’s own birthday fell on the same day (September 23) as the ancient Roman Festival of Apollo.\(^11\) This coincidence would have mattered to Francesco Barberini: just as a patron saint is the mirror of the man who either shares his name or is born on his feast day, so Apollo would have served as a mirror for the philoclassicist cardinal. Considering this convergence of court tradition, family tradition, natural inclination, and “auspicious birth,” it is hardly surprising that the cardinal should have commissioned a set of tapestries treating the stories of Apollo.

**THE STORIES OF APOLLO**

As mentioned, the Apollo series was the first new commission for the Barberini tapestry manufactory after the return of the family from their French exile.\(^7\) If one accepts Apollo as an allegory for Cardinal Francesco Barberini, then the timing of the commission suggests that the cardinal’s survival of his own postnecrotic crisis may be the interpretive key. And once that key is applied, the collection of stories no longer seems random but assumes a firm order around a set of themes. These themes, which relate to the cardinal’s own biography, are (in sequential order): delusion, exile, vindication, reconciliation, and the restoration of order. Through the surrogate of Apollo, the cycle tracks the cardinal nipote’s disappointment at Urban VIII’s death and his own consequent loss of power, followed by the bewilderment of wandering and the suffering of exile, followed by the reconciliation through diplomacy with a former enemy, and culminating in the restoration of the Barberini to Rome and to their “Parnassus.”

A second, related interpretive key is the Aliusque et idem impresa (fig. 7).\(^4\) Applied to Maffeo Barberini as he was rising through the ranks of the prelature, the impresa suggested that at each stage he was, like the rising sun, “another and yet the same.” In other words, though he wore a new hat (sometimes literally), Maffeo’s virtues and character always remained intact. But the meaning of an impresa is contingent on the identity of its bearer, and impresa designed for one context can gain additional layers of meaning when the bearer’s circumstances change or when the image and motto of the impresa are applied to other contexts. By the time Pietro da Cortona included a cartouche with the rising sun in the north cove of his Divine Providence ceiling in the 1630s, for instance, its core meaning (rebirth) was certainly more broadly applied.\(^4\) And when Cardinal Francesco had the Aliusque et idem impresa included in the borders of certain panels of the Life of Christ series, it became a comment on Christ’s own regenerative nature and the promise of life everlasting that he extends to the faithful. For Cardinal Francesco Barberini in the mid-1650s, the
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idea of being reborn “another and yet the same” could also apply to the “rebirth” of his fortunes after the exile. Broadening from the cardinal to his family, the rising sun is also an apt symbol for the regeneration of the dynasty as young Prince Maffeo and his Pamphilii bride began to produce the next generation of Barberini. As the sun personified, the figure of Apollo suggests in a parallel way the promise of eternal return within the cyclical order of nature.\footnote{45}

\textbf{APOLLO AND DAPHNE}

The reading of the series begins with the \textit{Apollo and Daphne}, the first of the panels to be woven (fig. 1).\footnote{46} The story, from Ovid’s \textit{Metamorphoses}, is well known: the sun god becomes infatuated with a wood nymph, descending to earth to woo her. Terrified, she runs away, but the god runs faster. Just as Apollo is about to lay his hands on her, Daphne prays for help from her father, Peneus, a minor river god, whom Maioli showed reclining on the opposite bank of the stream. Unable to do much against such a powerful Olympian, Peneus saves his daughter by transforming her into a laurel tree. Daphne’s toes sprout roots, and her fingers and hair become leafy branches. Just at the moment Apollo is confident of attaining his goal, he is left deluded, laying his hand on stiffening bark instead of supple flesh.\footnote{47} Maioli showed Apollo and Daphne at the climactic moment of metamorphosis.

As Guy Delmarcel has already pointed out, Maioli quoted Bernini’s celebrated \textit{Apollo and Daphne} (Galleria Borghese, Rome) as he composed this central pair.\footnote{48} Yet Bernini’s sculpture provides more than just a precedent for the tapestry’s composition; it also provides a precedent for its allegorical content. Cardinal Scipione Borghese had commissioned his marble \textit{Apollo and Daphne} in 1622, a year after his uncle Pope Paul V died. The timing is not insignificant: As I have argued elsewhere, the marble group is legible as a metaphor for Borghese’s own difficult experience in the wake of his uncle’s death and his own consequent fall from power.\footnote{49} For the base of Bernini’s sculpture, Borghese asked his friend and fellow cardinal Maffeo Barberini to compose a poetic Latin inscription. The future pope responded with a moralizing epigram that translates, “Whoever, loving, pursues the joys of fleeting beauty fills his hands with leaves or seizes bitter berries.”\footnote{50} In tandem with the inscription, Bernini’s image of the god’s delusion moves beyond the simple narrative level to become an emblem of the vanity of earthly pursuits. At the level of the impresa (the difference between an emblem and an impresa being that the former consists of two interdependent parts, the text and the image, while the latter consists of three—the text, the image, and the identity of the bearer), it refers more specifically to Scipione Borghese’s own experience of the transitory nature of power at the papal court and the fraught experience of the fallen cardinal nephew: Just as Ovid’s Apollo finds himself suddenly deluded when Daphne hardens beneath his touch, the Apollonian nephew in both Bernini’s and Maioli’s treatments finds himself deluded in the face of a parallel sociopolitical hardening. The meaning of the marble group, a Bernini-Borghese-Barberini collaboration, would surely not have been lost on Cardinal Francesco Barberini, who shared his uncle’s love both of Bernini’s sculptures and of moralizing poetry.\footnote{51}

Maioli’s quoting of Bernini’s sculpture for the central figure group of his \textit{Apollo and Daphne} tapestry mobilized a meaning that was both specific and (referencing Maffeo Barberini’s epigram) specifically Barberinian. Reused in the tapestry and redolent with allusion to Bernini’s famous work, Maioli’s \textit{Apollo and Daphne} evokes the delusion that accompanies a cardinal nephew’s sudden fall from power. Running confidently for the twenty-one years of his uncle’s pontificate, Francesco-Apollo suddenly found himself “seizing bitter berries” in 1644, when the Roman court metamorphosed into hard and hostile territory under a new pope. Though this allegory would
have operated without the mediation of Bernini's work, the reference made it that much more powerful and poignant. Cardinal Francesco would end up falling even farther than Scipione Borghese.

LATONA'S CURSE
The theme of exile informs each of the next three panels in the Barberini series: Latona Cursing the Lycian Peasants (fig. 2), Apollo Exchanging Gifts with Mercury (fig. 3), and the Playing of Marsyas (fig. 4). The narratives of the first two are directly predicated on the exile of their protagonists, while the connection between exile and the third is philological. On the allegorical level, this sequence of scenes tells first about the bewilderment of exile and rejection, and then goes on to sound themes of peacemaking, rectification, and the restoration of order, a sequence that parallels the experience of Cardinal Francesco Barberini at the hands of the Pamphili family.

Ovid recounted the story of Apollo's mother Latona in his *Metamorphoses*. Latona (often called Leto) was one of Jupiter's loves, bearing him the twins Apollo and Diana. Jupiter's jealous wife Juno forced the expectant mother and her babies into exile, with no land allowed to welcome her. She gave birth on the floating island of Delos but soon was wandering again with her babies, "at the imperial Juno's rough commands." She paused at a pond in Lycia where, thirsty and exhausted, she asked the peasants at the water's edge if she might take a drink from it. As Ovid wrote, "Whom would these soft persuasions not subdue, / Tho' the most rustic, and unmanner'd crew? / Yet they the Goddess her request refuse, / And with rude words reproachfully abuse: / Nay more, with spiteful feet the villains trod / O'er the soft bottom of the marshy flood, / And blacken'd all the lake with clouds of rising mud." Ovid's rustic, churning up the pond to make the water undrinkable, are an extreme caricature of inhospitality. Latona's response is to lift her hands to heaven and curse them, transforming them into frogs. Maioli depicted this climactic, metamorphic moment of the story: Of the five peasants visible in the fore- and middle ground, one is already a frog, two are still human (though they crawl and cringe like amphibians), and two are shown in the midst of metamorphosis, with frog's heads atop human shoulders (fig. 2). The trio of the goddess and her twin children is a loose copy of Domenico Pieratti's *Latona*, who similarly kneels, with one breast bared and a child clinging to either side. Pieratti's marble, executed between 1629 and 1635 at the commission of Cardinal Francesco, stood in the garden of the Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane before being moved to the main stair, where it stands today. Maioli's borrowing of the poses of the three figures gave his tapestry scene a readily accessible and specific Barberinian resonance and set the viewer up to read the tapestry's Latona specifically as a "Latona Barberiniana."

With or without this visual cue, the parallels between Ovid's exiles and the exiled Barberini follow easily. Like Latona, Cardinal Barberini had an enemy powerful and jealous enough to force him and his brothers from court. And like Latona, he was protecting a pair of destiny-laden children: Maffeo, fourteen years old when he fled to France in 1646, would grow up to be the Prince of Palestrina, while Carlo, sixteen at the time of the flight, would become a cardinal. Both the mythical and historical exiles met hostility in both high and low places (or to borrow the terms laid out in Cardinal Gabriele Paleotti's treatise on images and their audiences, among the *spirituali* and *lettenati* as well as among the *idioti*). If Juno has a seventeenth-century parallel in the powerful Pamphili, Ovid's Lycian peasants have a parallel in baser critics like the unruly mob that, after Urban VIII's death, stormed the Campidoglio, intent on destroying a statue of the pope that stood there.

Ovid's punishments often exquisitely suit the crime. The Lycians' uncompromising refusal to assist, their fouling of the water,
and their abusive utterances all find parallels in the characteristics and behavior of the frog: “The Goddess has her wish; for now they chuse / To plunge and dive among the wat’ry ooze; / . . . / Transformed to slimy frogs th’ inhuman brood / In accents hoarse, still croak among the Mud.”

This is a very different sort of metamorphosis than that of Daphne. Rather than the shock of change, here Ovid emphasized a certain continuity. The punishment is really nothing more than the Lycians’ own baseness amplified. Because of a particular set of topsy-turvy circumstances, the rustics had held power over Latona for a moment. Ultimately, though, they were insignificant, left to croak their insults to an audience of none.

As an allegory of the Barberini exile, the choice of Latona’s curse is somewhat contemptuous in tone. Yet though the Barberini had carefully sought reconciliation and a relationship with the Pamphili and other power brokers, they could ignore the lower-positioned rabble that had risen up against them in 1644. These unthinking and powerless enemies, Paleotti’s idioti, were unlikely to see the tapestries anyway and could be safely and aptly left to wallow in their own “wat’ry ooze.” This message and the contemptuous sentiment behind it have parallels in the Fountain of Latona at Versailles, which celebrates the triumph of Louis XIV and his mother over the rebellious factions of the Fronde. Begun just four years after the Barberini tapestries were finished, the fountain acknowledges a past political difficulty and celebrates the crown’s having overcome it. In both the French and the Roman cases the patrons could look back with satisfaction at having survived momentary danger, transcended the attacks of their critics, and gone on vindicated—like Latona and Apollo—to more dignified and decorous phases of their careers.

APOLLO EXCHANGING GIFTS WITH MERCURY
The next scene in the cycle, Apollo Exchanging Gifts with Mercury, shows the god sitting on a rock at the edge of a wood, tending a herd of cows that graze the pasture before him (fig. 3). A great mountain, perhaps identifiable as Mount Ida, rises in the distant background, its lines softened by atmospheric perspective. The manifestation of Apollo as a shepherd is the Apollo Nomios, an appellation that translates as the “Wandering Apollo.” There are two major myths (often conflated in the postclassical tradition) that cast Apollo as a herdsman, and both of them involve exile. One begins with Jupiter punishing Apollo for having killed the Cyclopes (who served Jupiter, furnishing his thunderbolts). In retaliation, Jupiter sentenced Apollo to one year of exile from Olympus, during which time he was forced to labor on earth as the servant of King Admetus of Pherae.

A very similar story, with a different king, appears as a flashback in Homer’s Iliad. Trying to convince Apollo to join him against the Trojans, Poseidon reminds him that both of them had once been forced together into exile and a year of earthly labor as wage-earners for King Laomedon of Troy. “Idiot,” rails Poseidon, “you . . . forget how we two alone of all the gods . . . worked for Laomedon a whole year at a stated wage and he gave us his orders. I built the Trojans the wall about their city, . . . while you, Phoebus, herded cattle for him in the dales of many valleyed Ida.” Homer’s Laomedon withheld payment from his divine laborers, threatened them, and even attempted to cut off their ears, earning the Trojans and their city Neptune’s undying ire. But Homer’s Apollo takes a more conciliatory approach, replying, “Lord of the earthquake, you would have no respect for me if I were to fight you about a pack of miserable mortals, who come out like leaves in summer and eat the fruit of the field, and presently fall lifeless to the ground. Let us stay this fighting at once and let them settle it among themselves.”

Here the sun god is above vindictive thinking, transcendentally willing to set aside old scores. His respect for his fellow Olympian
dwarfs any ire that he may have felt toward the mere humans. The refusal to bear a grudge and the solidarity with one's peers would be echoed by the position of the Barberini, who by the mid-1650s, when the tapestry series was conceived, were united in marriage to their former oppressors, the Pamphili.

Returning to the motif of the tapestry, the exchange of gifts between Mercury and Apollo Nomios is a story that is sometimes attached to Apollo's service to Admetus and sometimes to his service to Laomedon. However, the most authoritative version of the story, from the so-called Homeric Hymn to Mercury, mentions neither king. The hymn, which concludes with the arrival of the Thriae, a trio of Parnassan bee-nymphs possessed of oracular powers, was a favorite in Barberini circles because of the coincidence between the Thriae and the trio of bees on the papal family's coat of arms. The hymn's detailed narrative recounts how, while Apollo was guarding his herds, Mercury stole the cattle out from under his nose. After the crime was revealed and the cattle returned, the two gods reconciled. In Maioli's treatment of the story, the bridge in the background serves as a landscape metaphor for this coming together of two opposing sides. Maioli also showed the exchange of gifts that sealed the reconciliation. His Apollo already holds the lyre, Mercury's offering (which the artist interpreted not as a classical lyre but as the Renaissance lira da braccio). With his other arm, Apollo presents the caduceus, that distinctive serpent-twined staff that would become one of the standard attributes of the messenger god. The lyre, in turn, would become a standard attribute of Apollo. The individual symbolisms of the gifted objects further underscore the conciliatory message. The lyre, for reasons obvious to anyone who has strummed a well-tuned stringed instrument, represents harmony and concord. The caduceus, meanwhile, was recognized as a symbol of diplomacy from antiquity through the Middle Ages and into the early modern period: as the anonymous First Vatican Mythographer wrote, "Just as war is declared with the fasces, so peace is made by the bearers of the caduceus." Mercury's staff appears in Cesare Ripa's Iconologia (1593, with a second, expanded and illustrated edition in 1603) as an attribute not only of Peace, but also (among other things) as an attribute of "Forza sottoposta all'Eloquenza" (Force submitting to Eloquence).

On the allegorical level this scene, like that of Latona Cursing the Lycian Peasants, refers (through the deployment of the exiled Apollo Nomios) to the period of the family's exile. But rather than emphasizing the travails of exile, Apollo Exchanging Gifts with Mercury represents the negotiations that led to its end. Cardinal Francesco's rapprochement with the Pamphili parallels Apollo's with Mercury, while the recovery of the Barberini family's Roman fortunes parallels the restoration of the stolen cattle. The eloquence of Francesco, and of those allies who helped plead the case for the family's readmittance to the Roman court, had overcome the force that had first driven them from it. The analogy becomes all the more apt when one remembers that a key instrument of seventeenth-century diplomacy was the gift. Cardinal Francesco had presented various members of the Pamphili family with gifts over the critical five years between his own return from France and the return of his brother and nephews, and these gifts were reciprocated according to the etiquette of the Roman court. In the context of the narrative of exile and return, the scene of Apollo and Mercury not only represents reconciliation in general, but reconciliation-through-gifts in particular. And once reconciled, Cardinal Francesco, like Apollo Nomios restored to Olympus in the Iliad, was willing to overlook old insults and focus on restoring good relations. The vow spoken at the exchange of gifts in the Homeric Hymn to Mercury would have resonated strongly with the Barberini, now intermarried with their old adversaries: "Apollo . . . swore to be fellow and friend
to Hermes, vowing that he would love no other among the immortals, neither god nor man sprung from Zeus, better than Hermes.”

The Flaying of Marsyas
The next scene in the series, the Flaying of Marsyas, depicts the outcome of the musical contest between Apollo and the Phrygian satyr who had been impertinent enough to challenge him (fig. 4). Having won, the god could extract whatever prize he wished from his opponent, and he chose to have Marsyas flayed alive. Maioli stopped short of showing the actual peeling of skin from sinew, but the violence of the scene, with Apollo’s henchmen binding the struggling satyr to a tree, is still at odds with the balanced, orderly classical landscape. The spring gushing forth from the rocks at left must be the river Marsyas, which Ovid tells us “issue[d], sparkling in the sun-kissed air,” from a water table gorged with the tears of the woodland creatures who mourned the fate of their friend.

Though the vindictive narrative may seem unedifying or unbecoming to us today, the story was popular in Renaissance culture, as it represented the restoration of concord and the proper order of things. The topsy-turvy neatness of an animalistic satyr challenging an Olympian is, after all, subversive. Its firm punishment, on the other hand, is reassuring (at least to an establishment figure like Cardinal Barberini). Maioli used pose to emphasize the contrast between the divine order of the gods and the disorder represented by the satyr: Marsyas writhes and flails incoherently as he is lashed to the tree, while Apollo assumes a graceful pose of effortless majesty, loosely derived from the Vatican Apollo Belvedere. The interpretation of Marsyas’s death as the triumph of order over disorder had a long provenance: in ancient Rome, a painting by Zeuxis of the Flaying of Marsyas decorated the Temple of Concord. In the medieval and Renaissance Christian tradition of the Ovide Moralizé, the myth was assigned a Christian message in which the flaying represents the reassertion of God’s natural order. Furthermore, according to a 1567 source, the myth offered the consolation that, “as certainly as God will deal with the presumptuous . . . will he assist good people who are afflicted by misfortune.” The triumph of the mellow lyre, which stands for universal harmony, over the shrill aulos, an instrument of sometimes discordant particularity, provides parallels to the reconciliation-through-gifts of the previous scene of Apollo Exchanging Gifts with Mercury. At the allegorical level, the restoration of order in this scene parallels the restoration of the Barberini to their palaces, possessions, and positions in Rome.

A specific connection of the Marsyas story to the theme of exile hardly seems necessary to make it fit within the series as a whole. Yet there is a striking philological connection that surely would not have been missed by the cardinal, who loved ancient texts and literary games. While Ovid’s more complete version of the flaying of Marsyas comes in the Metamorphoses, he also told the story in the Fasti, his elegiac poem that explains (with one book for each month) the festivals and cults of ancient Rome. The work is divided and arranged according to the ritual calendar, with narratives inserted when they are relevant to the explanation of particular feast days. The story of Marsyas, who played the flutelike aulos, appears alongside the story of the exile of the tibicines in the entry for the Lesser Quinquatrus, a three-day festival of Minerva held in mid-June. The tibicines, or flutists, played a key role in the liturgy of Republican Rome but withdrew from the city after they were denied certain privileges. Like the Barberini (though certainly under different circumstances), they managed a return from exile and the restoration of privileges through some clever maneuvering. And though the story of the tibicines may seem obscure to today’s reader, it would have interested Cardinal Francesco, especially considering his family’s intensive patronage of music, his own interest in the
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archaeology of music, and of course the shared theme of exile and return. It is poignant to note (as a Purple Swan may well have) that Ovid himself was an exile and that the composition of his Fasti was interrupted by his own banishment to Tomis, in modern Romania.78

What makes the connection of the Barberini Flaying of Marsyas to Ovid’s Fasti and the Lesser Quinquatrus truly consequential, though, is the significance of the festival’s date to the Barberini. June 15, the third and culmination day of the annual Quinquatrus, was also the date of the wedding between Prince Maffeò Barberini and Innocent X’s grandniece Olimpia Giustiniani.79 This union, as noted above, sealed the alliance between the two families and marked the definitive restoration of the Barberini to a position of power at the papal court.80 For Cardinal Francesco and his family, the ritual event of the wedding was a reassertion of the proper order of things on a par with Apollo’s flaying of Marsyas.

Shortly after the Barberini–Pamphili wedding, the family issued a print after Pietro da Cortona’s Xenophon Sacrificing to Diana upon His Return from Exile, a painting that was already in Cardinal Francesco’s collection.81 The narrative moment is one of thanksgiving. The print, engraved by Pietro Aquila, bore a dedicatory inscription to the new bride. Xenophon, the military hero whose honeyed eloquence earned him the nickname “the Attic Bee,” was an apt allegorical stand-in for the bee-loving Barberini, and Cortona’s painting had clearly acquired an unanticipated poignancy during the years of exile.82 The print’s combination of image and text explicitly connects the wedding and the end of exile, mobilizing an allegorical structure and references to an ancient Greek exile narrative to make the point.

While it is not clear how many impressions were made of the Xenophon print, the print medium allowed for a much broader diffusion of message than did painting, sculpture, or tapestry. The Barberini had, clearly, made a decision to be unashamed of the exile. Recognizing that (at least in the short term) it would be impossible to have Rome forget that it had happened, they chose to frame the exile positively as an obstacle overcome. In the same vein, Cardinal Francesco commissioned a new opera in honor of the bride and groom, entitled Dal male il bene (Out of the Bad [Comes] the Good). Though the opera was a romantic comedy that had nothing to do with exile, a prologue sung by a figure of Fortuna connected its title and moral to the fall and recovery of the family’s fortunes.83 In acknowledging rather than trying to suppress memory of the exile, the Barberini followed the authoritative precedent of their fellow Tuscans the Medici. Over the course of their systematic subversion of the Florentine republic, that family was expelled frequently enough that they felt obliged to address the theme in their imagery, which emphasized cyclical and themes of return to suggest the inevitability of Medici power.84 A similar appropriative pattern of turning a negative into a positive informs and explains not just the Flaying of Marsyas, but the entire Apollo series.

PARNASSUS

The final panel in the series shows Apollo reposing in a bosky glade on Mount Parnassus, strumming his lyre by a gentle waterfall, while the nine Muses attend him (fig. 5).85 The mood is one of peace and harmony. Far from the contests and negotiations of the other panels, here the god is reinstated in his proper place. Reigning over the cultivated world of the arts, he enjoys concord even as he represents it. The figure of Apollo is a near-exact copy of the central figure from another Parnassus, the one that Giovanni Francesco Romanelli frescoed for Mazarin in Paris, when the painter followed Cardinal Barberini into exile in 1646.86 The artist probably took the drawings back to Rome with him and passed them to his student Maioli, as every gesture of the frescoed god was faithfully transcribed in the tapestry
cartoon (and subsequently reversed, of course, in the process of weaving). To a Roman audience, however, the woven Parnassus would more likely have recalled a geographically closer prototype, Andrea Camassei’s Parnassus ceiling in the Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane (fig. 8). In the detailed description of the palace that he published in 1642, Barberini panegyrist Girolamo Teti compared Apollo’s Mount Parnassus (as depicted by Camassei) to Urban VIII’s court.88

It is tempting to think that the Stories of Apollo may at times have hung in the room with Camassei’s Parnassus. It is of course difficult to determine where the series hung, and when: inventories are few and far between and provide only a momentary glimpse of a palace’s furnishings instead of a full range of season-to-season information.89 Tapestries are highly mobile by nature, and the detachable lateral borders of the Parnassus panel, an invention that increased flexibility, show that the ideators of the series actively intended it to suit a variety of spaces.90 During the cardinal’s lifetime, the panels were stored with the cardinal’s other possessions in the guardaroba at the Cancelleria, his official residence as papal viceregent; after his death they would be transferred to the Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane, according to the terms of his will. This was the case for most of his tapestries; even sets like the Life of Constantine and the Life of Urban VIII, both of which were designed for primary display in the gran salon of the Palazzo Barberini, were stored at the Cancelleria.91 By having his monumental propagandistic cycles executed in tapestry rather than fresco, the cardinal could ensure their availability for use both in his official residence and in the dynastic seat.

Though we cannot securely document the installation of the Stories of Apollo in the Sala di Parnaso in the Palazzo Barberini (or for that matter their installation in any other room of either palace during the cardinal’s lifetime), the set’s running length of 21.88 meters would have been a neat fit for the Parnassus room, which has about 22.5 meters of usable wall space.92 Thematically the fit would be perfect: the Parnassus of Urban VIII’s pontificate would be juxtaposed with the loss of that idyllic state and the subsequent recovery of it through perseverance, diplomacy, and virtue. Rather than being repetitive, the presence of two Parnassus scenes (one on the ceiling and one hanging on the wall) would have provided a beginning and an ending, their similarity emphasizing the cyclical theme of loss and return, with Camassei’s fresco representing “Parnassus Lost” and Maioli’s tapestry representing “Parnassus Regained.”

Regardless of whether the set ever hung in the Camassei room, the identification of the Palazzo Barberini with Parnassus is the key to interpreting Maioli’s Parnassus panel. Thus, having suffered delusion (Apollo and Daphne) and exile (Latona Cursing the Lycian Peasants), having negotiated his way back into favor (Apollo Exchanging Gifts with Mercury), and having securely restored the natural order of things (The Flaying of Marsyas), the cardinal could now rest, enjoy, and rule over his Quirinal Parnassus.

The idea of progress through travails toward a blissful restoration of order and the rule of Apollo recalls the topos of the return of the golden age. As Virgil prophesied in his fourth Eclogue, “Now the last age by Cumae’s Sibyl sung / has come and gone, and the majestic roll / of circling centuries begins anew: / Justice returns, . . . / the iron shall cease, the golden race arise / . . . thine own Apollo reigns.”93

The topos posits an ideal Arcadian age under the rule of Saturn in the distant past. This is followed by humanity’s progress through a series of increasingly troubled phases (the silver and bronze ages) to a violent and degraded age of iron. But Virgil’s verses also promised restoration and the renewal of the cycle with the return of Justice and the reign of Apollo over a new golden age.94 The return of the golden age is a standard metaphor in the political imagery of the Renaissance and Baroque eras, and it
provided material for the panegyrist at the outset of many a reign, including that of Urban VIII. The poet-pope, in fact, invited the comparison even more than most, as his own neo-Pindaric poetry was permeated with the notion of a perennially returning golden age. But though the beginning of Urban's pontificate had been greeted as the dawn of a new golden age (as had the 1631 elevation of Prince Taddeo Barberini to the office of Prefect of Rome), by the last years of Urban's reign in the 1640s the situation had slipped into a bronze age of war and eventually, for the Barberini nephews, into the chaos of an iron age of exile. Yet the topos is cyclical, and the restoration of the Barberini in 1653 could be seen as the return of a second Barberinian golden age, under the reign of Francesco-Apollo. While the Parnassus panel does not explicitly reference the topos, the idea of Apollo’s rule as the stable conclusion of a tumultuous cycle follows a familiar outline.

ALIUSQUE ET IDEM
Tracking the progress of Cardinal Francesco and his family from a happy golden age through delusion, exile, suffering, renegotiation, and ultimately to return and restoration, the Stories of Apollo tapestry series is an elegant expansion on the old Aliusque et idem impresa that Cardinal Maffeo Barberini had devised at the beginning of the century (fig. 7). Even more than the golden age topos, which it echoes in its emphasis on cyclicality and perennial return, the impresa provides a key to reading the series. A Barberini impresa had already provided the interpretive key for the earliest series to issue from the Barberini looms, the Castelli, which references the family's Virgilian Hic Domus impresa. Another series, the Life of Christ, featured a different family impresa, the one with three bees operating a plow, in the borders of all but four of the twelve panels. For those four exceptions, which treat Christological themes of birth, death, or rebirth, the designers substituted the rising sun of the Aliusque et idem impresa. The idea of the sun setting only to rise again, “another and yet the same,” fits neatly within a long tradition of identifying Christ with the sun. That the sun deployed was the sun of the family impresa effectively extended the comparison to the Barberini themselves, implying parallels between Christ and the “Vicar of Christ,” Urban VIII.

As mentioned above, the Aliusque et idem impresa coupled an image of the rising sun with a motto taken from Horace’s Carmen Saeculare. To quote the entire third stanza from which it derives, “O nourishing sun, who on your gleaming chariot bring forth the day and hide it, and are reborn another and yet the same, may you be able to behold nothing greater than the city of Rome.”

Though Cardinal Maffeo Barberini (the future pope) could hardly have predicted it when he invented the impresa, the symbolism was strikingly well suited to the events of his own nephew’s life. The sun sets, but the sun also rises; and rising again it beholds Rome. And the return from exile was not the only rebirth that the Barberini experienced in the mid- to late 1650s, the historic moment in which the Apollo tapestries were conceived. At this time, the Barberini were enjoying a dynastic rebirth, not only figuratively but also literally. In 1657, four years after their marriage and two years before the weaving of the Stories of Apollo began, Olimpia Giustiniani and Maffeo Barberini the Younger had their first child, a daughter. More children were to follow, including the future cardinal Francesco Junior and the future Prince Urbano, both born while the weaving of the panels was under way. The reuse of names is significant—each of the little princes was “another and yet the same.”

In an era when people committed poetry to memory, Cardinal Francesco Senior and his literary-minded friends would hardly have been able to consider the phrase “aliusque et idem” in isolation from the rest of the Carmen Saeculare. Horace’s invocation of the sun’s cyclical renewal, quoted above,
leads directly into two verses on childbirth that are worth quoting: “Lithyia [Diana], gracious at fittingly bringing forth offspring in due season, protect our mothers . . . goddess, rear our youth and bless the decrees of the fathers concerned with women and their need for wedlock and on the marriage-law, fruitful of new progeny . . . ?”103 The connections are obvious. The proliferation of the family through Maffeo and Olimpia’s growing brood was as crucial to the securing of the dynasty’s future as was the return to Rome.

The birth of the next generation may well have been the proximate celebratory cause of the commission of the Stories of Apollo, even though the narrative imagery’s references stop with the cardinal’s return from exile and the prince’s wedding. The connection to childbirth would help explain the custom-designed borders, which have a tone that is less Apollonian than it is Bacchic. The head of a grinning satyr occupies the spot at top center, and two baby satyrs flank the Barberini coat of arms in the lower border. These, along with the garlands of flowers and the cornucopias overflowing with bursting ripe fruit, sound an almost overpowering note of riotous, festive fecundity that otherwise would seem only remotely connected to the theme of Apollo. Framing (both literally and figuratively) the calm, measured, coloristically restrained landscapes within, these contrasting borders suggest the way in which the viewer is to read the contents of the narratives. A key detail, which appears twice in the upper border and twice in the lower one, is the pomegranate. In Ripa’s Iconologia, one of the main iconographic sources for Baroque artists, this fruit appears as an attribute of Concord, since it mingles individual seeds within a single husk. This meaning echoes that of the exchange of gifts between Apollo and Mercury.104 And because of its associations with Persephone, who returned every spring to bring the earth to flower, the pomegranate was also a symbol of regeneration (for the same reasons, it is a Christian symbol of the Resurrection).105 Finally, it joins the other fruits as a more general symbol of fertility. Here, nestled in a single husk, is the tripartite meaning of the cycle: it celebrates the concord and union that brought the Barberini exile to an end; it rejoices in the resurrection of the family’s fortunes; and it marks the reproductive fecundity that extends those fortunes into the future.

CONCLUSIONS
By the time the Stories of Apollo series was commissioned in 1659, the Barberini were well restored to their position, holding court at their Quirinal Parnassus. Innocent X had died in 1655, and Cardinal Francesco was considered a viable candidate for the papacy in the conclave that followed. Though Francesco would not be elected, his friend Fabio Chigi was elevated as Pope Alexander VII, and the cardinal must have felt that his family’s future was assured. Thus, by the time the workshop began weaving, there was enough distance from the exile for the cardinal to freely refer to it in a commission of this size and importance. Even so, the language of allegory always provided a veil of plausible deniability, minimizing the risk that anyone might take offense. Yet despite this risk, which itself dwindled with the years, I would argue that the cardinal felt an even greater imperative to take up the topic. Exile is easily equated with disgrace, yet if one takes possession of history by retelling it through an allegory, then one can effectively reshape public perception of that history. The next project for the Barberini tapestry workshop would be the even more ambitious and more directly referential Life of Pope Urban VIII, a celebration of the accomplishments of the pontificate that would be the final stage in Cardinal Francesco’s rehabilitation of his family’s reputation.

In commissioning the Apollo series, Cardinal Francesco Barberini emulated Apollo himself. Though the sun god was stymied in his pursuit of Daphne, he did not let the...
story end with his own dejection. Instead, he took possession of the narrative and got in the last word by designating the laurel as his sacred tree and mandating that triumphant heroes, poets, and even the god himself would thenceforth wear crowns fashioned from its branches. Through this action, he turned defeat into victory: to recast the hackneyed optimist’s mantra, when life gives you laurels, make laurel crowns. Ovid’s lesson is that one can honorably salvage something from disappointment by honoring that which remains in one’s hands—by ennobling the laurel remnant. This is a lesson that Cardinal Barberini, whose coat of arms is encircled by a laurel crown in the lower border of each panel of the Stories of Apollo, fundamentally understood: by embracing delusion and disappointment, one can transform them into the trappings of your own honor. Just as Apollo wove the laurel branches into a crown, so the weavers in the Barberini workshop wove the story of the cardinal’s exile into an Apollonian triumph.

1. While the payments for the design work all firmly indicate Maioli as the painter of the cartoons for the Apollo series, other archival evidence suggests that Giovanni Francesco Romanelli had some role in the ideation of the series and supervision of Maioli’s work. I laid out the evidence for this in cat. 37, in Thomas P. Campbell, ed., Tapestry in the Baroque: Threads of Splendor (exh. cat. [New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2007], p. 318), but I still consider it an open question. The repetition, in the Pamassu panel of the tapestry series, of a figure from a Romanelli project (which I did not note in Tapestry in the Baroque but discuss in a later section of the present essay) may be further “soft evidence” for Romanelli’s connection to the Barberini Stories of Apollo.

2. For an overview of Maffeo Barberini’s activities as a poet, as well as the poetic culture at the Barberini court, see Peter J. A. N. Rietbergen, Power and Religion in Baroque Rome: Barberini Cultural Policies (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2006), pp. 95–140.


There has been some confusion over the proper title of this scene, with seventeenth-century inventories and even modern scholars giving it a range of different names. The 1663 inventory of Cardinal Francesco Barberini’s possessions (transcribed in Pascal-François Bertrand, Les tapissiers des Barberini et la décoration d’intérieur dans la Rome baroque, Studies in Western Tapestry 2 [Turnhout: Brepols, 2005], p. 211, no. 562) lists it as “Mercurio et Appolo [sic].” Anna Maria De Strobel (Le manzerrie romane dal XVII al XIX secolo [Rome: Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani, 1989]), pp. 41–42) repeats the title give by Heinrich Göbel (Wandelbilder, vol. 2, Die romanischen Länder [Leipzig: Klinkhardt and Biermann, 1928], pt. 1, p. 420), “Apollo sorveglia il grege di Laomedonte,” but added a question mark and a cautionary note that Göbel probably confused Laomedon with Admetus. Adelson (European Tapestry in the Minneapolis Institute, p. 397) and Harper (cat. 37, in Campbell, ed., Tapestry in the Baroque, p. 316) both follow De Strobel’s lead, unnecessarily (and arguably incorrectly) including Laomedon in the title.

The dating for the panel used here, reconstructed on the basis of documents in the Barberini Archives, follows that laid out in Adelson, European Tapestry in the Minneapolis Institute, p. 397.

5. The Flaying of Marsyas, now in the collection of the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, is catalogued as no. 25 in Adelson, European Tapestry in the Minneapolis Institute, pp. 395–405.

7. The *Latona* panel, now in the collection of the Fondation Toms Pauli, Lausanne, is catalogued in Delmarcel et al., *Collection Toms*, pp. 76–77, no. 19. Though scholars have not been able to securely document the exact date of this panel, most have supposed it to have been woven immediately after the *Parnassus*, the last known payment for which came in May 1665 (De Strobel, *Le manazzerie romane*, p. 42). As the earliest payments for the design work of the Barberini anazzeria’s subsequent project, the *Life of Urban VIII*, came in November 1663 and the earliest payments for the weaving of the first panel of that series came in October 1664, it seems likely that the *Latona* panel dates to 1663–64 (and not 1663–65, as some have suggested). For these dates, see James G. Harper, “Les Barberini Tapisseries of the Life of Pope Urban VIII: Program, Politics and Perfect History for the Post-Exile Era,” PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1998, p. 557, cat. I.1.d–e. The *Latona* panel is the only one of the five *Stories of Apollo* that was not listed in the 1663 inventory of Cardinal Francesco’s possessions at the Palazzo della Cancelleria (BAV. Arch. Barb. Comp. 159; transcribed in Bertrand, *Les tapisseries des Barberini*, p. 211, no. 563), which suggests it was still on the looms at that date.

8. Nathan Whitman, referring to Louis XIV’s choice of the Latona myth, writes, moreover, that, “So many more heroic or gracious themes from the Apollo myth could have been selected that one is constrained to uncover the motivation behind the choice of a subject whose connection with the Apollonian program, above all with the Apollonian spirit, seems more formal than efficient”; Whitman, “Myth and Politics: Versailles and the Fountain of Latona,” in John C. Rule, ed., *Louis XIV and the Craft of Kingship* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1969), p. 293.

9. Four out of the five scenes treat themes that are also treated in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. The exception is *Apollo Exchanging Gifts with Mercury*. For the gobelins *Metamorphoses* series, an example of a purely Ovidian cycle that was begun about twenty years after the Barberini *Apollo* cycle, see Edith A. Standaen, “Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*: A Gobelins Tapestry Series,” *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 23 (1988), pp. 149–91.

10. De Strobel’s contribution (in *Le anazzerie romane*, pp. 41–42) was to clarify the dating of the weaving and attribution of the designs through archival research. However, consistent with the scope of her project, she did not speculate on the meaning of the series. Similarly, in his discussion of two of the Apollo panels that are now in Lausanne, Guy Delmarcel (Delmarcel et al., *Collection Toms*, pp. 28–30) treated meaning at the narrative level without speculating on any further allegorical possibilities. Most recently, Delmarcel, who was a participant in the symposium at the Metropolitan Museum in 2007 on the occasion of the exhibition “Tapestry in the Baroque,” has published an endorsement of my theory (which I aired both in the catalogue of that exhibition and at the symposium), for which see Delmarcel, de Reyniès, and Hefford, *The Toms Collection*, pp. 233–37.


12. For Pascal-François Bertrand (*Les tapisseries des Barberini*, p. 58), Mount Parnassus is the Vatican Hill under Urban’s benevolent rule, while the panels that treat themes of divine chastisement and divine assistance collectively evoke the idea of papal justice. He also claims that *Apollo and Marsyas* may refer to the reform of Marinism in poetry.


son vere, o dalle favolose, che sebene con false, hanno riguardo e ratiocinio al vero.”
18. This dedication was used at Jupiter's temple on the Capitoline Hill and is usually translated as “Jupiter, the greatest and the best.” For Pope Alexander VI's use of the full phrase “Jupiter Optimus Maximus” to refer to the Judeo-Christian God (and of “Diana” to refer to the Virgin Mary), a high point of the confusion of pagan past with Renaissance Christianity, see Rodney Stark, *For the Glory of God: How Monothelism Led to Reformations*, Science, Witch-Hunts and the End of Slavery (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2003), p. 69. The use of the title Pontifex Maximus, an early Roman priestly title that Augustus appropriated for the emperors, also carries ancient Roman associations. While it is not clear how its usage passed to the popes, they used the title officially (though not consistently) from at least the time of Pope Nicholas I (d. 867).
21. For the identification of Lanfranco's Apollo as Scipione Borghese, see Picacci, “Lanfranco e la nascita del barocco,” p. 335.
23. Though Apollo is not present in the Villa Ludovisi *Aurora*, the theme of sunrise is nevertheless explicitly Apollonian.
25. For the documentary evidence for Agucchi as the programmer of the Sala di Parnaso, see Cesare D’Onofrio, *La Villa Aldobrandini di Frascati* (Rome: Staderini, 1965), p. 131.
26. Agucchi wrote that this *Genesis* series by the Cavaliere d’Arpino is “pittura che oltre la vaghezza che reca per l’eccellenza del maestro, il quale certo in queste della villa l’ha mostrata forse più che in oltre opera sua, riduce anco a memoria di coloro, che l’aménita et delizia della Villa et giardino godono, quanto sia facile il perderla a chi con parca mano non l'usa et non ritiene il gusto con il freno dell’osservanza, et a ogni luogo et in ogni tempo, de divini precetti.” The transcription is from D’Onofrio, *La Villa Aldobrandini*, p. 98.
28. See (with some caveat) Salerno, “A Domenichino Series at the National Gallery.”
29. The dating here follows D’Onofrio (*La Villa Aldobrandini*, p. 128), with the documents and a date of November 1616–June 1618, rather than Salerno (“A Domenichino Series at the National Gallery,” pp. 195–96), who was working with less complete documentary evidence.
30. The bees, which replaced the horses that originally graced the Barberini *stemma*, were granted by King Henry IV during Maffeo Barberini's nunciature to France in 1604–7. For a summary of sources for this transformation, see Harper, “The Barberini Tapestries of the Life of Pope Urban VIII,” p. 160, n. 342.
35. The translation of the Bible used here is Noah Webster's version, published in 1833 by Durrie and Peck, New Haven.
36. The publication of this impresa in Giovanni Ferro, *Teatro d’imprese* (Venice, 1623), vol. 2, pp. 651–54, was the original one. See also Giovanni Ferro, *Ombre apparenti nel Teatro d’imprese* (Venice, 1629), vol. 2, pp. 190–94; and Sebastian
Schütze, Kardinal Maffeo Barberini, später Papst Urban VIII., und die Entstehung des römischen Hochbarock (Munich: Hirmer, 2007), pp. 258–59.


40. For the Pupurei Cyni, led by Cardinal Francesco’s younger brother Cardinal Antonio Barberini, see Scott, Images of Nepotism, p. 194, and Teti, Aedes Barberinae, reprint, pp. 38–52.

41. This was also the birthday of Augustus, who set a strong precedent by cultivating identification with Apollo throughout his life. For the tracking of this festival date from the Republican calendar to the Julian calendar (falling on “what we call 23 September”), see Denis Feeney, Caesar’s Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), p. 154.

42. The Life of Christ was on the looms before and during the Barberini exile and was not finished until 1656. A smaller but urgently important project, the weaving of an extra altar dossal and borders for a set meant for use in the Sistine Chapel (a gift to the newly elected Alexander VII), occupied the looms until April 1659, at which point the manufactory was finally free to start on the Apollo series. For the Sistine project, see De Stroebel, Le anzerzie romane, pp. 30–31; and James G. Harper, “Tapestry Production in Seventeenth-Century Rome: The Barberini Manufactory,” in Campbell, ed., Tapestry in the Baroque, pp. 298–99, 310. These sources also outline the sequence of the Barberini workshop’s production over the years of its activity.

43. The impresa, used by Maffeo Barberini prior to his election to the papacy (for which see Schütze, Kardinal Maffeo Barberini, pp. 258–59), may relate to the use of solar imagery by prior generations of Barberini (Scott, Images of Nepotism, p. 98, n. 21).

44. John Beldon Scott (Images of Nepotism, pp. 141–42) has read the vault’s impresa (in tandem with adjacent elements) as a reference to a rebirth in which papal Rome supplants ancient imperial Rome.

45. I am deliberately invoking the resonance between Horace’s Apollonian “aliusque et idem” and the scriptural verse Ecclesiastes 1:15: “The sun also riseth, and the sun goeth down, and hasteth to his place where he arose” (see note 35 above).

46. The sequence in which this essay allegorically reads the tapestries corresponds to the order of design and weaving with one exception. That exception, Latona Cursing the Lycian Peasants, is the only panel for which a secure date has not been documented. Nevertheless, evidence suggests that it was woven last, while it appears second in the allegorical sequence presented here.

47. Ovid, Metamorphoses 1.452–567.

48. Delmarcel (in Delmarcel et al., Collection Toms, pp. 78), says that Mazoli “paraphrase explicitement le fameux groupe sculpté de Gian Lorenzo Bernini.”


50. In Latin, the inscription reads, “Quisquis amans sequitur fugitivae gaudia formae / Fronde manus implet baccas sen carpit amaras.” For a thoughtful though incomplete treatment of its implications, see Anna Coliva, “‘Apollo e Dafne,’” in Coliva and Shütze, eds., Bernini sul tifo, pp. 52–73.

51. On impresa and impresa theory, and on the distinction between an impresa and an emblem, see Alan R. Young, “The Place of Imprese in an Index of Emblem Art,” in Peter M. Daly, The Index of Emblem Art Symposium, Papers from the Symposium, McGill University, September 27–28, 1988 (New York: AMS Press, 1990), pp. 21–35; Mario Praz, Studies in Seventeenth Century Imagery, vol. 1 (London, 1939; 2nd ed., Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1964), which, on p. 80, cites Ercole Tasso’s Della Realta... on the universal moral application of the emblem versus the personal application of the impresa. For a good recent bibliography on impresa theory, see also Dorigen

The Sun Also Rises


56. For Pieratti's sculpture Latona, see Claudio Pizzorusso, "Domenico Pieratti, primo soggetto del suo mestiere in questa città," ""Paragone 36 (November 1983), pp. 21–43. According to an observation penned in 1655 (quoted in ibid., p. 24), even though the cardinal paid richly for the sculpture, he took a while to find a permanent location for it. The date of the sculpture's transfer from its provisional location in a garden loggia (probably the limonaria) to the stairwell is not known (although it was after 1655). For a consideration of the Barberini Latona as a source for Louis XIV's Fountain of Latona, see Robert W. Berger, "A Source of the Latona Group at Versailles," Gazette des beaux-arts 119 (April 1992), pp. 145–48.

57. For a summary of Paleotti's division of society into four categories—the spirituali, the letterati (a category that overlaps with the first), the idiotti, and the pittori—see Rietbergen, Power and Religion in Baroque Rome, pp. 16–17.


61. For a list of sources on Apollo Nomios, the story of Apollo and Admetus, and the "popular post-classical conflation" of that narrative with the story of Apollo exchanging gifts with Mercury, see Jane Davidson Reid, with the assistance of Chris Rohlmann, Oxford Guide to Classical Mythology in the Arts, 1500–1990 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), vol. 1, pp. 179–80.

62. The version of the story quoted here is from The Iliad (21.434–67). The translation used in the text above is from The Iliad of Homer: Rendered into English Prose for the Use of Those Who Cannot Read the Original, trans. Samuel Butler (London, New York: Longman's, Green, 1898).

63. Ibid.

64. For a concise treatment of the conflation, see Davidson Reid, Oxford Guide to Classical Mythology in the Arts, vol. 1, p. 571.

65. For the bee-maidsens, which do not appear anywhere else in the Hesiodic or Homeric corpus, see Scheinberg, "The Bee Maidens of the Homeric Hymn to Hermes." While Scheinberg questions the conventional scholarly assumption that the bee-maidsens are the same as the Thiae, this question does not bear on Barberini interest in the hymn.


71. Ovid, Metamorphoses 6.382–400. The story is told in a number of other ancient sources, including Herodorus, Xenophon, Apollodorus, and Hyginus, for which see Joanna Nizyriska, "Marsyas's Howl: The Myth of Marsyas in Ovid's Metamorphoses and Zbigniew Herbert's 'Apollo and Marsyas,'" Comparative Literature 53, no. 2 (Spring 2001), pp. 151–69.

72. Ovid, Metamorphoses 6.398; the translation used here is from Ovid's Metamorphoses, trans. Brooks More, rev. ed. (Francistown, N.H.: Marshall Jones, 1978), p. 215. Maioli's anachronism, showing the river flowing before the actual act of flaying is carried out, would not have troubled the seventeenth-century viewer, who was accustomed to telescoped narrative.
73. Pliny, *Natural History* 35.66.
74. Edith Wyss, summarizing Natalie Conti’s 1567 *Mythographiae sine explicatione* jubilarum; Wyss, the *Myth of Apollo and Marsyas in the Art of the Italian Renaissance: An Inquiry into the Meaning of Images* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1990), p. 120.
75. For a Pythagorean take on the contrast between lyre and aulos, see Nizyrska, “Marsyas’s Howl,” p. 152.
76. Ovid, *Fasti* 6.649–710, with the Marsyas story coming in lines 698–710. The Lesser Quinquagintas begins on the 13th (which in June falls on the thirteenth) and continues for three days. For an overview of the *Fasti* and relevant contextual issues, see Elaine Fantham, “Review Article: Recent Readings of Ovid’s *Fasti*,” *Classical Philology* 90, no. 4 (October 1995), pp. 367–78.
77. Ovid’s account of the exile of the tibicines and the institution of the Lesser Quinquagintas is corroborated by Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 9.30.5–10.
79. The families announced the engagement on March 25, 1653, and concluded the marriage on Sunday, June 15. The celebration, a banquet of twenty-two people, was relatively low-key. Gigli (*Diario di Roma*, vol. 2, p. 682) listed the guests, nearly all of whom were family members. The manuscript volumes containing the documents pertinent to the wedding (BAV, Barb. lat. 2744, 2745) were unavailable at the time the present essay was written, owing to the three-year period the Vatican Library was closed.
80. Carlo Barberini did not arrive in Rome until a few days after his brother’s wedding, and Gigli (*Diario di Roma*, vol. 2, p. 683) reported that on June 23, “Io credo Cardinale, solo, come si fa de’ Prencipi.”
82. The nickname has its roots in the conventional connection of honey to eloquence. In the first century, no less an authority than Cicero called Xenophon’s writing style “melle dulcior.” See Cicero, *Orations* 32; and Scheinberg, “The Bee Maidens of the Homeric Hymn to Hermon,” p. 25.
85. Though the more canonical home of the Muses was Mount Helicon (where Hesiod situates them), Parnassus was also sacred to the Muses. On the conflation of Parnassus and Helicon in the Renaissance, see Elisabeth Schröter, *Die Ikonographie des Themas Parnass vor Raphael: Die Schriften- und Bildtraditionen von der Spätantike bis zum 15. Jh.* (Hildesheim, New York: Olms, 1977), p. 241.
86. This borrowing may simply have been an expedient, but it may have had shades of meaning as well. For Romanelli’s work for Mazarin in France, see Madeleine Laurant-Portemer, “Le Palais Mazarin à Paris et l’offensive baroque de 1645–50,” *Gazette des beaux-arts* 81, no. 3 (1973), pp. 151–68.
87. Fillipo Titi (*Descrizione delle pitture, sculture e architetture esposte al pubblico in Roma* [Rome: M. Pagliarini, 1763], p. 361) called Maioli, “allievo di Romanelli,” and though it is not clear whether the former was a student of the latter in the conventional sense, Maioli did serve as a member of the workshop that Romanelli led in the design of the Barberini *Life of Christ* series. For more on their relationship, see Harper, cat. 37, in Campbell, ed., *Tapestry in the Baroque*, pp. 318–19.
89. The series, except for the *Latona panel* (which was presumably still on the loom), appears as “Le favole d’Appollo [. . .]” in the 1663 inventory of Cardinal Francesco’s possessions at the Palazzo della Cancelleria (BAV, Arch. Barb. Comp. 159; transcribed in Bertrand, *Les tapisseries des Barberini*, p. 211, no. 563); as “Figure e Paesi” in the December 1679 inventory of Cardinal Francesco’s possessions in the Palazzo della Cancelleria at the time of his death (BAV, Arch. Barb. Comp. 179; transcribed in Bertrand, *Les tapisseries des Barberini,*
p. 221, no. 698); as "Figure e paesi" in the 1686 inventory of Prince Maffeo Barberini's possessions in the Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane at the time of his death (BAV, Arch. Barb. Comp. 392; transcribed in Bertrand, *Les tapisseries des Barberini*, p. 223, no. 720); and as "Boscaccie con ninfe, ricavati dalle metamorfosi d'Ovidio" in the 1692 inventory of Cardinal Carlo Barberini's possessions at the Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane (BAV, Arch. Barb. Comp. 345; transcribed in Bertrand, *Les tapisseries des Barberini*, p. 225, no. 783). Each of these inventories finds the tapestries stored in the *guardaroba*, though the 1686 inventory bears an annotation indicating that the *Parnassus* tapestry was pulled from storage for the use of the princess (Olimpia Giustiniani Barberini [1641–1729]) during the course of the inventory. The 1694 inventory of Prince Urbano Barberini's possessions shows that the same princess checked out from the *guardaroba* the entire set except for the two detachable lateral borders of the *Parnassus* panel (BAV, Arch. Barb. Comp. 523; transcribed in Bertrand, *Les tapisseries des Barberini*, pp. 227, no. 812).

90. The 1694 inventory of Cardinal Carlo Barberini specifies that of the five-piece set, "uno di detti pezzi ha li due freggi laterali staccati descritti in una partita distinta. . . ." The two *terme* panels are listed, as promised, further along in the same inventory (BAV, Arch. Barb. Comp. 345; transcribed in Bertrand, *Les tapisseries des Barberini*, pp. 225 no. 783, 226 no. 790).

91. Most scholars agree, for instance, that the *Life of Urban VIII*, though stored at the Cancelleria during the cardinal's lifetime, was designed to be used in the *gran salone* at the Palazzo Barberini alle Quattro Fontane, for which see Harper, "War and Peace in the Barberini Tapestries," p. 431 (with references).

92. The usable wall space in the room, which is numbered B37 on Patricia Waddy's fig. 101 (*Seventeenth-Century Roman Palaces: Use and the Art of the Plan* [New York: Architectural History Foundation; Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990], p. 182), is about 22.5 meters, a horizontal measurement that excludes doorways and windows. It also excludes the two *entreferetrie* spaces on the north wall, which would in fact be ideally suited for the display of the two detachable *terme* borders.

The overall running length of the five narrative tapestries (with *Apollo and Daphne* at 420 × 470 cm; *Latona Cursing the Lybian Peasants* at 419 × 484 cm; *Apollo and Mercury* at 420 × 470 cm; *Apollo and Marsyas* at 414 × 477 cm; and *Parnassus* at 420 × 280 cm) is 21.88 meters. This figure excludes the two detachable borders for the *Parnassus* panel. The dimensions of the two lost *termini* are not known precisely but may be estimated on the assumption that they match the integral borders of the other panels.


94. Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 11.113–50; and Virgil, *Eclogues* 4. Though Ovid specifies that Saturn reigned over the golden age of the distant past, Virgil's prophecy predicts its return under the reign of Apollo. Any confusion over Virgil's mention of both Saturn and Apollo is allayed by understanding that an "age of Saturn" is a conventional way of speaking of a golden age, regardless of who is actually ruling over it. As Robert D. Williams specifies, "Apollo is the guardian deity of the new age not only as the prophet who through his priestess the Sibyl foretold it, but also as the god of poetry who enables Virgil to sing it"; Williams, ed., introduction to Virgil, *The Eclogues and Georgics* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979), p. 107. Feeney (*Caesar's Calendar*, pp. 108–37) gives a fuller discussion of Augustan interpretations of the golden age.

95. See, for instance, the "Aureum Sacculum Urbano VIII P.O.M. orbi invectum anno MDCXIII," BAV, Barb. lat. 2105, fols. 1–9, by Mathias Casimir Sarbiéwski (the Jesuit known at court as the "Polish Horace"). In lines that deliberately recall the fourth Eclogue of Virgil, he wrote, "Aurea Romanis redeuntia Saccula fastis / Urbanumque Patrem, sacro cui lucidus auro / Annus init, nivique evolvunt tempora Menses, / Conditaque Hesperio canimus nova regna Quirino. / Phoebe, mone, si non solitis Helicona chores / Et nemora et riguis vocalia fontibus antra / Contigimus" (transcription from Anna Li Vigi, *Poeta quasi creator: Estetica e poesia in Mathias Casimir Sarbiéwski* [Palermo: Centro Internazionale Studi di Estetica, 2005], p. 22). In another ode, *Ad Apolloem*, Sarbiéwski implied comparison between Apollo and both Urban and Cardinal Francesco.


98. In the *Castelli*, the Barberini coat of arms and the motto *Hic Domus* are set in a laurel tree before a view of the Barberini fiefdom of Palestrina. Juxtaposition of the panel with others in the *Castelli*
series that show the royal palaces of Europe suggests parity of the papal family with older, established sovereign lines. The combination of the motto and the tree references an impresa of Maffeo Barberini, which in turn references book 7 of the *Aeneid*, in which a laurel tree swarming with bees is an omen of *translatio imperii*. For the impresa, see Schütze, *Kardinal Maffeo Barberini*, pp. 260–62. The Palestrina panel suggests that the Barberini are destiny-blessed “new Aeneases,” whose transfer from Florence to Rome set their destiny into motion. For the Castelli, see Pascal-François Bertrand, “*Hic Domus*: Le cardinal Francesco Barberini et le thème de ses premières tapiserries,” *Bulletin* (Association des Historiens de l’Art Italien), no. 6 (1999–2000), pp. 34–40.

99. The connections to birth, death, and rebirth are obvious for the *Adoration of the Magi*, the *Crucifixion*, and the *Resurrection*. The fourth panel, the *Last Supper*, refers to the Eucharistic transsubstantiation of the body of Christ, a sacramental “rebirth.”


102. Though the first payments for the weaving of the *Apollo* series came in April 1659, the design work (which is not firmly documented) preceded that and must have taken a certain amount of time. In all likelihood the idea for the *Apollo* series came in the middle of the decade, but its weaving was delayed by the finishing of the *Life of Christ* series as well as a smaller but urgent project, the weaving of an altar dossal of the *Annunciation* as a gift for the newly elected Pope Alexander VII. For the last project, which (including the borders) occupied the looms until February 1659, see De Strobel, *Le tapisserie romane*, pp. 30–31, and Harper, “Tapestry Production in Seventeenth-Century Rome,” in Campbell, ed., *Tapestry in the Baroque*, pp. 298–99, 310.

103. Horace, *Carmen Seculare* 13–20. The translation used here is from Putnam, *Horace’s Carmen Seculare*, p. 61. In the Latin and in full, these lines read, “Rite maturos aperire partus / lenis, Illithyia, tuere matres, / sive tu Lucina probas vocari / seu Genitalis: / diva, producas subolem patrumque / prosperes decreta super iugandis / feminis proliisque novae feraci / lege marita.” Illithyia, Lucina, and Genitalis are alternative names for Diana, the latter two emphasizing her role as the goddess of childbirth.


Tapestries in the Colonna Collection

Collecting tapestries in Baroque Rome may have arisen from different motivations. For such discriminating connoisseurs as Cardinal Scipione Borghese and Cardinal Alessandro Montalto, tapestries were magnificent objects of desire, as is revealed in their correspondence with the nuncios in Flanders and France. Tapestries were also admired for their high monetary value and were consequently viewed as instruments of self-propaganda, visible symbols of the wealth and prestige of their owners.

At the end of the seventeenth century, one of the most important Roman collections of tapestries was that of the gran conestabile Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna (1637–1689). The inventory of his possessions, drawn up soon after his death, listed, in addition to very rich textile coverings for furniture, 188 tapestries (doc. 8). This was quite a sizable ensemble compared to those of his contemporaries such as, for instance, Queen Christina of Sweden (1626–1689), whose collection was smaller in size although of higher quality, and Cardinal Nephew Pietro Aldobrandini (1571–1621), who in the opening years of the century had just over one hundred panels.

The principal Roman collections of tapestries of the period belonged mostly to papal and princely families or to high prelates, a fact that underscores the direct link between the very elevated cost of high-quality woven panels and the financial power of aristocrats and cardinal nephews. Archival sources reveal the existence of a great number of important tapestry collections. Accordingly, further research is needed to provide an adequate picture of the true situation at the time. Among the few exhaustive studies illustrating the use of textile furnishings for the interior decoration of palaces and for public ceremonies are those of Pascal-François Bertrand on the Barberini and the catalogue of the exhibition of tapestries of the Farnese and the Bourbons edited by Giuseppe Bertini and Nello Forti Grazzini. Forti Grazzini published the collection of tapestries preserved at the Palazzo del Quirinale. A thorough study of the considerable Vatican collections, of which only the most important pieces are known, is still lacking.

At the end of the sixteenth century, with the decline of the military obligations of the feudal aristocracy, courtly life became the chief concern of the grandees in the theater of Baroque Rome. Unceasing conflicts between feudal barons and papal nobility were signs of the relentless struggle for preeminence in official ceremonies that characterized the courtly society in which the Colonna and the Orsini—both considered on an equal footing with sovereign princes and the family of the reigning pope—were granted a privileged position. In this context, rich tapestries played a fundamental role in court splendor and were used as instruments of propaganda to promote and exalt the households of their owners.

In the Colonna family, tapestry collecting was probably more a function of dynastic and political ambitions than of aesthetic appreciation. The formation of the collection will be examined here based on archival documents that testify to the contributions of the relevant personalities in the family.
who shaped it over about a century, until 1689, the date of Lorenzo Onofrio's death and the time the collection reached its greatest number.16

MARTIN V: THE RETURN OF THE PAPACY TO ROME
The powerful Colonna family belongs to the oldest Roman nobility, and in the seventeenth century, it represented one of the last feudal households. Its fortune is owed mostly to Cardinal Oddone Colonna, later Pope Martin V (r. 1417–31), known as the one who effectively ended the Western Schism (1378–1417). He moved the papal court back to Rome after its nearly forty years of exile in Avignon, and he settled in his ancestral palace near the church of Santi Apostoli, where the main branch of the family, the Colonna di Paliano, still lives. He set about rescuing the Ecclesiastical State from the chaos into which it had fallen during the schism and carried out a vast program of reconstruction in Rome with the help of the celebrated artists of his time.17 The nepotism he liberally practiced toward his family greatly enlarged its territorial patrimony. This policy, later imitated by his successors, led to the formation of a new aristocracy with which the old nobility was always in harsh competition. Martin's favored relationship with Queen Joan II of Naples (r. 1414–35) yielded for his brothers rich feudal estates in the Kingdom of Naples and the corresponding illustrious titles. This entailed a durable alliance with the Spanish Crown, to which the Colonna would always be faithful. The feudal patrimony, both in the Kingdom of Naples and in the Papal States, is the primary source of the power of the Colonna.18

As a recollection of this glorious past, the tapestries from the time of Martin V were carefully kept. Both figurative panels and decorative verdures can be traced in the inventories until 1664: nine pieces said to be old and damaged are cited in 1611, but only six hangings survive from 1632 on.19

![Fig. 1. Colonna Armorial Portiere. Tapestry design by an unidentified artist, woven in an unidentified workshop, Rome (?), after 1648. Wool and silk, 405 x 300 cm. Collection of the Colonna Princes, Palazzo Colonna, Rome](image)

MARCANTONIO II, THE “TRIUMPHANT”: MILITARY GLORIES
With Marcantonio II Colonna (1535–1584), the family lived its moment of major glory, which would be recalled for posterity by the contemporary fresco decoration in the Palazzo di Paliano and later by the ceiling
frescoes decorating the vault of the gallery in the Roman palace at Santi Apostoli. In 1569, the dukedom of Paliano was made, to Marcantonio's benefit, into a princedom by Pope Pius V (r. 1566–72). Two years later, at the Battle of Lepanto, Prince Colonna distinguished himself against the Turks as admiral of the papal fleet and was accorded by the pope a weeklong public celebration on the model of the apotheoses bestowed upon the heroes of the Roman Empire. Marcantonio, dressed in black with the collar of the Golden Fleece granted him in 1560 by Philip II of Spain, was led to the church of Santa Maria in Aracoeli on the Capitoline Hill, where Roman heroes had been glorified, preceded by a procession of thousands, including Turkish prisoners and the spoils of war. On this occasion, the church was decorated with tapestries of the Triumphs of Scipio, illustrating the story of the hero who defeated Carthage, the traditional enemy of Rome, a clear allusion to Lepanto. The set was lent by (or hired from) Cardinal Ippolito d'Este (1509–1572), son of Alfonso II and Lucrezia Borgia and cardinal of Ferrara since 1538. Guy Delmarcel has recently established that the partial Scipio set, property of the Belgian State, displayed in Rome at the Academia Belgica, which belongs to one of the three earliest datable editions, apart from the lost Francis I set, is likely to have been part of the Este set. The Story of Psyche and Cupid set with the arms of the cardinal of Ferrara appears for the first time in the 1595 inventory. It is difficult to ascertain whether the set was purchased or received as a gift. Whichever the case, the arms of the prestigious first owner were never replaced. Seven of the original eight pieces were still extant in 1689, but after that date it is difficult to single them out in the inventories. None of these tapestries has survived. Some panels may be part of the "Dodici pezzi d'Arazzi detti Fichi [sic], Cupido" (Twelve pieces of tapestry called Figs and Cupid) mentioned in 1750. Although the story of Psyche and Cupid, taken from Lucius Apuleius's Golden Ass or Metamorphoses, was extremely successful among sixteenth-century weavers, very few series of that period have survived. Two lost twenty-six-piece sets made for Francis I and his son Henry II are known from seventeenth-century copies woven at the Paris manufactories and from descriptions in Louis XIV's inventory. They were woven after engravings by the Master of the Die, inspired by Raphael's frescoes of fictive tapestries painted on the vault of the loggia at the Villa Farnesina in Rome for the Sienese banker Agostino Chigi. These engravings may also have been influenced by Michel Coxie's work. A different set, woven in a Brussels workshop about the mid-sixteenth century, is in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Its composition was inspired by frescoes executed by Giovanni Battista Castello on the vaults of Tobia Pallavicino's palace in Genoa.

The inventory of Marcantonio II's residences in Messina and Palermo, taken in 1581 when he was viceroy of Sicily, an office granted him by Philip II of Spain in 1577, reveals that textile furnishings played an important role in the decoration of those palaces. It lists six narrative sets and one silk- and gold-woven figurative piece. Five tapestry portiere (door coverings) with figures are mentioned in the next inventory, 1583, together with further precious textiles such as thirteen baldachins, most incorporating his coat of arms, and seventeen portiere with heraldic devices. Of these sets, the nine-piece Story of Joseph would remain, throughout the seventeenth century, emblematic of the grandeur of the household, which, like most of the Roman noble families on state and festive occasions, decorated the facade of its palace with its most prestigious tapestries. The set is cited first in almost all seventeenth-century Colonna inventories until 1664. After that date, the Joseph set was probably considered old and worn, and it had lost its glamour. It had been lent to Cardinal Maidaichini. One
panel was cut in two pieces.\textsuperscript{34} It is described as in nine pieces until 1750,\textsuperscript{35} but in the 1785 inventory, there are only four extant pieces in poor condition.\textsuperscript{36}

The Colonna \textit{Story of Joseph} set has not survived. The narrative, which represented episodes in the life of the Old Testament patriarch who arrived in Egypt as a slave and, thanks to his God-given ability to interpret dreams, became chief adviser to Pharaoh, was extremely popular in the sixteenth century, particularly among the high nobility. A series was woven in Brussels after cartoons by Michiel Coxie and his circle.\textsuperscript{37} Others were woven about the mid-sixteenth century in Florence after designs by Agnolo Bronzino and collaborators.\textsuperscript{38} It is not easy to establish whether the Colonna set was Flemish or Florentine, but the inscriptions in the borders of each referred to in the documents suggest a Brussels workshop or at least exclude a Florentine manufactory, since the known tapestries it produced bear no inscription.\textsuperscript{39}

Besides the \textit{Story of Joseph}, only one other of Marcantonio’s sets can be traced in the documents: it is the \textit{Story of David}, of which just seven pieces of the original fifteen were listed in 1632.\textsuperscript{40} In 1664, five extant hangings were described as old and damaged and as having different borders, indicating that they belonged to different sets.\textsuperscript{41} No mention of them is found in the documents after this date.

**CARDINAL GIROLAMO COLONNA: A PATRON**

The significant expenditures for the military career of Marcantonio II and the subsequent indebtedness of the family were addressed and finances restored by the careful administration and shrewd matrimonial policy of Filippo I Colonna (1578–1659). Through the marriage of his daughter Anna to Taddeo Barberini, nephew of Pope Urban VIII (r. 1623–44), he wove a close relationship with the family of the reigning pope. Pursuant to Filippo’s will at his death but in spite of the objections of his eldest son, Federico (1600–61), Girolamo (1604–66), Filippo’s second son, was invested with the right of primogeniture and the feudal lands in the Papal States as well as the title Prince of Paliano. At Federico’s death, Girolamo inherited from him the territories in the Kingdom of Naples.\textsuperscript{42} Girolamo continued his father’s economic policy of restoration of the family finances, but this did not prevent him from undertaking an important redecoration of the palace and acquiring suitable works of art.\textsuperscript{43}

Girolamo was created cardinal by Urban VIII in 1627 and in 1632 was appointed archbishop of Bologna, where textile furnishings from his father’s collection were sent the following year to decorate his residence as befit his rank (see doc. 1, fol. 213). These consisted of two complete \textit{paramenti} of fine velvet, each containing pieces to cover the walls, a throne baldachin incorporating the Colonna device of the Siren,\textsuperscript{44} and other pieces as \textit{portiere} and overdoors, variously adorned with the family device and the conjoined arms of his parents, Filippo and Lucrezia Tomacelli. The cardinal was also given several tapestry sets, including the \textit{Story of Noah} and the \textit{Story of Hannibal},\textsuperscript{45} both in eight pieces, as well as four pieces of \textit{Wooded Landscapes} with animals and with figures (doc. 1). Girolamo returned to Rome in 1645 to take care of family business and, as chief of the household, settled in the ancestral palace. His lifelong acquaintance with Jules Mazarin (1602–61; created cardinal December 16, 1641, by Urban VIII)\textsuperscript{46} dated back to their infancy, when Mazarin’s father held the office of intendent of Filippo I, and was sealed by the marriage of Girolamo’s nephew Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna to Mazarin’s niece Maria Mancini.

The \textit{Story of Noah} entered the collection at the time of Filippo I and is first mentioned in 1626, after the death of Lucrezia Tomacelli.\textsuperscript{47} It is listed among the cardinal’s Roman possessions in 1657.\textsuperscript{48} The tapestries
as described in 1689, “con fregi d’uccelli, animali, e figure” (with borders of birds, animals, and figures), recall the borders of the second set woven for Philip II of Spain about 1565 by Willem de Pannemaker (partially surviving in the Patrimonio Nacional of Spain), which had newly conceived border designs featuring the four elements with animals in their natural habitat.\(^a\)

The Colonna set of the *Story of Hannibal* might have been one of the ones woven in Brussels beginning in the mid-sixteenth century. Several sets are known, and pieces are preserved at the cathedral of Zamora.\(^b\) But those who compiled the inventories were unsure of the subjects. The set therefore may be a duplicate of the *Story of Scipio and Hannibal*, based on designs by Giulio Romano and Giovanni Francesco Penni, which was first woven in Brussels for Francis I.\(^c\)

The 1632 inventory of the contents of Filippo’s palace in Rome also includes a thirteen-piece *Story of Abraham* “in figure piccole . . . fatti à grotteschi” (with small figures . . . in a grotesque style), the composition of which might have echoed a mille-fleurs set depicting the life of the patriarch and the Sacrifice of Isaac woven in Bruges in the last quarter of the sixteenth century after cartoons by Maarten de Vos.\(^d\) They were passed on to the abbot Pietro, a younger brother of Girolamo’s, according to an inventory taken about 1643.\(^e\)
It is of interest to note that three pieces of a *Story of Atlas* with spheres and signs of the zodiac are listed among Filippo’s possessions in the inventories of 1632 and 1636. They disappear from the documents after that date. The set recalls a prestigious sixteenth-century Brussels set in the collection of the Patrimonio Nacional.

As to tapestry collecting, Cardinal Colonna and Cardinal Mazarin probably both felt the influence of the Barberini, who were keen collectors of woven panels. From at least 1635, Mazarin, who was to become the avid collector we know, sought tapestries for his patron, Cardinal Antonio Barberini, when he was in Paris, and he later acquired a hanging for Cardinal Giovan Francesco Guidi di Bagno, an erudite and passionate connoisseur of tapestries. Giovan Francesco’s younger brother, Monsignor Nicolò Guidi di Bagno, when he was nuncio in France, oversaw for Cardinal Colonna the weaving of fourteen large *portiere* in an unidentified workshop. Cardinal Colonna was aware that tapestry was a key component of courtly ceremony and decoration of the palace of a princely household. The items listed in the 1648 inventory of his possessions (doc. 2) reflect his recent purchases of tapestries and reveal, more than his aesthetic inclinations, an intent to own hangings suitable to his rank as prince-cardinal and head of one of the noblest families in Rome. The inventory opens with the *portiere* with coats of arms and family devices that Guidi di Bagno saw woven in France. The *portiere* were accompanied by six “pezzi di fregio” (pieces of frieze), probably ornamental bands woven with the Colonna device. The next item listed is a baldachin, the first one, and ultimately the only one, woven in tapestry to enter the Colonna collections. Woven in an unspecified Roman workshop, it incorporated, on a blue ground, the coat of arms of the cardinal on the backcloth, and on the canopy the classical Colonna device of a Siren; she is described as in the sea and holding the Colonna coat of arms in her hand. The baldachin included four valances, two long and two short, with yellow silk fringe all around, and it was accompanied by four *portiere* with the cardinal’s coat of arms on a blue ground and swags of flowers in the borders, with fringe of yellow silk. These *portiere* were woven by Pietro Lascotti, or Lescot, a Roman weaver of French origin who was the head of one of the two main workshops of the Barberini manufactory (doc. 3).

The coat of arms on the extant heraldic *portiera* (fig. 1) is quite similar to that described on the panels woven by Lascotti, but the borders are different. Instead of swags of flowers, they incorporate emblematic devices symbolizing the virtuous deeds of the family, among which are a Maltese cross, various miters, military trophies including a shield with a Turkish crescent, and papal insignia such as the triregnum (papal tiara), the umbrella, and the keys of Saint Peter. The coat of arms on a blue ground in the center includes a shield with the column, surmounted by a two-tailed mermaid-like figure and a gold crown held by two winged putti. The shield is supported by two Turkish prisoners and surrounded by banners, of which the upper ones include different coats of arms. The privilege of the crown in the crest was granted in the fourteenth century by Ludwig IV of Bavaria, Holy Roman Emperor, to Cardinal Sciarra Colonna for his help on the occasion of his coronation in Rome. The hanging bears no city’s or weaver’s marks. The device featuring a Siren was an old Colonna emblem, already in use at the time of Martin V and seen on the facade of his palace at Genazzano. But from 1435, the Siren in the crest evoked the privilege granted to the Colonna by Alfonso V of Aragón for their participation in the naval battle for the succession to Queen Joan II of Naples (see note 38). The motif was illustrated in an early seventeenth-century fresco painted by an artist of the circle of Cesare Nebbia and Giovanni Guerra, on the vault of the Fountain Room in the Palazzo...
Colonna at Santi Apostoli (fig. 2); there the Colonna shield is surrounded by the collar of the Order of the Golden Fleece, and Turkish slaves crouch beneath. It was also used for furniture design, as seen on a wall table (fig. 3), on which the Siren is shown with Turkish slaves on either side.

Pietro Lascotti also executed two cantone (narrow pieces that complete the tapestry decoration of a room) and two panels to finish a “new” set of the Story of Hannibal that Girolamo had received from Giacinto Alessandri of Bologna as settlement of his debt toward the cardinal. From a Jewish merchant in Rome, the cardinal purchased two different sets of the Story of Honatus Codes. He also acquired a set of very fine Brussels tapestry, the Story of Scipio and Hannibal in ten pieces (doc. 5). These acquisitions of armorial tapestries as well as sets illustrating classical history and legends substantiate the cardinal’s intent in reasserting the ancientness of the nobility of his family and its place among Latin heroes.
The audience hall of Maria Mancini at the time she was still living with her husband, Lorenzo Onofrio, whom she left in 1672, was hung with one of the two sets of the *Story of Horatius Cocles*. One of the sets included inscriptions; the other did not. “Horatius the one-eyed” was a legendary Roman hero who defended the city against the Etruscans and drove them back at Pons Sublicius. He was a member of the *gens Horatia*, a family known in Rome from very ancient times. His exploits at Pons Sublicius were recorded in frescoes by Luzio Luzzi (Luzio Romano) at Castel Sant’Angelo for Pope Paul III (r. 1534–49).

During the Renaissance in a series of tapestries of the *Triumphs of the Seven Virtues*, Horatius Cocles personified Fortitude. Since Fortitude was considered one of the Colonna family virtues and is traditionally associated with their emblem, the column, it is not surprising that Cardinal Girolamo purchased two sets of the *Story of Horatius Cocles*. 
MARCANTONIO V COLONNA
GIOENI: A PRIVATE DIMENSION
Marcantonio V, Lorenzo Onofrio’s father, was known as Marcantonio Colonna Gioeni, from the surname of his wife, Isabella Gioeni, a Sicilian heiress who had inherited her father’s feudal estates. After some years spent in Sicily, where Lorenzo Onofrio was born, Marcantonio returned to Rome with his family, when in 1642 he succeeded his oldest brother, Federico, in the office of gran connestabile of the Kingdom of Naples. He settled in the Palazzo Colonna at Santi Apostoli. An inventory of the furnishings of his apartment there, taken in 1654, reveals that Marcantonio was influenced by the wind of renewal that was blowing through the palace while Cardinal Girolamo was redecorating his private quarters. But Marcantonio, who, as a younger brother, was free from the obligations incumbent upon the chief of the household, would manifest a taste quite different from Girolamo’s, that is, a taste mainly characterized by a pleasant private dimension.

Of the sixteen sets of tapestries enumerated in the 1654 inventory (doc. 6), only three narrative sets are found in the first
inventory of Marcantonio’s son Lorenzo Onofrio, taken in 1664: the History of the King of France in eight pieces, which likely corresponds to the one Lorenzo Onofrio would take to Aragón in 1678 after he was appointed viceroy by Charles II of Spain in October 1677; the Story of Queen Niobe in seven pieces, probably corresponding to a Story of Diana; and the eight-piece Story of Alexander with a piece of painted cloth as a complementary frieze. He also kept a set with verdures and animals and its two overdoors. The other sets, most of which had been brought from Sicily as mentioned in the 1654 inventory, were either given to his brother Pietro or exchanged by a Jewish merchant, Leone Air, likely for other pieces not specified in the document. The same inventory lists pieces acquired by Marcantonio in 1652, of which it is difficult to ascertain whether they are tapestries or rather parati used to cover the walls, as for instance the six all’indiana silk and gold pieces with their door covering, table cover, and overdoors for which 1,600 scudi were paid to Giovanni de Cordula in 1653, or the “nearly new” eight pieces a broccatello (like a brocade) with vases. In 1655, Marcantonio
purchased an eight-piece Story of Massinissa in Antwerp for 1,240 scudi. Massinissa was a king of Numidia, famed for his role as a Roman ally in the Battle of Zama. His story, like that of Hannibal, is derived from the Story of Scipio.

Marcantonio had already purchased, during the 1640s, fifteen tapestries from the duca di Ceri for 3,168 scudi, and five pieces of Wooded Landscape from Pietro Paolo Valentini, a secondhand dealer in Rome. To complete the furnishing of his Roman apartment, he turned, like many of his contemporaries, to Jewish merchants for secondhand tapestries, portiere, and overdoors, and commissioned from the weavers Bartholomeo Torreggiani and Caterina della Riviera seat covers and a table cover, both woven in silk. In 1652, four embroidered gold-cloth portiere were commissioned from Francesco Vezzi.

LORENZO ONOFRIO: THE CENTRAL FIGURE IN COLONNA TAPESTRY COLLECTING

By the time Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna died in 1689, the family’s tapestry collection, gathered through inheritance and acquisi-
tion, had reached its largest extent. His privileged relationship with the Spanish Crown made him the uncontested central figure of the Roman scene in the second half of the seventeenth century. He was also one of the most important patrons of the arts of his time and collected more than nine hundred paintings. Among members of his family, he stands out as the one who left the major imprint on the Palazzo Colonna. In particular, he was responsible for the construction of the Great Gallery, which had begun in 1661 just after his marriage to Maria Mancini, former favorite of King Louis XIV. Lorenzo Onofrio’s patronage must be understood in light of the temporary crisis endured by the family at the death in 1644 of Pope Urban VIII, to whom the Colonna were bound by close ties of friendship, and of the consequent need to recover their rank within the courtly society when it was further compromised by Maria’s extravagant escape in 1674. In a period when old nobility had to defend its privileges against the new nobility of the papal families, the display of sumptuous hangings was part of the strategy, which is probably why the number of narrative tapestries in Lorenzo Onofrio’s collection was greater than the decorative and verdure panels. The 1689 inventory (doc. 8) details 188 tapestries, including fifteen narrative sets (111 pieces), six sets of verdures variously called “wooded landscape and hunts,” “gardens,” or “giant leaves” (42 pieces), one nine-piece set of decorative panels “tessuti à foggia broccatelli” (woven in the manner of brocade) with vases purchased by his father in 1652, and twenty-six extra pieces, assumed to be the remains of older figured sets. In addition to this group of 188 tapestries were thirty-four portiere (thirty with armorial motifs and four with verdures), the throne baldachin, thirteen woven cantonate, and twenty-three pieces of painted cloth such as cantonate, termini, and overdoors, used to complete tapestry decoration.

The first set listed in the 1689 inventory is the History of the King of France with different borders from those on the set owned by Marcantonio V, as noted above. Five of the eight hangings were displayed in the Audience Hall, where official business was conducted by the gran conoscenti. This selection reminds us of the ambition of Prince Colonna, who, although a Hispanophile by tradition, aspired to put himself on equal standing with the grand monarch of the day, the king of France. The prestigious set was considered one of the most suitable to demonstrate at a glance the status and power of its owner, and it was among those taken to Aragón by Lorenzo Onofrio in 1678.

The Tales from Ovid, a subject not found in any of the Colonna inventories before the 1689 one, may correspond to the Hunts of Diana purchased by Cardinal Girolamo, along with four pieces of Wooded Landscapes with Hunts, from his sister Vittoria, known as Suor Chiara Maria della Passione, before his death in 1666. The set of the Story of Caesar was among the tapestries that entered the Colonna collection at the time of Lorenzo Onofrio, as did the nine-piece set with gold known as the “Le maraviglie” (the Wonders of the World) and two sets of Wooded Landscapes with Views. The Story of Caesar set is described as “bellissimi, e nuovi” (very beautiful and new) and could have been among the sets woven in the Brussels workshops of Willem van Leefdael and Gerard van der Streek after cartoons by Justus van Egmont.

As to the “Wonders,” the description of each hanging enables us to identify the subject as the Story of Artemisia, five pieces of which are still in the Palazzo Colonna and two are at the Minneapolis Institute of Arts; two smaller pieces are lost. The misunderstanding of the subject matter is likely due to the presence in some of the backgrounds of monuments that were considered wonders of the ancient world: the Colossus of Rhodes in the Queen Entering the Harbor of Rhodes and the Colosseum in Rome in the background of the Riding Lesson. The Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, the plans of which are being presented to the queen in...
Fig. 9. The Finding of Moses (detail) from an eight-piece set of the Story of Moses. Tapestry cartoon by Abraham van Diepenbeeck, woven in the workshop of Michiel Wauters, Antwerp, ca. 1660–79. Wool and silk, 407 × 403 cm (inside wood frame). Collection of the Colonna Princes, Palazzo Colonna, Rome

Fig. 10. Moses and the Burning Bush (detail) from an eight-piece set of the Story of Moses. Tapestry cartoon by Abraham van Diepenbeeck, woven in the workshop of Michiel Wauters, Antwerp, ca. 1660–79. Wool and silk, 407 × 395 cm (inside wood frame). Collection of the Colonna Princes, Palazzo Colonna, Rome
Fig. 11. The Raising of the Brazen Serpent (detail) from an eight-piece set of the Story of Moses. Tapestry cartoon by Abraham van Diepenbeeck, woven in the workshop of Michiel Wauters, Antwerp, ca. 1660–79. Wool and silk, 407 × 516 cm (inside wood frame). Collection of the Colonna Princes, Palazzo Colonna, Rome

Fig. 12. Moses Striking the Rock (detail) from an eight-piece set of the Story of Moses. Tapestry cartoon by Abraham van Diepenbeeck, woven in the workshop of Michiel Wauters, Antwerp, ca. 1660–79. Wool and silk, 405 × 513 cm (inside wood frame). Collection of the Colonna Princes, Palazzo Colonna, Rome
Fig. 13. View of the first antecamera on the piano nobile of the Winter Apartment in the Palazzo Colonna, the room with the Story of Moses tapestries. Between the windows hangs The Finding of Moses and on the wall at right, The Raising of the Brazen Serpent. Above the door in the background, partially hidden by the chandelier, is the painted overdoor Baby Moses Placed with a Wet Nurse by Pharaoh’s Daughter (fig. 14). Collection of the Colonna Princes

the sixth piece listed in the inventory, was also considered a wonder.

How Lorenzo Onofrio acquired this set of the Story of Artemisia is not known. A nine-piece set “with gold” is listed among the pieces he took to Aragón in 1678 (see note 72). Since the Artemisia set is the only gold-woven set in the Colonna collection, we may assume it is the same set as the one listed in 1678. However, it could not have been given by Louis XIV to Maria Mancini on the occasion of her marriage to Lorenzo Onofrio in 1661, as has been rumored, because neither the set nor the gift is mentioned in earlier Colonna documents. It seems more plausible that these magnificent tapestries were purchased secondhand by Lorenzo Onofrio, who, in his strategy of reaffirmation of the status of the family through works of art, probably considered that he was lacking an important set woven with gold.

The series depicts the deeds of Artemisia, Queen of Caria, famous for erecting a funeral monument to her husband, King Mausolus. The story, dedicated to Catherine de’ Medici, was written in 1562 by Nicolas Houel, a Parisian apothecary, and illustrated with drawings, commissioned from Antoine Caron, which Houel suggested might also be used as models for tapestries. The designs were not translated into woven panels until the beginning of the seventeenth century. The series was one of the most popular in France and abroad.76
Apart from the Colonna set, two others belonging to Italian patrons are known, a twelve-piece set woven in Paris about 1606 for Cardinal Alessandro Montalto and an eight-piece set with the arms of Louis XIII that was in the Barberini collection and is now in Minneapolis. An isolated piece of the *Riding Lesson* of which little is known is in the Vatican collections.

The 1689 inventory details the subjects of the Colonna series as follows: 1. *Procession of Priests and Children* (fig. 4); 2. *The Gifts* (Minneapolis); 3. *A Butler with Servers Carrying Vases* (fig. 5); 4. *The Queen’s Entry into the Harbor of Rhodes or The Colossus of Rhodes* (Minneapolis); 5. *The Queen Distributing the Booty* (fig. 6); 6. *The Queen Examining the Projects of the Architects* (fig. 7); 7. *The Riding Lesson* (fig. 8); 8. *The Education of the Young King* (lost); 9. *Three Figures with Vases* (lost). All the panels have wide borders with the letters AM woven in the side cartouches; Isabelle Denis has convincingly read these as standing for Artemisia and Mausolus.

In each of the five hangings in the Palazzo Colonna, the main field was reduced, mostly at the top and sides, probably so they would fit in a new location. This is confirmed by the fact that the two pieces in Minneapolis have preserved their original dimensions and have the marks FM and a flower resembling a pink, or dianthus, woven into the selvage. The significance of the FM monogram has most recently been strongly argued by Bertrand as that of the manufactory of the Faubourg Saint-Marcel, run by the Flemish entrepreneurs Marc de Comans and François de La Planche, while the flower is the signature of the *boutique d’or* (gold shop), one of the two main workshops of the manufactory, specializing in the most precious weavings, those with metal-wrapped thread. Since the flower mark does not appear on weavings after 1623, it seems likely that the Colonna hangings were woven before this date.

Eight of the Colonna *Artemisia* hangings depict episodes that were woven often, but
one appears to be unique since the subject has not been found in any other set. The Queen Examining the Projects of the Architects (fig. 7) shows Artemisia studying a plan for a projected funeral monument to King Mausolus. The drawing by Antoine Caron depicting this episode is very different from the scene illustrated in the tapestry. It could not, therefore, have been the source of inspiration for the full-scale design. The composition and style were intended to match the Mannerist style of the other panels, and the borders are identical. The main scene nonetheless shows Baroque additions such as the facade of the Mausoleum, which echoed the recently completed facade of the Roman church of Sant'Andrea della Valle, and the figure of the queen in regal attire, seated under a draped blue canopy that confers on the scene a typical theatrical Baroque effect. The scene is set in a stately loggia adorned with columns, pilasters, and statues.

Payments made by Lorenzo Onofrio's administration (doc. 9) show that by 1670 he had planned to add a new panel woven with gold to the eight he already owned. Giuseppe Belloni received 50 scudi for the design of the borders, while in 1672 payments were made in favor of the weaver Lorenzo Castellani and his companions. Also in 1672 the painter Francesco Rossi received 20 scudi for a "pittura in forma d'arazzo" (painting in the form of a tapestry), which was likely the cartoon, and in 1677 a final settlement was made to Lorenzo Castellani and Lamberto della Mancia.

From at least 1647, Lorenzo Castellani seems to have been working in Rome. He delivered a woven altar frontal (1657) and the termine for the Story of Apollo (1668) to Cardinal Francesco Barberini, and, in collaboration with Pietro Lascotti, he restored the Barberini set of the Story of the Trojan War. He produced a tapestry of Saint John the Baptist and Saint John the Evangelist after a sketch by Belloni, commissioned by Cardinal Flavio Chigi for the basilica of San Giovanni in Laterano (probably lost).
Fig. 16. The Battle of Arbela from a six-piece set of the Story of Alexander. Tapestry cartoon by an unidentified artist after Charles Le Brun, woven in the workshop of an unidentified weaver, Brussels, ca. 1670–1700. Wool and silk, 339 × 519 cm (inside wood frame). Collection of the Colonna Princes, Palazzo Colonna, Rome

Fig. 17. The Queens of Persia at the Feet of Alexander from a six-piece set of the Story of Alexander. Tapestry cartoon by an unidentified artist after Charles Le Brun, woven in the workshop of an unidentified weaver, Brussels, ca. 1670–1700. Wool and silk, 338 × 414 cm (inside wood frame). Collection of the Colonna Princes, Palazzo Colonna, Rome
Giuseppe Belloni was in the circle of Pietro da Cortona, who designed the Roman pieces of the *Story of Constantine* and the series of the *Life of Pope Urban VIII* for Cardinal Francesco Barberini.87 Specializing in tapestry cartoons, Belloni was commissioned, in 1648, to produce the full-scale design for the Annunciation panel in the *Life of Christ* series and for the *Story of Deborah* after designs by Giovanni Francesco Romanelli.88 As for Francesco Rossi, nothing is known of his work.

Lorenzo Onofrio also purchased second-hand tapestries such as two different sets of *Wooded Landscapes with Views*, mentioned above, and seven pieces of *Wooded Landscape* in wool, nearly new, paying 200 scudi to the Roman merchant Girolamo Palazzeschi.89 His wife, Maria, turned to Salomone Todesco (the German), a Jewish merchant who had sold “ordinary” tapestries to the Barberini,90 to purchase five pieces of the *Story of Joshua* woven in Brussels, already in poor condition in 1664.91

In 1681, Lorenzo Onofrio returned from Spain with increased prestige and fortune. His efforts at recapturing preeminence within the Roman court were crowned with success thanks to the marriage, in April of that year, of his eldest son, Filippo (1663–1714), to Lorenza de La Cerda (d. 1697), daughter of the duque de Medinaceli, minister plenipotentiary of Spain. At the death of his father in 1689, Filippo succeeded him as gran connestabile of the Kingdom of Naples and inherited the primogeniture.

**LATER INVENTORIES AND THE SURVIVING HANGINGS**

The room-by-room inventory taken at Filippo’s death in 1714 records most of the...
Fig. 19. *The Defeat of Pons* (left part) from a six-piece set of the *Story of Alexander*. Tapestry cartoon by an unidentified artist after Charles Le Brun, woven in the workshop of an unidentified weaver, Brussels, ca. 1670–1700. Wool and silk, H. 336 cm (inside wood frame). Collection of the Colonna Princes, Palazzo Colonna, Rome

Fig. 20. *The Defeat of Pons* (right part) from a six-piece set of the *Story of Alexander*. Tapestry cartoon by an unidentified artist after Charles Le Brun, woven in the workshop of an unidentified weaver, Brussels, ca. 1670–1700. Wool and silk, 337 × 488 cm (inside wood frame). Collection of the Colonna Princes, Palazzo Colonna, Rome
items, including the tapestries, that were listed in 1689 and their location in the palace at Santi Apostoli. The tapestries were also listed in a separate fascicle, "Nota degli arazzi" (Note of the tapestries). Missing from the 1714 inventory, in addition to some miscellaneous pieces and portiere, are three principal sets: the seven-piece Tales from Ovid (this generic name makes it difficult to identify), the Este Story of Psyche and Cupid, and the decorative set a brocatoello with vases, purchased, as we have seen, by Lorenzo Onofrio's father. No additional hangings entered the collection during Filippo's time. This might suggest that Filippo had no interest in these beautiful works or that this type of wall decoration was losing its appeal. It might also mean that no further artistic strategy was required since Lorenzo Onofrio's ambitions had been met and the family had reestablished its position among the highest nobility.

Although the Colonna collections were subject to the right of primogeniture and protected from dispersal as a fideicommissum, they, like those of many families, were much depleted over the course of the eighteenth century because of unforeseen family and political events. As a sign of these unfavorable circumstances, Filippo III (1760–1818), a descendant of Lorenzo Onofrio and the last Gran connestabile of Naples, sent all his silverware as well as some of his sculpted objects to the papal mint to be melted down, according to an inventory of 1785. In 1796, Filippo III placed his private militia at the disposal of Pope Pius VI, who had to face the invasion of the Papal States by General Bonaparte's troops, and in doing so was appointed general of the papal army. In 1798, the Roman Republic was proclaimed after General Louis Alexandre Berthier invaded Rome and imprisoned Pope Pius VI in France, where he died on August 29, 1799. Feudal rights were abolished, and the Roman nobility sold many works of art to help pay the tariffs imposed on them by the French. Filippo was assessed 80,000 scudi, equivalent to a year's income. On September 15, 1816, because of an increased tax burden, he renounced the privileges, which in 1814 had been reestablished to the aristocracy in the Papal States by Pius VII (r. 1800–1823). In the Kingdom of Naples, the feudal rights were abolished in 1806 and were never restored. Since Filippo had no sons, at his death his free patrimony was divided among his three surviving daughters, while the primogeniture passed to his nephew Aspreno (1787–1847).

As for tapestries, by the end of the eighteenth century, they were often kept folded up in storage rooms and brought out only for visiting American collectors who were interested in acquiring them, as happened with the Barberini tapestry collection. This lack of esteem accorded tapestry is demonstrated in the 1785 posthumous inventory of Filippo III, in which a scant ten sets are listed and the subjects of most are mistakenly recorded. The rest of the collection is grouped into several indistinct masses of hangings, and most are described as in poor condition.

At present, the rooms in the Palazzo Colonna are hung with seventeen tapestries: five pieces of the Artemisia set and an armorial portiere that were among the 188 pieces listed in Lorenzo Onofrio's collection; four pieces of the Story of Moses that entered in the collection through the marriage, in 1718, of Fabrizio Colonna (1700–1755), first son of Filippo II (1663–1714) and grandson of Lorenzo Onofrio, to Caterina Zeffirina Salviati, who brought them as dowry; six pieces of the Story of Alexander that were apparently in the collection from about 1763; and an early sixteenth-century panel with courtly scenes acquired in the nineteenth century. The four pieces of the Story of Moses were part of an eight-piece set inventoried in 1756, when it was described as woven in a Brussels workshop, faded and damaged, appraised at 1,000 scudi. Half the pieces disappeared between 1756 and 1785. The
four extant panels illustrate the *Finding of Moses* (fig. 9), *Moses and the Burning Bush* (fig. 10), *the Raising of the Brazen Serpent* (fig. 11), and *Moses Striking the Rock* (fig. 12). Each hanging is framed by an architectural motif of two pilasters linked by an entablature, the pilasters decorated with a female and a male term emerging from a swag of flowers and raising a bowl of fruit in their hands (see fig. 13). Similar borders, but with more elaborate terms, frame the *Story of Judith* in Hluboká Castle, Czech Republic, as well as a set of *Hunts* in the Royal Museums of Art and History, Brussels, woven in the Reydams-Leyniers Brussels workshop between 1712 and 1719, when these two workshops were associated. They were probably the source of the design for the Colonna borders.

The main scenes of the *Moses* panels are characterized by a simple and conventional composition that follows the biblical narrative literally and reflects a Counter-Reformation influence that leaves no room for any arbitrary interpretation of the subject. The weaving is attributed to the Antwerp workshop of Michiel Wauters, between 1660 and 1679, after designs by Abraham van Diepenbeeck (1596–1675). This attribution is based on the identification of the Colonna *Finding of Moses* with a panel with different borders preserved in Zagreb. Abraham van Diepenbeeck and Michiel Wauters were in turn credited respectively for the designs and the weaving of the Zagreb hanging by Nello Forti Grazzini on the basis of the similarity of the borders to those of a piece of the *Acts of the Apostles* in the Jerusalem Chapel of Westminster Abbey, London, attributed convincingly by George Wingfield Digby to Michiel Wauters (note 94). Other sets were woven after the same cartoons, such as a five-piece set showing some iconographical simplifications and slightly different borders at the Château de Flaugergues in Montpellier, France, and another in seven pieces with different borders that is in the collection of the Société Archéologique de Montpellier.

In 1870, the antiquary Xavier Barbier de Montault noted that the decoration of a room in the Palazzo Colonna that was hung with four pieces of the *Story of Moses* was completed by overdoor paintings of the *Baby Moses Placed with a Wet Nurse by Pharaoh’s Daughter* (fig. 14), *Esther Fainting before Ahasuerus*, and *Susanna and the Elders.*

The earliest inventory listing that refers with certainty to the six-piece *Story of Alexander* that is currently displayed in the Palazzo Colonna is in the 1763 inventory of Cardinal Girolamo II, grandson of Lorenzo Onofrio. The set, which was not part of the primogeniture, passed to the descendants of Girolamo’s elder brother, Fabrizio. The panels are described in the inventory as hanging in the Audience Hall and in the Tapestry Room, each in its carved and gilt wood frame, as they are today, and they were appraised at 1,800 scudi. The date and circumstances by which they entered the Colonna collection are so far not known; no mention of them appears in any of Lorenzo Onofrio’s inventories.

The set was woven after adaptations of Charles Le Brun’s famous painted cycle, dated between 1661—when the first painting, the *Tent of Darius*, was begun—and 1673—when the last one, the *Defeat of Porus*, was exhibited at the Paris Salon. The episodes in the set, in chronological order, are the *Crossing of the River Granicus*, depicting Alexander’s successful first engagement with the Persians, which opened for him the way to Asia; the *Tent of Darius*, also known as the *Queens of Persia at the Feet of Alexander*, in which they implore clemency from the Macedonian after the defeat of King Darius; the *Battle of Arbela*, a cavalry battle concluded by a decisive victory over Darius; *Alexander’s Triumphal Entry into Babylon*, representing the climax of Alexander’s Persian campaign when he receives the homage of the ancient city; and the *Defeat of Porus* (depicted in two large panels), an episode of
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the Indian campaign. Le Brun’s *Story of Alexander* was woven from 1664 at the Manufature Royale des Gobelins after cartoons based on his paintings. The battle scenes, considered too large to be woven in a single piece, were divided into a main center scene and a narrower piece for each side. Engravings after the paintings were soon made by Gérard Edelinck, Gérard Audran, and Sébastien Leclerc and served as models for series woven in Brussels workshops, notably those of Marcus de Vos and Jan-François van den Hecke. Notwithstanding the dense and silky quality of the weaving, quite similar to products of the Gobelins ateliers, the Colonna *Alexander* set was probably woven in Brussels, possibly in the workshop of Marcus de Vos or Jan-François van den Hecke. While all Gobelins sets faithfully follow Le Brun’s models, surviving examples of the Flemish weavings show differences in color and in the division of the battle scenes. These differences may also be noted in the Colonna set: the *Crossing of the Granicus* (fig. 15) and the *Battle of Arbela* (fig. 16) are each woven in a single panel. With respect to Le Brun’s model and to Gobelins weavings, the Colonna *Queens of Persia at the Feet of Alexander* (fig. 17) presents a reversed image, with the figures of Alexander and Hephaestion at the right of the composition. The scene is limited to a brief moment in the narrative, and the monumental figures occupy the entire space of the picture area. This is due to a drastic reduction in the size of the composition and the consequent elimination of the secondary elements. A comparison of the Colonna weaving of the *Queens of Persia at the Feet of Alexander* with one woven at the Gobelins that is now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, shows variations in the color of the tent and in some of the costumes. For the *Triumphant Entry of Alexander into Babylon* (fig. 18), Le Brun’s original proportions were modified and consequently emphasis seems to be placed on Alexander and the elephants, which appear larger because of the reduction in the upper and lower portions of Le Brun’s scene. The panel might have been shortened, but the edges are masked by the wood frame. As for the *Defeat of Purna*, the battle episode was divided into two large scenes, each on a single panel (figs. 19, 20).

Earlier sets of *Alexander* tapestries documented in the Colonna inventories cannot possibly correspond to the six panels hanging in the palace now, because Le Brun’s paintings provide an absolute terminus ante quem. They may have been the product of Flemish workshops like the series woven in Brussels by Jean Leyniers after cartoons by Jacob Jordaeus, which was highly praised in Rome since the Chigi, a Roman princely family descending from Pope Alexander VII, owned at least three sets, as indicated by Bertrand. It was seemingly also a favorite subject of the Barberini, Urban VIII’s family, since they owned two sets of it. The eight-piece set called the *Battles* in the 1679 inventory of Lorenzo Onofrio’s Roman guardaroba may also relate to a *Story of Alexander*, since in the literature, Le Brun’s paintings after which the extant series were woven were variously called “History,” “Triumph,” and, more frequently, “Battles of Alexander.”

A restoration of the Colonna *Story of Alexander* is planned in the not too distant future, and that will enable a closer study. In addition, we may be able to learn more about their origin, for any manufacturers’ signatures or marks that may be in their borders will be uncovered when they are unframed.
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2. The honorary office of Grand Constable (graven constabulare of constable) of the Kingdom of Naples, or commander in chief of the army, was the first among the seven high offices of the Kingdom of Naples granted to the great vassals of the Spanish Crown. It implied the right to sit to the right of the king or the viceroy. Fabrizio Colonna (d. 1520), grandfather of Marcantonio II, was the first of his family to receive this hereditary title (December 23, 1515).


5. According to a practice consolidated in the seventeenth century, the newly elected pope appointed as cardinal one of his close relatives, generally a nephew. The cardinal nephew held the office of Superintendent of the Ecclesiastical State and handled the temporal affairs and foreign relations of the Holy See. He was usually charged with collecting works of art for his newly ennobled family.


8. For the tapestries woven in Roman workshops, see Anna Maria De Strobel, Le atazzerie romane dal XVII al XIX secolo (Rome, 1989).

9. Renata Ago, "Sovrannt pontefice e società di corte: Competizioni cerimoniali e politica nella seconda metà del XVII secolo," in Maria Antonietta Visceglia and Catherine Brice, eds., Ceremonial et rituel à Rome: XVIIe–XVIIe siècle (Rome, 1997), p. 225; Maria Antonietta Visceglia, "Il cerimoniale come linguaggio politico: Su alcuni conflitti di precedenza alla corte di Roma tra Cinquecento e Seicento," in ibid., p. 139. Ever since the sixteenth century, the most prestigious secular office in the Vatican administration has been that of Prince Assistent to the Pontifical Throne. This hereditary position was shared by the heads of the oldest noble families in Rome, Princes Orsini and Colonna, who occupied the post during public ceremonies before all the Roman feudal barons. The position was conferred in perpetuity by Pope Sixtus V in 1589 on the occasion of the marriage of his grandnephew Flavia and Orsina to, respectively, Virginio Orsini, duke of Bracciano, and Marcantonio III, prince and duke of Paliano. Precedence was granted to the older of the two. See Gaetano Moroni, Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica da S. Pietro sino ai nostri giorni... (Venice, 1840–61), vol. 40, pp. 233–34, 240.

10. The Colonna private archives may be consulted at the convent of Santa Scholastica in Subiaco. I express my gratitude to Don Romano Di Cosmo, Elia Mariano, Cinzia Di Fazio, Micaela Lucci, Tiziana Checchi, and Carlo Cristofanilli for the help I received at Subiaco. I am also grateful to Prince Prospero Colonna for his generous assistance. In addition, I thank Dottoressa Patrizia Piergiovanni for her help during this research.


13. 1611: AC, III QB 36, "Inventario de Beni Ereditarij dell'Ecc.mo S.r G. Contestabile D. Marc'Anté Colonna Juniores 1611 A P.mo Luglio, Fatto ad Instanza dell'Ecc.mo Sig.r D. Filippo Colonna Erede Beneficiato," fol. 17; "Razzì fatti a figura, et à boscaglia, antichissimi chiamati di Papa Martino.
pezzi tra grandi, e piccoli n° nove tutti stracciati, e cattivi Cincuenta scudi—30—.”

1632: AC, III QB 5/A, fol. 44 (appendix, doc. 1); 1656: AC, III QB 35, fol. 38; 1639: AC, III QB 37, fol. 24, and AC III QB 36, fol. 26; 1647: AC, III QB 12, fol. 150; 1664: AC, III QB 14, fol. 96.
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30. AC, III QB 22, fol. 75.


33. AC, III QB 19, fol. 23 (appendix, doc. 8); 1714: AC, III QB 29, fasc. “Nota degli arazzi,” “al 1055.”

34. The David set is listed in fifteen pieces in the two inventories taken in Sicily (1581: AC, III QB 48, fol. 35; 1583: AC, III QB 49, fol. 2), but thirty years later only seven pieces are extant (AC, III QB 5/A, fol. 43 [appendix, doc. 1]).


40. For Cardinal Mazarin as a collector, see Patrick Michel, Mazarin, prince des collectionneurs: Les collec-


41. AC, III QE 1, “Inventario della Guardaroba No. 139 1626,” fol. 30. This inventory was taken at the time of Filippo I, widower of Lucrezia Tomacelli, who died in 1622.

42. AC, III QB 25, fol. 15 (appendix, doc. 4).

43. Lorenzo Onofrio’s 1689 postmortem inventory, AC, III QB 19, fol. 21 (appendix, doc. 8). For Philip II’s second set, see Campbell, Tapestry in the Renaissance, p. 269; Maria Hennel-Bernasikowa, cat. 52, in Campbell, Tapestry in the Renaissance, p. 447; Thomas P. Campbell, Henry VIII and the Art of Majesty: Tapestries at the Tudor Court (New Haven, 2007), p. 349; Nello Forti Grazzini in Bertini and Forti Grazzini, eds., Gli arazzi dei Farne se e dei Borbone, pp. 116, 117.

44. Delmarcel, Het Vlaamse wandtapijt, p. 138.

45. Ibid., pp. 92, 138.

46. AC, III QB 5/A, fol. 43 (appendix, doc. 1). Its similarity to the set woven from cartoons by Maarten de Vos was kindly pointed out to me by Guy Delmarcel; see Delmarcel, Het Vlaamse wandtapijt, p. 185. I am greatly indebted to him for his advice and suggestions, which have significantly improved this paper.

47. AC, III QB 57, “Inventario del Signor Abbate D[ono] Pietro Colonna n. 219,” fol. 31. The document includes an inventory of the furnishings found in Genazzano at the death of the abbot Pietro Colonna (1616–1643), youngest child of Filippo I and Lucrezia Tomacelli, and consigned to Camillo Sinibaldi, officer of the guardaroba.

48. 1632: AC, III QB 5/A, fol. 44 (appendix, doc. 1); 1636: AC, III QB 55, fol. 38, and AC, III QB 24, fol. 39.


50. Cardinal Giovano Francesco Guidi di Bagno (1578–1641), muncio in Flanders and in France (1627–30), owned six pieces of the Story of Jacob, ten pieces of wooded landscapes with animals, seven pieces “à l’antique” of the Story of the Pilgrim, fourteen pieces of old tapestries variously narrative, and one piece with gold of the Depositi on from the Cross. In 1638, he made a will to the benefit of his brother Nicolò (1583–1655) but forbade him any alienation of tapestries and carpets; see Pietro Torelli, “Notizie e documenti Rubeniani in un archivio privato,” in Ad Alessandro Luzio: Gli archivi di stato italiani;miscellanea di studi storici (Florence, 1933), vol. 1, pp. 173–94.

For Cardinal Mazarin’s acquisition of a tapestry for Cardinal di Bagno, see Michel, Mazarin, prince des collectionneurs, p. 27.
51. Cardinals Niccolò and Giovan Francesco Guidi di Bagno were related to Cardinal Gaetano Colonna through their mother, Laura Colonna, daughter of the duke di Zagarolo. The portiere were inventoried in 1640, and Guidi di Bagno is mentioned then: AC, III QB 1, fasc. "Paramenti," fol. [1] (appendix, doc. 2), which speaks of only twelve portiere. However, a payment was made on March 14, 1654, for the transport cost and tax duties paid for fourteen portiere; AC, Libro Mastro I B 25, fol. 150 (see appendix, doc. 3).
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Appendix: Extracts from a Selection of Colonna Documents Pertaining to Tapestries in the Colonna Collection

AC—Archivio Colonna, Subiaco

1. May 1632, AC, III QB 5/A. From the inventory taken room by room of Filippo Colonna’s tapestries and textile furnishings in Rome; those sent to Bologna for the use of Cardinal Girolamo when he was appointed archbishop of the city are listed on folio 215:


[fол. 2] Paramento uno di velluto, e raso cremisino rosso di teli di velluto n° 20, di raso teli n° 21, trine in tutto n° 47 d’oro, e argento larghe un ditto grosso alto palmi 13 con fregio di velluto teli n° 45, trine del fregio n° 48 [on the facing folio] Il controscritto Paramento fu datto da S.E. al Sig.r Card.le per portare a Bologna con tutte le altre robbe compagne al paramento come si vede in quello all’carta 215 Sopraporti n° 2 simili di n° 4 teli l’uno cioè due di velluto, e due di raso lunghi palmi 5½ l’uno, [fol. 3] sopracitamo uno di teli n° 4 cioè due di velluto, e due di raso con 3 trine lungo palmi 7½
Sovratavolino uno di velluto, e raso simile, cioè di velluto intorno nelle cascate, alto palmo 1° con sua frangetta grande, e piccola di seta, et oro, e raso nel mezzo lungo palmi 3/4

Padiglione uno di raso cremino simile di 3 pezzi cioè due di teli n° 7° l’uno, e l’altro di palmi 10° alto palmi 16° scarsi con fregio largo palmo 1° di velluto cremino piano foderato di taffetà sua frangetta di seta, et oro sopra il fregio lungo palmi 14°

Cappelletto del medesmo velluto di teli n° 24 alto palmi 3 1/2 con due frange grandi una d seta, e l’altra d’oro, una nel mezzo, e l’altra nell’estremità

Tornaletto di velluto simile di teli n° 9 alto palmi 1 1/2 foderato di tela con sua frangetta di seta, et oro

Baldacchino uno di raso simile con fregio di velluto siena con due colonne, e rubbechi intorno di lama d’argento, et oro. Pendoni di velluto n° 4 foderati di taffetà con frangia alta, e bassa d’oro, e seta cremino larga canna 6/4, lungo canna 11

Dossello simile con fregio di velluto da tre bande trina d’oro alto canna 15/2 largo palmi 11 con arme della Casa, e Tomacella nel mezzo di lama d’argento et oro [on the facing folio] Tutte le robbie scritte di contro furono dette al Sig.r Card.le per portare à Bologna insieme con altre che si vedono all’essito in que[j]esto a carta 215

[fol. 17] Paramento uno di velluto cremino, e tela d’oro di teli n° 40 con fregio di tela d’oro simill’le con frangia di seta, et oro alto palmi 13 1/4 teli di velluto n° 20 di tela d’oro n° 19 uno di que[j]esto teli sta in opera nel baldacchino, e serve per pendente alla parete del muro sono in tutto teli 20 d’oro, e n° 20 di velluto [on the facing folio] Il controscriito Paramento fu datto al S. Card[ina]le per portare à Bologna insieme con le altre robbie scritte all’essito in que[j]esto a carta 215

[fol. 29] Cortinaggio di broccato d’oro, e tela d’oro di Milano con suo cielo foderato di tela, cascate n° 8, ma à quella da capo di dietro manca un poco di frangia [on the facing folio] Il controscriito Cortinaggio fu datto al S. Card[ina]le per portare à Bologna con tutti li suoi finimenti eccetto che la sua littera restò in Roma, come si vede all’essito delle robbie in que[j]esto à carta 215


[fol. 36] Portiera n° 1 d’arazzo con arme della casa e moto Flectum, sed non frangimur undis

Portiera n° 1 d’arazzo alta palmi 10°, grossa, foderata di tela verde

Portiera n° 1 d’arazzo con arme della casa, banderole e n° 4 galere

[fol. 43] Arazi pezzi n° 9 intieri, et uno diviso per mezzo in due pezzi con l’Historia di Gioseffo tutta di conserto alto palmi 16

Arazi pezzi n° 8 di conserto con Arme del S. Card[ina]le d’Este alti palmi 17°, tutti
insieme girano palmi 131. Historia di Venere, et Amore, anzi di Psiche, et Amore
Arazzi pezzi n° 8 Historia di Noè alti p.m.i 13½ [on the facing folio] Li ottot pezzi dell’historia di Noè furono dati al Sig. r Card[ina]le per portare a Bologna con le altre robbere scritte in qu[el]sto all’esisto à c[artella] 215
Arazzi pezzi n° 13, Historia d’Abraham, et Isaac [sic] in figure piccole alti palmi 14 fatti à grottechi
Arazzi pezzi n° 17: a oro, et seta, ricco largo palmi 15 – scarso alto palmi 13½ con n° 16 – figure, e con questa cartella In pec- catis hic tentatur homo coelitus minatur, sed misericordia tueatur.
Arazzi pezzi n° 8 Historia della lotta tra Scipione Africano, et Annibale Cartagin- nese presso al fiume . . . . alti p.m.i 13½ [on the facing folio] Li ottot pezzi dell’historia di Annibale furono dati al Sr Card[ina]le per portare a Bologna con le altre robbere scritte in qu[el]sto all’esisto à c[artella] 215
Arazzi pezzi n° 2, cioè un intiero, e l’altro diviso in due, figurati diversamente vecchi, e rotti alti palmi 16.
Arazzi pezzi n° 7, historia de David alti palmi 14 . . . [F] compresse, un pezzo differente
Arazzi pezzi n° 2 di conserto cioè uno con tre figure grandi largo palmi 10. alto palmi 13½. L’altro simile con Ré, Regina, et altre.
Arazzo pezzo uno scompagnato alto palmi 14.— à verdura

[fol. 44.] Arazzi pezzi n° 6, Historia de Ré . . . [on the facing folio] Ne sono 5 a Paliano, uno in Guard.ba, andorno per servizio del Sr D. Prospero
Arazzi pezzi n° 3, Historia d’Atlante con stiere, e segno sopra alsi palmi 16. longhi palmi 32 – l’uno
Arazzi di Boscaglia pezzi n° 8 con ani- mali, et alcuni con figure, cioè n° 6. d’un conserto, e n° 2. d’un altro, ma tutti sono alti palmi 12— in c[irca] [on the facing folio] quattro dilli contoscritti pezzi d’Arazzi à Boscaglia furono dati al Sr Card[ina]le per portare a Bologna insieme con altre robbere scritte all’esisto in qu[el]sto à c[artella] n° 215
Arazzi à fogliami pezzi n° 5 alti palmi 8—, tutti insieme coprono palmi 74
Arazzo pezzo uno alto palmi 14, largo palmi 10½ con due soldati, una donna, et altre figure
Arazzi pezzi n° 5 opera grossa di lana, Historia di Golia
Arazzi pezzi n° 4 vecchi di Papa Martino. Vanno a[sieme] li due scritti nella fac. precedente
Portiera una d’Arazzo à verdura
Portiera una d’Arazzo à figure alta palmi 11½ larga palmi 7½
Arazzi pezzi otto di fiandra fatti ad Archi, fontane, e giardini che girano in tutto ali 225, alti di cinque furono comprati dall’Ambasciatore di Francia

[fol. 45.] Zampanarono di velo bianco di seta con fettuccia di seta bianca intorno di teli n° 16 alti palmi 7, e di teli n° 3 il sopraccielo lungo palmi 9 con suo telaro e cordone [on the facing folio] Questo zampanaro l’ha portato il S. Card[ina]le à Bologna insieme con le altre robbere scritte in qu[el]sto à c[artella] 215

[fol. 46.] Sopratutvello uno di velutto rosso cremisini di teli n° 4 lungo palmi 11½ con sua frangetta intorno d’oro, e seta e fodera di tela [on the facing folio] Il sopratutvello di contro fu dato al S. Card[ina]le per portàtre à Bologna insieme con le robbere scritte all’esisto in qu[el]sto à c[artella] 215 e il suo corame di contro
Sopratutvello uno di corame bianco stampato federato [fol. 47.] di taffetà rosso, orlato di fettuccia rossa lungo palmi 11½ largo palmi 6


Il Paramento divelluto e raso cremisino con suoi soprapcritto à c. 2
Il Sopratutvello compagno à c[artella] 3
Il Baldacchin col suo dosello à c[artella] 3
Il Padiglione di raso e villuto cremisino à c[artella] 3
La Portiera compagna à c[artella] 4
Il Paramento divelluto cremisino e tela d’oro scritto à c[artella] 17
Le due Portiere compagno à c[artella] 5
Il Baldacchin compagno à c[artella] 32
Il sopratutvello di villuto compreso col suo corame à c[artella] 46
Il Cortinaggio di tela d’oro à c[artella] 29
Le otto sedie compagnie di villuto cre- misini à c[artella] 55
Un Baldacchin di rasetto di Venetia à c[artella] 15
Un tapeto lungo palmi undeci da Baldacchino à c[artella] 41
Un tapetro longo palmi 8 per la Capella à c[artella a 41
Otto pezi d’arazzi dell’Historia di Noè à c[artella a 43
Otto pezi d’arazzi dell’Historia d’Annibale à c[artella a 43
Quattro pezi d’arazzi a Boscaglieria à c[artella a 44
Uno zampanaro di velo bianco à c[artella a 45

2. August 20, 1648, AC, III QB 1. Tapestries in the inventory of Cardinal Girolamo’s guardaroba (wardrobe), committed to Antonio Cioni, new keeper of the wardrobe:


[folios not numbered] Paramenti d’Arazzi
Un paramento fatto di dodici pezzi d’Arazzi cioè dodici portorioni grandi, che serveno per paramento col fondo verdono col fregio che ha il fondo leonato [sawny] col L’arme et Imprese della Casa di colori diversi alti palmi sedici incirca e servono per paramento di due stanze et s. Ecc[elle] nza li ha fatti fare in francia per mezzo di Mons.e Nuntio di Bagnò

E più sei pezzi di fregio d’Arazzi col fondo leonato coll’impresa della casa, che servono per le cantonate delle stanze, et sono alti palmi sedici compagni delle suddette portiere


E più portiere quattro di Arazzo che s. Ecc.nza ha fatto fare in Roma col fondo turchino coll’Arme di S. Ecc.nza col li friggi lavorati di fiorami à fes-tone foderati di tela [?]oria con la francettà di seta gialla attorno alte palmi sedici in circa

[next fol.] Un paramento di Arazzi di otto pezzi dell’Historia di Anibale cartaginense è Scipione Africano di altezza palmi tredici incirca

E più otto altri pezzi d’Arazzi con l’Historia di Nouè di altezza palmi tredici . . .

E più due portiere di Arazzi con l’Arme di s. Ecc[elle]nza con il fondo turchino [blue] con il fregio attorno giallo et rosso di altezza palmi . . .

Pezzi n° sei di Arazzi lavorati con l’Historia di Orazio di sei ale di altezza; che sono palmi sedici incirca che s. Ecc.nza li comprò in Roma.

E più altri otto pezzi di Arazzi simili alli suddetti della medema Historia alti palmi sedici in circa che sono ale cinque che s. Ecc.nza comprò in Roma da Isac hebro.

E più una coperta d’Arazzi venuta dall’Indie lavorata à opera piccola all’Indiana col fregio attorno di fondo rosso lavorato di diversi colori

E più due cuscini compagni della suddetta coperta.

3. 1654–58, AC, I B 25 (Libro Mastro), Lettera C, Cardinal Girolamo’s purchases of tapestries, and expenditures for mending and lining of some hangings:

[fol. 150] 1654


[fol. 178] 1655
Pietro Lescot tappezziere deve dare à di 21 Luglio per sc. cinquanta m[one]ta pagati dal Monte della Pietà à conto degli’Arazzi, che
dove fare per accompagnare l’Arazzi venuti da Bologna al Riscritto 12 In [que]sto [fol.] 182 — sc. 50—
e è a 28 Settembre per sc. cinquanta m[one]ta pagati dal M[one]nto accunto della suddetti Arazzi come sopra Riscritto 17 [que]sto [fol.] 183 — sc. 50—
e è a 18 Decembre per sc. quaranta m[one]ta pagati per saldo di sc. 140 per un panno d’Arazzo alto Ale 6%, e largo Ale 3½ per accompagnare quelli venuti da Bologna Riscritto 21 questo [fol.] 188 — 40 — sc. 140—

1656

e è a 24 Gen[na]ro per sc. cinquanta m[one]ta acconto d’un altro pezzo d’arazzo compagno del sopradetto Riscritto 23 [que]sto [fol.] 188 — sc. 50—

1657

e è a 12 febb. per scudi settanta m[one]ta a bonconto del suddetto pezzo d’arazzo riscritto 11 [que]sto [fol.] 215 — sc. 70—
e è a 25 Aprile per sc. venticinque b[ascchi] 27½ m.ta per saldo di sc. 137: 27 simili che importa il prezzo del suddetto pezzo d’arazzo d’ale 20% Riscritto 17 [que]sto [fol.] 217 — sc. 27: 27½

[fol. 189] 1655

e è a 18 dicembre per sc. centoquaranta m[one]ta a Pietro Lescot tappezziere in tre partite pagate dal Monte per un pezzo d’arazzo alto ale 6½ lar[go] alé 3½ d’opera a vaso con fiori serve per una cantonata per accompagnare gli’Arazzi, che vennero da Bologna in questo [fol.] 178 — sc. 140— [Story of Hannibal; see doc. 4]

4. August 30, 1657, AC, III QB 25. From the inventory of Cardinal Girolamo I’s possessions kept in Rome, taken at the death of Giovanni Antonio Cioni, keeper of the guardaroba, when he was succeeded in that office by Giovanni Pietro del Rè.


[fol. 14] Paramenti d’Arazzi

E più sei pezzi di fregio d’Arazzi con fondo leonato con l’impresa della Casa che servono per le cantonate delle stanz et sono alti p[ali]mi 16 luno compagni delle suddettet e portiere.


[fol. 15] Paramenthi d’Arazzi

E più otto altri pezzi d’Arazzi che servono per un paramentho da stanza del Istoria di Noè di Altezza p[ali]mi 1½ buona misura.


[fol. 16] Paramenti d’Arazzi


E più due cuscini compagni della sudetta Copertina che hanno una trina seta gialla attorno ed suoi fiocchi di seta gialla alle cantonate.


[fol. 17] Paramentii d’Arazzi

E più due pezzi d’Arazzi che S[u]a Em[ilenza] ha fatti fare in Roma da Pietro Lascotti tappezziere che servono per cantonate delle sudetti ariazi et hanno li fregi fatti a festone con frutti fiori e putti con un vaso in mezzo a ciascheduno di d.ti pezzi con fiori dentro alti l’uno palmo sedici e mezzo e larghi p.mi otto e mezzo.

5. Ca. 1650, AC, Patrimonio artistico 7 fasc. 7. A set of the Story of Scipio and Hannibal purchased by Cardinal Girolamo Colonna:

Nota d’un paramento di Tapizerie finissima di Bruges alta canne 6 dell’Istoria di Scipione et Hannibale In pezze N° 10.

Una pesa essendo Il disegno come Scipione venne In Roma triumfante di longhezza canne 13½
Una pezza dove Il Padre di Scipione è riferito longa ç[ann]a 12½
Una pezza della Battaglia grande che perse Hannibale In Africa di Longhezza ç[ann]a 12½
Una pezza dove in una notte abrusciato il campo di Scipione di longhezza ç[ann]a 11½
Una pezza dove Scipione et Hannibale parlamenta al fiume larvis longa ç[ann]a 9½

Una pezza la sposa presentata a scipione longa ç[ann]a 9½
Una pezza dove Massenissa presenta la Corona del Regno a scipione di longhezza ç[ann]a 6½
Una pezza dove scipione naviga verso il Re [?] sphax de longhezza ç[ann]a 9½
Una pezza dove scipione sphax et Asdrubal sono mangiando a tavola longa ç[ann]a 8½
Una pezza dove li Cartaginesi vengono a trattare la pace con scipione di longhezza ç[ann]a 6½
Montano in Longheza ç[ann]a 97½ In quadro ç[ann]a 58½.

6. 1654, AC, III QB 26/A. Tapestries in the inventory of gran connectabile Marcantonio V

Inventario del S[ignor] Cont[estabile] in Roma 1654

[fol. 1] Arazzi pezzi nunm° otto lavorati di seta, e lana con figure intiere fini che rappresentano l’Istoria del Rè di francia armati tutti di corda, e tela con fregio intorno di chiaro scuro n° 8
Arazzi nunm° sette lavorati dell’istessa qualità con la Storia della Regina di Eniobe n° 7
Arazzi pezzi nunm° otto lavorati con figure si lana, e seta che rappresentano la Storia di Dario, e [Carlo canceled] Alessandro Magno armati di tela con corda, e suo fregio atorno con un pezzo di tela fatto à fregio n° 8
Arazzi pezzi n° cinque[d]’altezza ali cinque[d] lavorati à figure con fregio atorno quasi nuovi armati di tela e corda n° 5 [marginal annotation] Dati da S[u]a E[ccellenza]
Arazzi venuti da Sicilia pezzi n° cinque[d] diversi verdura, et animali armati di tela, e corda n° 5 [marginal annotation] cambiati con Leone Air Hebreo
Arazzi pezzi n° cinque[d] bassi per Camerino verdea et animali, et alcune figure piccole armati di tela turchina, e corda n° 5 [marginal annotation] cambiato ç[om]e 5(opta)
Arazzi pezzi quattro più bassi a felpati con figure piccole, armati di tela turchina, tre pezzi longhi, e l’altro piccolo n° 4
Arazzi a fogliami pezzi sei con alcuni
animali al naturale fini armati di tela turchina, e corda n° 6 [marginal annotation] cambiati con l’hebreo sud[etti]

Arazzi in portiere pezzi due conforme li sud[etti] arazzi di verdea n° 2 [marginal annotation] cambiati come sopra

Arazzi à fogliame, e verdura pezzi setti con diversi animali, e quattro sopra porte dell’intesso armati di tela e corda alcuni rotti
Arme per due portiere di contrataglio in tela d’oro contornato di cordoncino d’oro, e seta sopra tela sangallia nera n° 2

[signed] Io Pietro Bitij de Benedictis ho ricevuto la sud[etti] partita

Arazzi fatti all’Indiana col fundo d’oro conto pezzi sei con fiori, fogliame et uccel-lame per una stanza..............n° 6
Una portiera del stessa fattura..............n° 1
Un sopra tavola del stessa fattura .......n° 1
Due sopra porti del stessa fattura tutti foderati di tela..........................n° 2
Arazzi fatti a telo di brocatello col fre-ggio da capo e guarnizione finta rivesta ad ogni tela alti palmi sedici n° o otto..............n° 8
Arazzi fatti a Boscaglia quasi novi alti p[l]mi quattordici incirca n° sette..............n° 7
Due pezzi d’arazzi si siano sopraposti uno lungo p[l]mi sei e mezzo alti p[l]mi tre meno un quarto et l’altro lungo p[l]mi cinque e largo c[om]e sopra
Arazzi pezzi n° tre colo fregi con figure alli lati di due Re e fregio di verdura vecchi rotti e quasi inutili

7. 1649–52, AC, Libro Mastro I B 23. Marcantonio Colonna Gioeni’s tapestry and embroidery expenditures

[fol. 101] 1649
e a 3 febb. per scudi quaranta m[one]ta fatti pagare come sopra [Sacro Monte della Pietà] à Bartholomeo Torreggiani per il prezzo d’otto pezzi di sedie d’arazzi di seta, cioè sei spalliere, e due sederi. Sono come sopra [fol.] 98———sc. 40——
e a 4 Maggio per scudi venti m[one]ta fatti pagare come sopra à Cat[er]ina della Riviera per prezzo d’un sopratavolino d’arazzo novo con seta lavorato con fiori. . . . Sono per detto S. Monte al [fol.] 116———sc. 20——
e a 15 Giugno per scudi venti m[one]ta fatti pagare dal S. Monte della Pietà à Cat[er]ina della Riviera à conto di sei fascie di sedie, e di quattro sederi d’arazzo di seta,

che lavora a rag[g]iòne di sc. 11—l’ala. Sono per detto S. M[one]te [fol.] 123———sc. 20——

[fol. 184] 1650
et a . . . d[ett]o [Marzo] per scudi trent’otto b[aiocchi] 37½ m[one]ta fatti pagar come sopra a Caterina della Riviera à comp[imenti] di sc. 78.37½ prezzo di 4 sederi, e sei fascie d’arazzo di seta per servizio di 6 sedie a sc. 11—l’ala, compresi gli altri sc. 40 pagati in due parte del detto Monte. Sono per come sopra [fol.]
182———sc. 38.37½——

[fol. 314] 1652
et à 17 Aprile per scudi cinque d. 65 m[one]ta di Monte in somma di sc. 38.33 à Vin-cenzo Gabrielle setarlo per tanto filo e sete diverse da cuscire [sic] per serviz[io] del racamo alle portiere di tela d’oro. Sono per come sopra [fol.] 307———sc. 5.65——

[fol. 331] 1652
et à ? d[ett]o [ottobre] sc. sessanta m[one]ta di Monte a Fran.co Vezzi Racamatore per il lavoro fatto da lui ed à farsi, per il ricamo di quattro portiere di S.E. di tela d’oro. Sono per come sopra [fol.]
332———sc. 60——

8. April 15, 1689, AC, III QB 19. Tapestries in Lorenzo Onofrio’s postmortem inventory:

[fol. 1] Inventario di tutti li Beni e Robbe dell’Eredità della Chiara melioria
dell’Ecce[llentiss]mo Sig.r Contestabile D. Lorenzo Onofrio Colonna Ritrovati dopo la sua morte eseguito il di 15 Aprile 1689

[fol. 12] Portiere quattro di arazzo con arme della Casa, e scudo in mezzo, festone attorno di frutti e fiori, con mascheroni, sotto detta arme vi è quella dell’Em[inentiss]mo Colonna, ahe canna una palmi 6, larga canna una palmi 2, frangetta attorno di seta gialla, foderate di barbante rosa, et anelli da capo; e sono buone. [marginal annotation] sono alle 3½ l’una in tutto alle n° 77½ le medeme scritte fra gli arazzi

[fol. 16] Arazzi
Arazzi n° Otto dell’Historia del Re di Francia à figure grandi et alli cantoni, con un soldato a cavallo in fondo torchino, di ale come appreso [marginal annotation] ve ne sono tre e l’altri cinque stanno nella Camera d’Udienza del Signore
P.m.o Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 36
2° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 39
3° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 42
4° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 48
5° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 26 [28]
6° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 32½
7° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 31½
8° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 99 [40½]

n° 304½
Li sudetti n° 8 pezzi d’Arazzo sono buonissimi et ascendonno ale n° 304½, incirca. [marginal annotation] Ve ne sono tre e l’altro cinque stanno nella Camera d’Udienza del Signore.

Arazzi n° sette dell’Historia delle favole di Ovidio, à figure grandi, con una figura colca [coricata] nel fregio deli medemi Arazzi, di ale come appresso, per ciaschedun’ pezzo, vi sono li ovato nelli fregi con figure in piedi, e colche
• P.m.o Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 33
• 2° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 37½
• 3° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 54½
• 4° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 43½
• 5° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 37½
• 6° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 31½
• 7° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 33

Ale n° 270½ [54]

[fol. 17] Li di contrario sette Arazzi sono in tutto Ale n° 270½ in circa, e sono buoni, eccettuato l’Arazzo 7° di Ale 33—che è rotto in diversi luoghi.

Arazzi n° nove dell’Historia di Cesare, à figure grandi e piccole, con scrittura in mezzo da capo di ciascheduno Arazzo di ale come appresso
• P.m.o Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 49
• 2° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 26½
• 3° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 48
• 4° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 36½
• 5° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 41
• 6° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 34
• 7° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 52½
• 8° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 45
• 9° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 45

n° 397½
Li sudetti nove pezzi d’Arazzi sono in tutto ale n° 397½, e sono bellissimi, e nuovi.

Portiere d’Arazzo n° quattordici, con arme della casa, e bandiere, legno da capo, e padiglione da piedi, di ale 20½ l’una, che in tutto sono ale n° 415—; sono un’ poco usate ma non rotte. [marginal annotation] ve ne sono due in guardaroba e sei alla stanza della signorina e altre sei ne mancano.

Sei cantonate d’Arazzo lavorate à Trofei, con armatura in mezzo di ale 13—l’uno, che in tutto sono ale n° 78—, sono usate, ma non rotte.


Arazzi n° sette dell’Historia di Cupido, à figure grandi e piccole, con un’ arme da capo di un cardinale con gigli et Acque; di Ale l’uno come appresso [marginal annotation] stanno in opera nell’Appartamento di Signorino Carlo
• P.m.o Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 23
• 2° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 57
• 3° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 49½
• 4° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 44½
• 5° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 41
• 6° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 32½
• 7° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 32½

n° 280—
Li sudetti sette pezzi d’Arazzi sono ale n° 280, in circa, e sono usati, e scoloriti.

Arazzi n° sei, à Boscareccia, e prospettiva, con fregio attorno di fiorami diversi, per ciascheduno Arazzo, di ale come appresso
• P.m.o Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 37½
• 2° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 25
• 3° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 26½
• 4° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 25
• 5° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 30
• 6° Arazzo di Ale..........................n° 22½

n° 166½
Li sudetti sette pezzi d’Arazzi sono, in tutto ale n° 166½ e sono quasi nuovi.

[fol. 19] Arazzi n° Sette, à Boscareccia e Prospettiva, con fregio attorno di fiori di fiori; frutti, uccelli e fogliami, con fogliami gialli e peli; punte di ciascheduno Arazzo, di Ale l’uno come appresso
• P.m.o Arazzo Ale..........................n° 15
• 2° Arazzo Ale..........................n° 26½
• 3° Arazzo Ale..........................n° 22½
• 4° Arazzo Ale..........................n° 30
• 5° Arazzo Ale..........................n° 20
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• 6° Arazzo Ale..............n° 38½
• 7° Arazzo Ale.................. n° 20

n° 172½

Li suddetti sette pezzi di Arazzi ascendono ad’ale n° 172½ e sono quasi nuovi.

Arazzi n° otto dell’Historia di Ortazio à figure grandi e piccole fà [questi] uno di essi è foderato di Sangallo Rosso e frangetta di seta gialla, attorno, anelli da capo et à ciascun di detti Arazzi, vi è nel fregio vasi, fiori, e frutti, con statue, e sono di ale l’uno come appresso [marginal annotation] ve ne è uno, e l’altri n° 7 stanno nella cam[e]ra d’Udienza della Sig[no]ra

• Pmo Arazzo ale.......................n° 30
• 1° Arazzo ale......................n° 35½
• 2° Arazzo ale......................n° 39½
• 3° Arazzo ale......................n° 44
• 4° Arazzo ale......................n° 22
• 5° Arazzo ale......................n° 27½
• 6° Arazzo ale......................n° 21
• 7° Arazzo ale......................n° 40½

n° 233

Li suddetti otto pezzi di Arazzi sono ale n° 233 in circa, e sono ordinari, et usati.

Arazzi n° otto dell’Historia di Nouè, tessuti à figure grandi, e piccole, con fregi d’uccelli, animali, e figure, di ale come appresso

• Pmo Arazzo ale.......................n° 31½
• 1° Arazzo ale......................n° 26½
• 2° Arazzo ale......................n° 36½
• 3° Arazzo ale......................n° 21
• 4° Arazzo ale......................n° 31½
• 5° Arazzo ale......................n° 24½
• 6° Arazzo ale......................n° 40½

n° 255

Li suddetti otto pezzi di Arazzi sono ale n° 255 e sono quasi nuovi. [marginal annotation] Ve ne è uno, e l’altri n° 7 stanno nella Camera dell’Udienza della Sig[no]ra

[fol. 20] nota che al pezzo n° 5° vi è un riporto che va à canto al cammino, fatto di tela dipinta e serve per il pezzo, che per contrassegno, vi è la Luna et il mare, ma però l’arazzo, e intiero ma ripiegato.

Arazzi n° otto tessuti, à Giardini, fontane, Termini, e figure, con fregio attorno fatto a fogliami gialli e figurine di ale come appresso [marginal annotation] l’altri sei stanno nella stanza dove dorme il Signorino

• Pmo Arazzo ale.......................n° 42½
• 1° Arazzo ale......................n° 21½
• 2° Arazzo ale......................n° 29
• 3° Arazzo ale......................n° 32
• 4° Arazzo ale......................n° 32
• 5° Arazzo ale......................n° 32
• 6° Arazzo ale......................n° 21½

n° 242½

Li suddetti otto pezzi di Arazzi sono ale n° 242½ in circa e sono quasi nuovi, fra questi vi è il pezzo 6° serve per sopra il cammino, che a un riporto di tela dipinta che accompagna il medemo Arazzo che per segniale, vi è una figura con una scala, detto arazzo è intiero, ma si ripiega. per finimento di detti 8 Arazzi vi è una cantonata di tela similmente dipinta à modo di detti arazzi, altra cada una palmi 6½ e larga palmi 4; ogni cosa in buono essere e quasi nuovi.

[fol. 21] Arazzi n° otto, rappresentanti bataglie, con figure grandi, e piccole, con fregio di vasi, fiori, e figure, di ale come appresso

• Pmo Arazzo ale.......................n° 31½
• 1° Arazzo ale......................n° 26½
• 2° Arazzo ale......................n° 36½
• 3° Arazzo ale......................n° 21
• 4° Arazzo ale......................n° 31½
• 5° Arazzo ale......................n° 24½
• 6° Arazzo ale......................n° 21
• 7° Arazzo ale......................n° 40½

n° 252½

Li suddetti Arazzi in n° otto, sono ale n° 252½ ordinari et usati, uno di questi, è rotto e guasto dal acqua et è l’arazzo 6°

[fol. 22] Arazzi n° otto tessuti, à boscaglia, e Caccie, di figure mezzane, e piccole, con pastori, et animali, fregio attorno di figure, fogliami, e frutti, di ale come appresso

• Pmo Arazzo ale.......................n° 26½
• 1° Arazzo ale......................n° 26½
• 2° Arazzo ale......................n° 21
• 3° Arazzo ale......................n° 31½
• 4° Arazzo ale......................n° 31½
• 5° Arazzo ale......................n° 48 [42]
• 6° Arazzo ale......................n° 48
• 7° Arazzo ale......................n° 21

n° 248

Li suddetti otto pezzi di Arazzi sono ale n° 248 in circa, e sono ordinari, et usati.
Arazzi n° Sette, à Giardini, e Archi con fregi lavorati a fiori, Rosoni, e fogliami, di ale come appresso

- Pmo Arazzo ale........................n° 40
- 2° Arazzo ale..........................n° 20
- 3° Arazzo ale..........................n° 26
- 4° Arazzo ale..........................n° 25
- 5° Arazzo ale..........................n° 30
- 6° Arazzo ale..........................n° 31½
- 7° Arazzo ale..........................n° 20

n° 192½

Li suddetti sette pezzi di Arazzi sono ale n° 192½ in circa, ordinari, et usati.

[fol. 23] Arazzi n° nove dell’Historia di Giuseppe, à figure grandi, e piccole, con Inscrittione, in mezzo di ciascheduno arazzo, in fondo turchino, fregio attorno di frutti, figure, e fogliami, di ale come appresso

- Pmo Arazzo ale........................n° 59
- 2° Arazzo ale..........................n° 37½
- 3° Arazzo ale..........................n° 33
- 4° Arazzo ale..........................n° 45½
- 5° Arazzo ale..........................n° 43½
- 6° Arazzo ale..........................n° 34
- 7° Arazzo ale..........................n° 47
- 8° Arazzo ale..........................n° 41½
- 9° Arazzo, tagliato in due pezzi
  ogni pezzo della parte del taglio è orlato che tutti dui li pezzi sono ale in tutto...........n° 54
  
  n° 415

Li suddetti nove pezzi di Arazzi sono ale n° 415 incirca fra questi vi è il suddetto tagliato come detto al nono pezzo, e sono un’ poco usati.

Arazzi n° sei dell’Historia d’Oratio, à figure grandi, e piccole, Inscrittione in mezzo da capo per ciascheduno arazzo, di ale come appresso

- Pmo Arazzo ale........................n° 44½
- 2° Arazzo ale..........................n° 38
- 3° Arazzo ale..........................n° 57
- 4° Arazzo ale..........................n° 31½
- 5° Arazzo ale..........................n° 44½
- 6° Arazzo ale..........................n° 57

n° 272½

Li suddetti Arazzi n° sei sono ale n° 272½, e sono quasi nuovi.

[fol. 24] Arazzi n° otto dell’Historia di Massinissa, à figure grandi, e piccole, Inscrittione in mezzo da capo; per fregio festoni di frutti e fiori, termini e Trofei da piedi, di ale come appresso

- Pmo Arazzo ale........................n° 45½
- 2° Arazzo ale..........................n° 52
- 3° Arazzo ale..........................n° 58½
- 4° Arazzo ale..........................n° 45½
- 5° Arazzo ale..........................n° 32½
- 6° Arazzo ale..........................n° 30
- 7° Arazzo ale..........................n° 35½
- 8° Arazzo ale..........................n° 39

n° 338½

Li suddetti otto pezzi di Arazzi sono ale n° 338½ in circa, e sono quasi nuovi.

Arazzi n° nove tessuti à foggia broccatelli, opera grande, e vasi, in fondo rosso, fregio da capo, lavorato à fogliami, frangia, e trine, fatta d’arazzo, d’ale come appresso [marginal annotation] andorno a Genazzano

- Pmo Arazzo ale........................n° 23½
- 2° Arazzo ale..........................n° 19
- 3° Arazzo ale..........................n° 42
- 4° Arazzo ale..........................n° 42
- 5° Arazzo ale..........................n° 19½
- 6° Arazzo ale..........................n° 19½
- 7° Arazzo ale..........................n° 24
- 8° Arazzo ale..........................n° 24
- 9° Arazzo ale..........................n° 41

n° 254½

Li suddetti nove pezzi di Arazzi sono ale n° 254½, vecchi e rappazzati.

[fol. 25] Arazzo uno à figure grandi, e piccole, tessuto con oro, Inscrittione da capo, con Lettere Latinse antiche fregio attorno di fiori e frutti, in fondo verde di ale n° 29½ con qualche rottura, et è antico

Arazzi n° quattro per mezzanini, bassi, à figure mezzane con fregio attorno di frutti e fogliami, e mascheroni, di ale come appresso

- Pmo Arazzo ale........................n° 9½
- 2° Arazzo ale..........................n° 19½
- 3° Arazzo ale..........................n° 25½
- 4° Arazzo ale..........................n° 28½

n° 84½

Li suddetti quattro pezzi di Arazzi sono ale n° 84½, e sono usati.

Portiere d’Arazzo n° dodici servono per sopra some [bestie da soma] fondo verde, arme della casa, bandiere, e schiavi, e Trofei attorno, di ale 20 l’una che in tutto sono ale 240— in circa, e sono ordinarie
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Arazzi quattro, à figure grandi, e piccole, tessuti di lana grossa, vecchi, e rappezzati, con fregio di verdura, e figure piccole di ale come appresso [marginal annotation] manca uno

- P. mo Arazzo ale .................. n° 20
- 2° Arazzo ale .................. n° 43
- 3° Arazzo ale .................. n° 207
- 4° Arazzo ale .................. n° 36

n° 127
Li suddetti quattro pezzi di Arazzi sono ale n° 127—, e sono vecchi come sopra.

[fol. 26] Arazzo uno, di lana grossa Vecchio, roto, e rappazato federato di tela rossa; che rappresanta caccia con animali, e boscaglia, male in esser di ale n° 12
Arazzo uno di Boscaglia, e Caccie di animali, figure piccole, Vecchio assai, e rootto di ale 31— incirca, di lana grossa
Arazzo uno, di Boscaglia, homini à cavallo, in piccolo con animali, Vecchio, e rootto di ale n° 20—
Arazzo uno Vecchio, e roto, e rappezzato, di lana grossa rappresentante Caccie, e Boscaglie, di ale 35½ in circia
Arazzo uno, da una testa guasto dal acqua di boscaglia, e Caccie, Vecchio, e rootto di ale n° 36— in circa
Arazzo uno, simile à detto, Vecchio assai, di ale n° 40— in circa
Arazzo uno, di Boscaglia, e Caccie, Vecchio, roto e rappezzato, di ale n° 20
Arazzo uno, à figure mezzane, e boscaglia, vecchio assai, di ale n° 34— in circa
Arazzo uno, à figure grandi, vecchio assai, e rootto di ale n° 30— in circa
Arazzo uno tessuto à fogliami e verdura grossa, Vecchio, roto, e rappezzato, di ale n° 32— in circa
Arazzo uno simile à detto, Vecchio assai, e rappazzato di ale n° 22— in circa

[fol. 27] Arazzo uno à figure piccole, e termini tessuto in fondo rosso, vecchio assai di ale n° 20 in circa
Arazzo uno fondo rosso, termini con Chiesa, e Lampade; di ale n° 16 in circa, vecchio assai
Arazzi dui, fatti à portiera, tessuti à verdura grossa con animali diversi, federati di tela tornicha, usati di ale n° 13— à l’una, che in tutto sono ale n° 26—
Arazzi sei ordinari, tessuti à verdura grossa con uccelli, e putti, usati, di ale come appresso

- P. mo Arazzo ale .................. n° 21½
- 2° Arazzo ale .................. n° 21½
- 3° Arazzo ale .................. n° 19½
- 4° Arazzo ale .................. n° 19½
- 5° Arazzo ale .................. n° 25
- 6° Arazzo, tagliato, in mezzo serve per sopraporti, simile à detti, in tutto ale .......... n° 22

n° 129—
Li suddetti sei pezzi d’Arazzi sono in tutto ale n° 129— in circa, non troppo buoni.

Arazzo uno à verdura grossa, vecchio assai, e roto di ale n° 9½
Arazzo uno, simile à detto, cattivo, e roto di ale n° 18— in circa.
Arazzo uno antico, con incisioni antiche da capo, à figure grandi, e piccole, con una stella, e giro grande in mezzo, roto, e rappezzato, di ale n° 76½ in circa male in essere.

[fol. 28] Arazzo uno, Anticho, vecchio, e roto, figure grandi, e piccole, con segni deli 12— mesi dell’anno giro in mezzo, e Lettere antiche, con fondo tornicha di ale n° 75 in circa.
Arazzo uno anticho, vecchio, e roto, Lettere antiche da capo, figure grandi, e piccole, con il sole da una parte, di ale n° 78— in circa
Arazzo uno anticho, vecchio, e rappezzato, di figure grandi, e piccole, con un’ Vascello in mezzo, di ale n° 57— in circa
Arazzo uno, anticho, vecchio, con figure d’homini et Animali, grandi, e piccole, camell[li] e mori; di ale n° 65— in circa
Arazzo uno, anticho, vecchio, à figure grandi, e piccole che portano vasi in mano; di ale n° 53— in circa, che è rappezzato
Arazzo uno, anticho, vecchio, et un’ poco roto, à figure grandi, e piccole, e con vasi; di ale n° 48— in circa
Arazzo uno, anticho, vecchio, senza fregio da una parte, con diverse figure, di ale n° 21— in circa vecchio assai
Arazzo uno, anticho, à figure grandi, e piccole con Colonna in mezzo, fregio di fiori attorno, vecchio, e rappezzato, di ale n° 41— in circa
Arazzo uno, simile à detto, vecchio, e rappezzato male in essere di ale n° 40— in circa.

[fol. 29] Arazzi n° nove con oro che rappresentano Le maravigli, à figure grandi, e piccole, come appresso, con fregi attorno
con mascheroni, e cifre, e con figura di ale come segue (appresso)

* P.mo Arazzo, con quattro figure piccole, e due grandi con palme, in mano, di ale n° 43– in circa ...n° 43–
* 2° Arazzo, con Regine, e vasi, e con prospettive, di ale ...n° 42–
* 3° Arazzo, con 3– figure, due vasi, e un' cane, di ale ...n° 40–
* 4° Arazzo, rappresentante il Colosso di Eredo, dal Ponte, con altre figure e Trofei di ale ...n° 76–
* 5° Arazzo, con regina a sedere, et uno che gli porga, un bacile con gli uie, e con diversi soldati, due arbori di dattoli, et altre figure, grandi, e piccole con trofei, di ale ...n° 77–
* 6° Arazzo, con una Regina a sedere et uno, che gli presenta un disegno avanti, e diverse altre figure grandi, e piccole, e detta Regina sta sotto il trono, et è di ale ...n° 74½
* 7° Arazzo, con un colosso grande sopra piedestallo, con cavalli grandi, e piccoli, con uomini sopra, et altre figure, di ale ...n° 74½
* 8° Arazzo, con fregio da capo, e da piedi solo, arme da capo. in mezzo era [il] Re che scrive et un cane da piedi di ale ...n° 26½

segue di Ca. ale ...n° 452½

[fol. 30] Seguono li Arazzi con oro di La per la somma del Ale ...n° 452½
* 9° Arazzo, con oro come l'altro addietro, con 3 – figure, e vasi, fregio da capo, e da piedi solo, di ale n° 12½– in circa ...n° 12½

...n° 465

Li retroscritti e detti Arazzi n° nove, sono ale n° 465– in circa; li medemi tessuti tutti con oro, e sono quasi nuovi, e lavorati finissimi senza alcun difetto.

Arazzi n° otto del Historia di Anibale, à figure grandi, e piccole, di testitura fina, con due termini per arazzo, e festoni nelli fregi con uno scudo, da capo, e da piedi un Arquela per ciascudeno Arazzo, di ale come appresso [marginal annotation] l'altre cinque stanno in opera nella stanza della Scaleta Lumaca verso il Giardino

* P.mo Arazzo ale ...n° 53
* 2° Arazzo ale ...n° 40½
* 3° Arazzo ale ...n° 45½
* 4° Arazzo ale ...n° 34
* 5° Arazzo ale ...n° 34
* 6° Arazzo ale ...n° 46½
* 7° Arazzo ale ...n° 40½
* 8° Arazzo ale ...n° 59

...n° 333

Li suddetti otto pezzi di Arazzi sono ale n° 333– in circa, e sono buonissimi.

[fol. 31] Arazzi n° otto, del Historia di Anibale, a figure grandi, e piccole, di testitura fina, con due termini per arazzo, e festoni nelli fregi, con scudo da capo, e da piedi, di ale come appresso [marginal annotation] l'altre sei stanno in opera nella Camera de Specchi alta Scaleta Lumaca verso il Cortile

* P.mo Arazzo ale ...n° 50
* 2° Arazzo ale ...n° 39
* 3° Arazzo ale ...n° 43½
* 4° Arazzo ale ...n° 32½
* 5° Arazzo ale ...n° 34
* 6° Arazzo ale ...n° 45½
* 7° Arazzo ale ...n° 39
* 8° Arazzo ale ...n° 59

...n° 342½

Li suddetti otto pezzi di Arazzi sono ale n° 342½– in circa, e sono buonissimi.

Una [soprapposta canceled] cantonata di Arazzo, con due termini, festone di frutti e vaso di fiori, et è buonissimo, di ale n° 19– in circa

Altra [soprapposta canceled] cantonata simile à detto, di ale n° 19 in circa

Trei [soprapposte canceled] cantonate di Arazzo, con un termine solo, vaso, e festone sudetto di ale n° 16 l'uno, che in tutto sono ale n° 48– in circa, e sono bonissimi

Cantonate due di un termine sono d'Arazzo, con fiori di ale n° 10½– l'uno che in tutto sono ale n° 20½, in circa, et sono bonissime

Un Baldacchino d’Arazzo, cioè dosello tessuto, con festone attorno, di frutti, e fiori, mascheroni nè cantoni, fregio giallo, e torcino, con arme della Casa in mezzo, [marginal annotation] sta nella 2.a Anti-camera [fol. 32] riportate, sopra altra dell'Em[inentissimo] Colonna, frangietta gialla alli 3 lati, di ale n° 29– et è buonissimo

Cielo di detto baldacchino, con fregio di qua, e di la fatto a trofei; in mezzo
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di esso una serena con l’onde, et arme della Casa, foderato di tela torchina, di ale n° 14½ in circa.

Pendenti due di detto baldacchino tenuti con revettoni, e legnino, frangia di seta gialla alta e frangieta, foderati di taffeta lionati, di ale l’uno 4½ per ciascheduno, che in tutto sono ale 9— in circa

Pendenti due, similì a detti, di ale 3½ l’una che in tutto sono ale n° 7— in circa, frangiasa foderà come detta, ogni cosa buonissimo

Portiere quattro d’Arazzo, con arme della Casa, et scudo in mezzo, festone attorno, di frutti, e fiori con mascheroni, sotto detta arme vi è quella dell’Em[inentissimo] Colonna frangetta attorno di seta gialla, foderate di barbantina rossa, anelli da capo, e sono buone; di ale l’una 10½; in tutto ale n° 77½ in circa le medeme scritte fra le portiere

Due termini di tela dipinta a foggia d’Arazzo, che vanno con li Arazzi di Massinissa, alti l’uno p.mi 16, e larghi p.mi 3½ l’una

Sei termini di tela dipinta, a foggia d’Arazzo, con trofei, e berrettoni, usati assai. alte C/[ann]a 2— in circa l’uno.

[fol. 11] Un Soprapporto di Cordellone, dipinto a foggia d’Arazzo a boscaglia, e paesetti, fregheto di fiori e fogliami attorno, foderato di quadretto bianco, lungo C/[ann]a una, e palmi 2½, largo palmi 3½, et è buono

Un Soprapporto di Cordellone, dipinto come s[op]ra, e foderato in tutto c/on[e] s[op]ra, lungo C/[ann]a una, e largo palmi 4, et è buono

Un Soprapporto di Cordellone, dipinto come S[op]ra, a boscaglia foderà detta alto palmi 6, e largo palmi 6, et è buono

Un Soprapporto di Cordellone sud[d]extro, dipinto come s[op]ra foderà detta lungo palmi 7, e largo palmi 3— et è buono

Quattro soprapporti di tela dipinta a guazzo, con cascate di fianco, servono per supplemento d’Arazzi, dipinti con verdure

Due altri soprapporti similì a detti senza cascate, e servono come s[op]ra

Quattro cantonati similì a dette stretti Un’altra cantonata più stretta di detta Cinque sericette dipinti con fiori, servono c/on[e] s[op]ra

Un pezzo di Arazzetto in quadro da tela d’un S. Pietro con gallo, et è buono

[Signed] Fran.co Bellarosa m.o pp.a [mano propria]


[fol. 191] 1670
Et à 3 Feb.ro per sc. cinquanta m.ta per cassa a Giuseppe Belloni per sodisfazion[e] del disegno di 4— pezzi di fregio per serv[izio] di un arazzo che si deve fare con oro etc. Sono come s[opra] [fol.] 193— sc. 50—

[fol. 236] 1672
Et à 12 Maggio per Sc. novanta tre m[one]ta per cassa a Lorenzo Castellani à bon conto del prezzo di uno arazzo che stanno facendo per serv[izio] nostro. Sono per cassa [fol.] 266— sc. 93—

Et à 17 detto [giugno] per Sc. venti m[one]ta per cassa à Franc.co Rossi Pittore per saldo della pittura in forma d’arazzo del 1671. Sono come s[opra] [fol.] 266— sc. 20—

Et à 31 Dec-bre per Sc. cento cinquanta sette m[one]ta pagati da noi de contanti a Lorenzo Castellani e compagni à conto di un arazzo che stanno facendo. sono per spese nostre particolari [fol.] 249— sc. 157—

[fol. 294] 1673
Mobili di casa devono dare à 13 Gen.ro per Sc. cento m[one]ta à Lorenzo Castellani à c/on[ono] del prezzo di un arazzo che stanno facendo per serv[izio] n[ost]ro. Sono per cassa [fol.] 294— sc. 100—

Et à 28 d[ett]o [ Luglio] per Sc. cinquanta m[one]ta per cassa à Lorenzo Castellanilower. Sono come sopra [fol.] 302— sc. 50—

Et à 30 d[ett]o [ settembre] Sc. cento cinquanta sette m[one]ta pagati da noi de contanti a Lorenzo Castellani e compagni à conto del prezzo di un arazzo n[ost]ro. Sono per spese nostre particolari [fol.] 249— sc. 157—

Et à 4 d [ settembre] per Sc. cento m[one]ta per cassa al detto Castellani à conto come sopra. Sono per cassa [fol.] 306— sc. 100—

Et à 15 Decembré per Sc. cinquanta quattro m[one]ta per cassa à Lorenzo Castellani Arazziere per saldo del lavoro à 4 n[ost]ro portiere et un Baldacchino. Sono come s[opra] [fol.] 312— sc. 54—

[fol. 378] 1677
Et à 28 Feb.ro per Sc. duecento cinquanta b [aiocchi] 40 m[one]ta per cassa à Lor[enz]o Castellani e Lamberto della
1. *Paramento*: a textile furnishing used to decorate the interior walls of a dwelling.

2. *Palmo*, or *palm*: an old linear measure of approx. 25 cm.

3. *Padiglione*: a sort of baldachin hung from the ceiling over a bed, or a cloth draped over a throne, a door, or a window.

4. *Canna*: an old linear measure, used for textile, of approx. 3 m.

5. Referring to Lucrezia Tomacelli, wife of Filippo I.

6. *Portiera*: a curtain made of cloth or tapestry used as an ornamental cover for a door, often incorporating the owner's coat of arms.

7. *Ormesino*: very fine silk cloth.


10. Small pieces of silk cloth.
Tapestries for Court and Ecclesiastical Use in Seventeenth-Century Spain

The collection of tapestries belonging to the Spanish Crown is unquestionably one of the most important in the world, owing to the interest and support of the monarchs, from Isabel la Católica (r. 1474–1504) to Charles II (r. 1665–1700), who enriched the royal patrimony with successive acquisitions, and to the careful oversight of the Real Oficio de la Tapicería (Royal Tapestry Office), established under Philip II (r. 1556–98). Royal inventories show that under the Habsburg monarchs of Spain tapestries were considered veritable jewels, representative of the authority of the crown, and because of the testamentary regulations of Philip II, they could not be sold, so were permanently linked to the service of the crown princes. The Real Oficio de la Tapicería was entrusted to protect and preserve the collection in the best possible condition. And royal patronage continually augmented this exceptional treasure, as demonstrated by the inventory of the tapestries amassed by Philip IV (r. 1621–65), drawn up in 1666 as part of his posthumous inventory, as well as that of his son Charles II, the last Habsburg monarch of Spain. Thus, according to tapestry historians from the nineteenth century on, the tapestry collection of the Patrimonio Nacional is remarkable not just for the number of tapestries in it, but also for their quality and their state of preservation. The publication in 1986 of the catalogue of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century tapestries in the Patrimonio Nacional lists more than five hundred panels.

The tapestries made between 1600 and 1700 number 265 panels grouped in thirty sets. Among these thirty sets, all but two were produced in Flemish workshops. The two that were not are the Story of Phaetón (Patrimonio Nacional series 55), woven in the Medici workshop in Florence from cartoons by Alessandro Allori, destined for the decoration of the Palacio del Buen Retiro of Philip IV; and the Story of Diana (PN ser. 43), a reedition of the series designed by Toussaint Dubreuil (ca. 1561–1602) for Henry IV of France that was woven about 1608–10 in the manufactory of the Faubourg Saint-Marcel in Paris for Don Pedro Álvarez de Toledo, Spanish ambassador to France, as indicated by the arms of the Toledo and Osorio in the upper borders.

The range of subjects and the number of Flemish workshops represented in the Spanish collection attest to the diversity and the dynamism of the weavers active in Brussels. Their ateliers often worked in association with each other to create monumental series, as was the case with the workshops of Maarten Reybouts II, Jan Raes II, Catherine van den Eynde, Jacques Geubels II, and François van den Hecke. Throughout most of the seventeenth century, tapestry cartoons by the great generation of mid-sixteenth-century artists were reissued, adapted or simplified, as demonstrated by set of the Acts of the Apostles (PN ser. 48), which replicates the first edition commissioned by Pope Leo X for the Sistine Chapel from cartoons by Raphael; the panels have the marks of the workshop of Jan Raes II.
and a border of strapwork spiraling around a grapevine. Similarly, the set of the *Story of the First Parents* (PN ser. 50), from cartoons by Michiel Coxie, woven in the workshop of Jacob Fobert and Jan Vervoort, is a reedition of the set ordered by Sigismund II Augustus Jagiellon for Wawel Castle.

Although material richness was one of the characteristics of Renaissance tapestries, only two seventeenth-century Flemish sets belonging to the Patrimonio Nacional were woven with precious metal: the * Battles of the Archduke Albert* (PN ser. 46; fig. 1) and the *Story of Decius Mus* (PN ser. 52; fig. 2), woven twenty years apart. Panels from both sets were selected for inclusion in the exhibition “Tapestry in the Baroque: Threads of Splendor,” as much for their material richness as for their having been woven in the Brussels workshops of Maarten Reyimbouts II (*Battles*), and Jan Raes II and Jacques Geubels II (*Decius*), after designs by Otto van Veen (*Battles*) and his most gifted student, Peter Paul Rubens (*Decius*).

The *Battles of the Archduke Albert*, consisting of seven tapestries woven of silk and silver and gilt-metal wrapped threads, commemorates the triumphs of Archduke Albert of Austria (1559–1621) over Henry IV of France in Picardy, in battles at Calais (fig. 1), Ardres, and Hulst. The series is both a colophon of Flemish sixteenth-century tapestry making and a precursor of the Baroque period as much for the dates of its realization as for the artists who took part in its creation. It was conceived as a
woven military chronicle, with portraits of the protagonists and detailed topographies of the sites of the principal battles and with borders that include emblems and trophies alluding to the heroic qualities of the archduke. Nothing about the tapestries heralds change to a new style, for even the concept of the series resembles the sixteenth-century *Conquest of Tunis* for Emperor Charles V in utilizing shared visions of two artists, one who designed the figures and the other, the landscape and topography.

The series was commissioned by the magistrate of Antwerp to present to Albert of Austria and Isabella Clara Eugenia, archdukes of the Spanish Netherlands, for the occasion of their triumphal entry into that city. Otto van Veen (1556–1629) was commissioned to design the cartoons not only because of his merit as a painter, but also because of his good standing for having previously produced work for the magistrates and other civic bodies and above all because of his Catholic faith and his loyalty.
to the policies of Philip II. The triumphal entry was described and illustrated by Joannes Bocchius, secretary of Antwerp, in his *Historia narrationis profectionis et inaugurations Serenissimorum Belgii Principum Alberti et Isabellae, Austriae Archiducam*. According to Bocchius, these tapestries astonished those who saw them on this occasion of their first public display, for their execution with such a large amount of precious metal thread made them look rigid, as though they could stand on their own without needing to be hung.7

The other seventeenth-century Flemish set with gold is the *Story of Decius Mus*, the first commission received by Rubens (1577–1640) for designs for tapestries. The series was conceived in 1616 for an unknown Genoese patron. Its cartoons, which Rubens himself described as “molto soperbi” in the letter he sent in May 1618 to the English collector and diplomat Sir Dudley Carleton, were based on the events in the life of the Roman consul Decius Mus as recounted in Livy’s *Ab urbe condita*, and were inspired by Raphael’s designs for the *Acts of the Apostles*.

The role played by Rubens as a designer of tapestries was of major importance in the art of Baroque tapestry, indeed similar to that played a century previously by Raphael. Rubens’s novel conception of the cartoons as paintings in oil on canvas, the collaboration in this by his accomplished followers Jacob Jordaens and Anthony van Dyck, and his theatrical compositions and Counter-Reformation allegories all meant a radical shift toward regarding tapestries as true works of art.

Two sets of the *Story of Decius Mus* are preserved in the Patrimonio Nacional. The one referred to as “Decio de oro” (PN ser. 52; see fig. 2) was woven with an abundance of gilt-metal-wrapped thread for highlights in the modeling, the details of the clothing, and the armor. The one called “Decio de seda” (PN ser. 53) was woven in silk. Both sets followed Rubens’s cartoons, which are preserved in the Liechtenstein Museum in Vaduz and Vienna.

Similar uncertainties to the ones that surround the editio princeps for the Genoese patron also surround the Spanish sets, for although they are associated with the decoration of the Palacio del Buen Retiro of Philip IV, it is not known when they entered the royal collection. The king invested enormous sums of money in the remodeling and decoration of his pleasure palace in a program similar to those undertaken by other seventeenth-century monarchs for the embellishment of cities and palaces, such as the Coudenberg in Brussels and Whitehall in London. The presence of the *Decius* tapestries in the inventories of the royal palace was part of Philip’s response to this acquisitive and decorative program. History tapestries such as the *Conquest of Tunis* (PN ser. 13) were moved from the treasury of the Alcázar in Madrid to adorn the royal apartments of the Buen Retiro. Between 1633 and 1640 a number of tapestries were commissioned, acquired, or confiscated from their owners by the king and his favorite, the conde-duque de Olivares, for Buen Retiro. Among the sets thus acquired are some of the famous series woven in the Brussels workshop of Jan Raes II based on compositions of the painter Anthonis Sallaert, such as the *Story of Theseus* (PN ser. 56, 57) and the allegory of virtues and vices, known in the inventories of the Real Oficio de Tapicería as the *Allegory of the Life of Man* (PN ser. 58, 59). The metamorphosis series of the *Story of Phaeton* was also obtained in this fashion to decorate Buen Retiro.8 Philip IV had sent there sets of *Landscapes* (PN ser. 64, 65) and *Landscapes with Animals* (PN ser. 67), both woven in Brussels, and *Galleries of Arbores* (PN ser. 66), woven in the Antwerp workshop of Jacob Wauters. The pergolas and garden alcoves depicted in the *Galleries* introduced nature into the loggias and corridors facing the gardens and created the illusion of interior gardens.

The success and popularity of the *Story of Decius* in the Spanish golden age is well demonstrated by the two sets in the Spanish royal collection, as well as the numerous
sets woven in the Brussels workshops of Jan Raes II, Jacques Geubels II, and François van den Hecke that are preserved and documented in the seigneurial collections (Valdeavero), aristocratic collections (Villahermosa), and ecclesiastical collections (Oncala, Navarra, Toledo) of seventeenth-century Spanish society.

Tapestries played a major role as official art in the various manifestations of courtly, public, and private life throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They constituted essential elements of decoration for such ceremonies as banquets, canonizations, triumphal entries, coronations, baptisms, and royal weddings. By their very nature—the flexibility of their fibers and the adaptability of their structure—they were easy to transport. They could be used indoors and out, and to create spaces or be installed as wall...
hangings. When they were hung outdoors in urban spaces, the visual effects produced by the dyed silks and wools were multiplied by the natural light. The wefts created a play of light and shadow that animated the compositions and stimulated active participation in the ceremony by the public.

Rubens's *Triumph of the Eucharist* (PN ser. TA-D/1–20; figs. 3–5) provides exceptional testimony of the narrative and scenographic qualities of seventeenth-century tapestry, and of their monumentality, mobility, luminosity, and dynamism. This remarkable series, commissioned about 1625–26 by Archduchess Isabella Clara Eugenia for the Monasterio de las Descalzas Reales in Madrid, was designed by Rubens to decorate the church during the celebration of Holy Week. The tapestries are still preserved in the convent and are still used to decorate the cloister during Holy Week.

Illustrating the theological allegory of the Triumph of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the series was a gift of the archduchess to the convent, founded by her aunt Juana of Austria in 1556.

Contrary to traditional interpretations, including that which I set forth in *Tapestry in the Baroque: Threads of Splendor*, new research suggests that the twenty tapestries that make up the set are in two very different groups. The processional tapestries, destined for use outside, in the cloister, and on the exterior walls of the convent facing the plaza, follow a linear composition. The panels intended for the walls of the convent church follow a vertical pyramidal composition. The five tapestries that make up the

---

**Fig. 4.** Peter Paul Rubens, *The Adoration of the Eucharist*, bozzetto for the arrangement of five tapestries in the *Triumph of the Eucharist*, ca. 1626–27. Oil on panel, 31.5 x 32 cm. The Art Institute of Chicago, Bequest of Mr. and Mrs. Martin A. Ryerson (37.1012). Photograph: Bruce White

**Fig. 5.** Sketch of the hypothetical arrangement of the five tapestries in the set of the *Triumph of the Eucharist* to hang over the main altar of the Descalzas Reales. The five tapestries are, on the lower level, left to right, the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy in Adoration* and the *Secular Hierarchy in Adoration*; on the upper level, the *Monstrance Held by Two Cherubs* hangs between two *Angels Playing Music*. 

---
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altar hanging were meant to cover the main altarpiece by Gaspar Becerra (figs. 4, 5). One of these, Secular Hierarchy in Adoration (see fig. 5), has portraits of the champions of Catholicism: Emperor Ferdinand II of Austria, Philip IV accompanied by his wife, Isabella of Bourbon, and Archduchess Isabella Clara Eugenia, her aunt, dressed in a Franciscan habit.

Ten processional tapestries, each some five meters high, were destined from their arrival in Madrid to be hung outdoors to decorate the exterior plaza of the convent, as attested in the description of the procession of the Exaltation of the Cross, celebrated on July 16, 1632. The wind and the sunshine lent movement and color to the processional cortège depicted in the tapestries and intensified the compositional dynamism, conferring great solemnity and plasticity. The scenes were organized on two levels, or architectonic registers, as they appear in the oil sketch of the Adoration of the Eucharist in the Art Institute of Chicago (fig. 4).

In seventeenth-century Madrid, tapestries were part of the cityscape, and tapestry makers and merchants exhibited their works and their wares to potential buyers. The Diego Velázquez canvas The Spinners or The Fable of Arachne (Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid) gives us an idea of this manufacturing activity in the calle de Santa Isabel in Madrid, where from the beginning of the sixteenth century, weavers like Pedro Gutiérrez from Salamanca established themselves at the Madrid court to attend to the restoration of the royal collection, as well as to weave tapestries in the Flemish manner. ¹⁰

Literature on Baroque art in Spain began with the publication in 1600 of Noticia general para la estimación de las artes by Gaspar Gutiérrez de los Ríos. That work, considered the oldest Spanish text of its kind, summed up the artistic theories of the sixteenth century as introduction to Baroque theories, and it included praise for the art of tapestry, following Giorgio Vasari, who

---

Fig. 6. King Alfonso XIII of Spain kneeling during the procession of the Octava del Corpus celebrated at La Granja de San Ildefonso, Segovia, on June 18, 1914. Hanging on the facade of the palace are tapestries from a set of the Life of Christ (at center, The Last Supper), given to the Colegiata de San Ildefonso by Queen Consort of Spain Elisabeth of Parma. Photograph: after La Esfera 1, no. 26 (June 27, 1914), n.p. (Fotografía Campúa)
extolled as a “miracle” the Acts of the Apostles that Raphael designed for Pope Leo X.\textsuperscript{11}

Is it not a miracle to see at least one of the wonders of the world, the rich and ingenious tapestries that his Majesty has? If they had this art in antique times, I think they would have lost interest in the laudations delivered by the Poets. And I do not say this because my father was the first in Spain to have distinguished himself in the practice of it, except that is the truth. . . . Speak to us, then, of the arts related to painting, in the drawing as well as in the coloring. What can be said of the wondrous art of tapestry making, in which, as we see, everything from nature is imitated so accurately and lifelike? Whether or not this is worthy of note, it would be worth more if others said it because, as I have said, I am passionate. It is witness, then, to the treasure of the rich and ingenious tapestries that his Majesty has, for whom it would be easier to win a Kingdom than to make new ones.\textsuperscript{12}

Indubitably, the efforts undertaken during the reigns of Alfonso XII (1857–1885) and Alfonso XIII (1886–1941; see fig. 6) to publicize the royal tapestry collection—photographing the tapestries, encouraging the preparation of inventories, permitting the pieces to be moved so they could be included in national and international exhibitions such as those in Philadelphia (1879), Barcelona (1888), Paris (1900), and Madrid (1892), as well as publishing the first catalogues of the

Fig. 7. View of a facade of the Cathedral of Toledo hung with tapestries, including those from a set of the Triumph of the Eucharist, for the procession of the Most Holy Sacrament on Corpus Christi in June 2009. The tapestries were commissioned by Cardinal Luis Manuel Fernández Portocarrero, woven in the workshop of François van den Hecke, Brussels, ca. 1700, and given by the cardinal to the Cathedral of Toledo in 1701. Photograph: the author
collection—were the starting point for many of the research and museological projects carried out through much of the twentieth century. A depository was created that was adequate for the preservation of the pieces on reserve in the Palacio Real; successive catalogues have been published; exhibitions have been participated in to testify to the richness of the Patrimonio Nacional's tapestry collection; plans are under way for a dedicated tapestry museum; and there is participation in international multidisciplinary programs of cultural investigation.

The translation from the Spanish is by Suzanne Stratton.

1. The list of tapestries in the posthumous inventory of Philip IV is transcribed in the documentary appendix that completes the series of royal inventories published to date, in Concha Herrero Carretero, Rubens, 1577–1640: Colección de tapices. Obras maestras de Patrimonio Nacional (Madrid: Patrimonio Nacional, 2008), pp. 124–49.


11. “La quale opera fu tanto miracolosamente condotta, che reca maraviglia il vederla, ed il pensare come sia possibile avere sfialo i capegli e le barbe, e dato col filo morbidezza alle carni: opera certo piuttosto di miracolo che di artificio umano, perchè in essi son acque, animali, casamenti, e talmente ben fatti, che non tessuti, ma paiono veramente fatti col pennello” (This work was executed so marvelously, that it arouses astonishment in whoever beholds it, wondering how it could have been possible to weave the hair and beards in such detail, and to give softness to the flesh with mere threads; and it is truly rather a miracle than the work of human art, seeing that in these tapestries are animals, water, and buildings, all made in such a way that they seem to be not woven, but really wrought with the brush); Giorgio Vasari, Le opere di Giorgio Vasari, ed. Gaetano Milanesi from 2nd ed. (1568) of Le vite de’ più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori (Florence, 1966), vol. 4, p. 370; and Gaston du C. De Vere, trans., Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects (New York, 1996), vol. 1, p. 739.

12. “No es milagro ver, o a lo menos una de las maravillas del mundo las ricas e ingeniosas tapicerías que su Majestad tiene? Si la hubiera en tiempos antiguos esta arte, yo pienso que tuvieran harto que decir los Poetas en sus loores? Y no lo digo por haber sido mi padre el primero que en España se ha señalado en el ejercicio de ella, sino porque es la misma verdad. . . . Digamos pues ahora de las artes conjuntas a la pintura, así en el dibujo como en el colorido. Del arte milagrosa de la tapicería,
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adonde se imitan todas las cosas de la naturaleza tan propia y vivamente, como vemos, qué se me ofrecía decir? Si es digna de fama, o no, más vale que lo digan otros, que como tengo dicho, yo soy apasionado. Sea pues testigo del tesoro de las ricas e ingeniosas tapicerías que su Majestad tiene, a quien le sería más fácil ganar un Reino, que hacer de nuevo otras”; Gaspar Gutiérrez de los Ríos, Noticia general para la estimación de las artes y de la manera en que se conocen las liberales de las que son mecánicas y serviles, con una exhortación a la honra de la virtud y del trabajo contra los ociosos y otros particulares para las personas de todos estados (Madrid: Pedro de Madrigal, 1600), pp. 118–19, 135–36.


14. Such a program is the MODHT (Monitoring of Damage in Historic Tapestries), developed for the most part over the last five year; its findings are presented in Anita Quye, Kathryn Hallett, and Concha Herrero Carretero, eds., “Wrought in gold and silk”: Preserving the Art of Historic Tapestries (Edinburgh: National Museums of Scotland, Edinburgh, 2009).
Spanish Family Pride in Flemish Wool and Silk: The Moncada Family and Its Baroque Tapestry Collection*

In his pioneering study of Brussels tapestry, published in 1878, Alphonse Wauters was the first to establish a chronology of the manufactories and to describe that of their production with which he was familiar. He noted that the tapestry producer Albert Auwercx had joined the trade in 1657 and was privileged in 1671. As an example of Auwercx’s work, Wauters mentioned the History of the Conde Guillermo Raymond de Moncada, which belonged to a M. de Saint-Albin, and he described four hangings from the set that were displayed at the Union des Arts Décoratifs in Paris in 1874.1

A few years later, in 1897, Wauters returned to the subject in an article on the work of David Teniers II and III.2 This time, he referred to the catalogue of the sale of the collection of the marquis de Villafranca at the Hôtel Drouot, Paris, on April 21, 1870, at which six of these tapestries were sold, along with twenty paintings on copper, each measuring 54 by 68 centimeters, apparently the models for a large tapestry series of the History of the House of Moncada. Eight of the painted sketches bore the signature of David Teniers, five that of Luigi Gentile, six that of Willem van Herp, and one that of Adam Frans van der Meulen, and the signature of Jan van Kessel also appeared on ten of the paintings. The plates bore the date of manufacture, some 1663 and others 1664. All six tapestries had the Brussels mark and the signature A. AVWERCX. This information was repeated in the major survey by Heinrich Göbel (1923), who added that the tapestry series was then with Count Potocki in Paris.3

None of these publications illustrated the tapestries or the paintings, and scholarship seemed to have forgotten the series. A later publication on the Teniers as designers of tapestry did not mention the series, while another, devoted to some of the paintings on copper, did not note the existence or the location of the tapestries.4 Göbel’s mention is what led us to find them: they are still at the Hôtel Potocki, currently the headquarters of the Chambre de Commerce et d’Industrie de Paris on the avenue de Friedland.5 The discovery of complementary documents and of other tapestries of the series in Spain and Belgium has provided us with the opportunity to analyze them in detail for the first time and, above all, to place them in the broader context of their historical and artistic genesis.

THE ORIGIN OF THE HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF MONCADA: THE VICISSITUDES OF A COMMISSION

The twenty paintings on copper of the History of the House of Moncada, some dated 1663 and others 1664, all bear the coat of arms of the Moncada family, which is repeated on the six tapestries (figs. 2–12).6 The arms are set within the collar of the Order of the Golden Fleece, at that date widely considered the highest distinction of European nobility. That honor was granted
in 1651 to Luis Guillén de Moncada (1614–1672), seventh duque de Montalto and prince of Paternò, but it was not given to any of his successors. It was therefore this person who was behind the painted and woven cycles glorifying the story of his ancestors.

Luis Guillén de Moncada was born in Palermo on January 1, 1614. In 1626, his parents, Antonio de Aragón and Juana de la Cerda, left secular life and took holy orders with the Jesuits and the Carmelites, respectively, making Luis their sole heir and arranging his marriage to María Afán de Ribera, daughter of the duque de Alcalá, then viceroy of Naples. In 1635, Luis Guillén became viceroy of the Kingdom of Sicily, succeeding his father-in-law, who was sent to Milan. Residing in Messina and in Palermo (in the Palazzo Aiutamicristo), he contributed to the adornment of the cities by building fountains and structures such as the Porta Montalto. At court he led a grand life, surrounded by musicians and artists. From his time in Naples and in Caserta, he had a pittore di casa, Andrea Azzolino, brother-in-law of Juan de Ribera, who is mentioned in 1632 with reference to works commissioned by Moncada. After the death of his first wife en route to Rome in 1639, in 1642 Luis Guillén de Moncada married
a relative, Catalina Moncada de Castro, daughter of Francisco Moncada, marquês de Aytona (d. 1633), governor-general of the Spanish Netherlands. Over the years, Luis Guillén served as viceroy of Sardinia from 1638 to 1647, stilled a conspiracy in Sicily in 1649, and became viceroy of the Kingdom of Valencia in 1652. He moved to Madrid in 1659, where he became mayordomo mayor of Queen Mariana of Austria in 1665. His political power reached its peak in 1666, when he became a member of the Council of State; but in 1667 he took holy orders, as his parents had done, and Pope Alexander VII (Fabio Chigi) immediately made him a cardinal (fig. 1). He died in Madrid on May 4, 1672, at the age of fifty-eight.9 His only son, Don Fernando de Aragón (1644–1713), was his sole heir. In 1665 Fernando married María Teresa Fajardo, daughter of the marqués de Los Vélez.

Considering the eventful career of Luis Guillén de Moncada and the large number of his residences in both Italy and Spain, it is readily apparent that a tapestry, a portable fresco from the north, was an ideal and appropriate decoration for such a person. This is confirmed in the many documents relating to his art collections, reprinted here in the appendix.10 After commenting in detail on the History of the House of Moncada tapestries, we shall review the documents, which will allow us to identify other sets that belonged to this Spanish grandee.

In the Moncada archives in Spain, two payments, made in 1662 and 1663, relate to designs for tapestries. On December 3, 1662, 8,680 silver reales were paid “to have some plates ordered for a tapestry [series] of the history of the House of His Excellency” (doc. 6). Neither the number of plates nor the name of the artist or artists is mentioned. On September 5, 1663, a similar expenditure, this time 6,912 silver reales, is more explicit (doc. 7). This was for the “preparation of some plates on which David Teniers will paint for a tapestry [series] of the History of the House of His Excellency at the time of Don Antonio de Moncada.”

Here we have documents of the commissions for the twenty paintings on copper that were sold in Paris in 1870, mentioned above. The dates correspond: twelve of them, executed by different painters, including Willem van Herp (1614–1677), Luigi Gentile (Louis Cuspin; 1606–1667), and Adam Frans van der Meulen (1632–1690), with borders painted by Jan van Kessel (1626–1679), are dated 1663; the eight paintings signed by David Teniers II (1610–1690) are dated 1664.

We do not know under what circumstances Luis Guillén ordered the paintings on copper. He was living in Madrid at the time (1662–65), and the possibility that the commission was negotiated through David Teniers III (1638–1685) has not been ruled out. Son of David II, he also lived in Madrid during those years, and he later became a renowned painter of tapestry cartoons.11

Don Luis Guillén must have given precise instructions regarding the scenes to be represented and the inscriptions to be included. We know that he took great care over the reputation and commemoration of his family. He had the chronicle of the family, Ritratti della Prospapia, et heroi Monachi nella Sicilia, written by Father Giovanni Agostino della Lengueglia and published in Valencia in 1657.12 Through his will, we know that he also commissioned a large gallery of ancestral portraits. These included thirty-four bust-length portraits on copper and thirty-four lifesize, full-length paintings on canvas (doc. 11). In the 1754 inventory of his great-grandson Don Fadrique Vicente Álvarez de Toledo, fifty-two portraits on copper are mentioned (doc. 20).

It seems astonishing, therefore, that the tapestries tracing the history of his ancestors were not woven during Luis Guillén’s lifetime. They do not appear in the posthumous inventory of his property in 1672 (doc. 12), in which several other notable tapestry sets are mentioned, as will be discussed below. The History of the House of Moncada project was taken up much later by Luis Guillén’s son, Don Fernando de
Fig. 2. Willem van Herp and Jan van Kessel, Queen María, Abducted from Catania, Embarking on a Trireme, 1663. Oil on copper, 54 × 68 cm. Private collection. Photograph: courtesy of Domenico Sanfilippo Editore

Fig. 3. Queen María, Abducted from Catania, Embarking on a Trireme from the set of the History of the House of Moncada. Tapestry design by Willem van Herp and Jan van Kessel, 1663; woven in the workshop of Albert Auwerx, Brussels, 1699–1708. Wool and silk, 407 × 665 cm. Chambre de Commerce et d’Industrie, Paris. Photograph: Studio Sébert, Paris
Aragón. On December 19, 1699, Fernando had a contract of procurement drawn up with Lambert de Hondt, which stipulated that the painter would deliver cartoons for "twelve tapestry pieces depicting the history of the most illustrious and ancient lineage of the House of his excellency according to the models painted on Twelve copper-plates," which he was to follow exactly, including the borders, coats of arms, and inscriptions (doc. 15). The choice of Lambert de Hondt (ca. 1650–1708) was not fortuitous; for he had demonstrated talent as a cartoon painter in the models he prepared for the Art of War, a renowned tapestry series woven in 1696 at the Brussels workshop of Hieronymus Le Clerc and Jasper van der Borch, sets of which can be found in Munich (Neues Schloss Schleissheim) and at Blenheim Palace, for example. The borders of these tapestries were embellished with military trophies, as were some of the 1663 models for Moncada; the Art of War borders were designed by Jan van Orley, and De Hondt certainly knew of them. According to the contract of 1699, weaving of the History of the House of Moncada was to be assigned to Albert and Nicolas Auwercx, tapestry producers in Brussels. Albert Auwercx was one of the producers of the Battles of the Torriani and the Visconti (see below), and he also provided armorial tapestries to some Spanish nobles, including the duque de Medinaceli, which demonstrated his skill in heraldry. The models chosen for the six tapestry cartoons supplied following the 1699 commission deal with the oldest part of Moncada family history, the valorous deeds of Guillén Ramón III de Moncada, about...
Fig. 5. Luigi Gentile and Jan van Kessel, *Moncada in Discussion with the King*, 1663. Oil on copper, 54 × 68 cm. Private collection. Photograph: courtesy of Domenico Sanfilippo Editore

Fig. 6. *Moncada in Discussion with the King* from the set of the *History of the House of Moncada*. Tapestry design by Luigi Gentile and Jan van Kessel, 1663; woven in the workshop of Albert Auwerpex, Brussels, 1699–1708. Wool and silk, 410 × 447 cm. Chambre de Commerce et d'Industrie, Paris. Photograph: Studio Sébert, Paris
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1384; these episodes had been depicted on twelve of Don Luis’s original twenty paintings on copper and dated 1663. We may assume that the other six cartoons commissioned from De Hondt in 1669 were intended to show either later episodes in Guillén Ramón’s life or else outstanding events in the life of his brother Antonio de Moncada, about 1410, which are depicted on the other eight of the twenty paintings. In any case, we note that four models by Willem van Herp and two by Luigi Gentile were selected by Don Fernando to serve as the models for Lambert de Hondt’s cartoons, and ultimately none by David Teniers II.

The 1669 contract stipulated that the twelve tapestries planned were to be delivered in early June 1701, thus within seventeen months. From 1700 to 1703, Don Fernando corresponded with his agent in Brussels about this order, providing interesting information on the progress of weaving and about the relationship between himself and the executing artist and weavers. Nevertheless, the pieces were not finished or delivered during Don Fernando’s lifetime. After his death on November 11, 1713, the tapestries were not mentioned in his inventory (doc. 16). The six tapestries that had been woven were still at the workshop of Albert Auwercka. He had died in August 1709, and five of his nine children and heirs jointly held six panels of the History of the House of Moncada. Those were sold to Don Fernando’s daughter, Catalina de Moncada, between May 1714 and December 1718 (doc. 17). She attempted to realize her father’s initial plan, and in 1726 she commissioned the six outstanding
Fig. 8. Willem van Herp and Jan van Kessel, *Moncada Named Barón de Cervelló*, 1663. Oil on copper, 54 × 68 cm. Private collection. Photograph: courtesy of Domenico Sanfilippo Editore

Fig. 10. Willem van Herp and Jan van Kessel, *King Martin Entrusts Moncada with Regency of the Kingdom*, 1663. Oil on copper, 54 × 68 cm. Private collection. Photograph: courtesy of Domenico Sanfilippo Editore.
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tapestries from the successors of the original artisans, namely, Philippe de Hondt, son of Lambert (d. 1708), and Philippe Auwer, son of Albert (doc. 18). That commission was not carried out, however, perhaps because Catalina died in 1728. The earliest mention of the weavings in family records dates to 1754, the inventory of the estate of Doña Catalina’s son, Fray Vicente Álvarez de Toledo, ninth marqués de Villafranca, which lists only the six tapestries that survive today (doc. 20). The tapestries remained in that family until the Paris sale of 1870.

THE TAPESTRY SERIES TODAY
While the twenty paintings on copper relate the feats of valor of two Moncada ancestors, Guillén Ramón III de Moncada (d. 1398) and his younger brother Antonio de Moncada (d. 1413), as mentioned, the tapestries illustrate only episodes in the life of Guillén Ramón III. At the time, Sicily was governed by Queen María de la Rocca Ursina, daughter and heir of Federico III (r. 1355–77), but she was held under guardianship by a local baron, Artale Alagone, who acted on behalf of Gian Galeazzo Visconti of Milan. Guillén Ramón III de Moncada, who belonged to the opposing faction of the House of Aragón, took the young queen from Catania to Agosta, near Rome, on January 23, 1379; subsequently, in 1382, to Cagliari, on Sardinia; and thence to Aragón. In 1390, she was apparently forced to marry the son of Infante Martin of Aragón, Martin the Younger. Upon the death of the king of Aragón in 1396, Moncada became adviser to the young prince, but in 1397 he was accused of lèse-majesté, lost all his titles, and died of grief in 1398.

In the upper border, each tapestry has the Moncada coat of arms and the inscription guillelmuS raymonduS moncata huS nominis iii auctusae comes (Guillermo Raymond de Moncada, third of that name, conde de Agosta). In the lower borders, beneath the coat of arms of Luis Guillén de Moncada (fig. 12), are inscriptions explain-

Fig. 12. Coat of arms of Luis Guillén de Moncada, detail of fig. 4

Reginam a Catinensi arcet detractam / alio valda triremi transportat (On a mighty trireme, he transports the queen, whom he has taken from the citadel of Catania; fig. 3)

A maerente regina missione / efflagitat in Hispanicam navigaturus (From the sorrowful queen, he claims [his] mission to sail to Spain [i.e., he forces her to leave for Spain]; fig. 4)

Regem Arragoniae alloquitur illique / ereptam Alagonio reginam spondet (He speaks to the king of Aragón and proposes that he marry the queen seized from Alagona; fig. 6: beside King Martin the Elder sits Martin the Younger)

Martino regi expeditionem / Siculam meditanti proprio aere copias Suppeditat (For King Martin, who plans an expedition to Sicily, he furnishes troops raised with his own funds; fig. 7)
Cerbellionis ac sancti Vincenti / baro in Cathalonia a Martino rege creatur (He is made barón de Cervelló y San Vicente in Cataluña by King Martin; fig. 9)

A rege Martino seniore Hispaniam repetente / filly regy ac regni salus illi comminitur (King Martin the Elder, returning to Spain, entrusts him with regency of the kingdom and tute-lage of the young king; fig. 11)

Each tapestry has a border of its own, distinct from the others. This was a departure from the norm in seventeenth-century Flemish tapestry, in which a single design generally surrounded all the hangings in a set. Here, scenes with military subjects are bordered by displays of arms and trophies, while nonmartial episodes are adorned with books, flowers, and, for Queen María, Abducted from Catania, Embarking on a Trireme (fig. 3), still lifes appropriately composed of fish.18

The tapestries must have been moved and handled a great deal while they were with the Villafranca family. This would explain their present condition: they display a fair number of old restorations and relatively marked discoloration in the brown tones. Because they are now surrounded by molding, we cannot verify whether the signature of the tapestry producer Auwerxc, mentioned by Wauters, is still present in the lower selvedges.

THE PAINTINGS ON COPPER
The 1870 sale of the Villafranca collection dispersed the twenty paintings on copper that included the models for the tapestries. Most of the twenty were purchased by members of the Spanish nobility and are therefore likely still in private collections.19

Five of the eight paintings signed by David Teniers II have been located. Two are in the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza in Madrid; one was designated as being on the art market in 1989; and two others have recently appeared in a private collection in Spain.20 All these pieces deal with episodes from the story of Antonio de Moncada, which were not reproduced in tapestry. Their format (57 by 70 cm) is the usual one for paintings on copper, which were very widespread in early seventeenth-century Flanders and were exported to the Iberian Peninsula in large quantities. It is even estimated that a quarter of the paintings produced by David Teniers II were executed in that format.21

In a 1978 article devoted to Willem van Herp's works in Spain, Matías Díaz Padrón identified and reproduced eight paintings on copper by that artist that were among the twelve scenes of the life of Guillén Ramón III.22 Three of the six existing tapestries correspond to paintings illustrated in that article (figs. 2, 8, 10). Subsequently, one of these paintings came up for sale in Madrid. It is the model for the fifth tapestry, Moncada Named Barón de Cervelló (figs. 8, 9).23 The tapestry is in the same direction as the painting, but it was reduced in width and a few figures on the sides were omitted. The model for the third tapestry, Moncada in Discussion with the King, now on the art market, was also slightly reduced in width (figs. 5, 6).24 On the tapestries that correspond to the other two paintings, the opposite occurred: figures were added on the right to Queen María, Abducted from Catania, Embarking on a Trireme (figs. 2, 3), and on both that tapestry and King Martin Entrusts Moncada with Regency of the Kingdom (figs. 10, 11), the sea in middle ground, between the groups of people on either side, was extended. The cartoonist, in this case Lambert de Hont, mentioned in the contract of 1699, must have adapted the compositions of the models on copper to widths that corresponded to the tapestries to be woven (doc. 13). These widths were specified for each tapestry and varied between five and twelve Flemish ells, measurements likely imposed by the site where the tapestries were to be hung.

The borders painted by Jan van Kessel on the copperplate models for these tapestries
were very faithfully replicated, as the 1699 contract stipulated. In them, Van Kessel displayed all his art as a painter of flowers and still lifes. For the cartoons, De Hondt had to reverse and enlarge the models; their width (50 cm) corresponds to the approximately three-quarters of an ell specified in the contract. Both the models and the tapestries render the historical events of the late fourteenth century with figures in sixteenth-century dress, thus conferring on the whole a rather curious “troubadour” effect.

So far, we have been unable to locate the painted models for the other two tapestries, one of which was also provided by Willem van Herp (see fig. 7), the other by Luigi Gentile (see fig. 4). The tapestries themselves do not permit us to discern stylistic differences between these two painters: the cartoonist Lambert de Hondt rendered the compositions faithfully enough, but he did so in his own pictorial idiom.

TAPESTRIES AS CHRONICLES OF HISTORY
Under the Spanish regime in the Netherlands, many members of the high nobility used Flemish tapestry to promote their own lineage for propaganda purposes. That generally meant commissions for armorial tapestries, the reposteros so dear to the grandees of Spain. They were expensive, since the cartoons were made to order and could not
be reused by other clients, although a particular cartoon was then woven many times, somewhat reducing the price per piece.\(^5\)

Luis Guillén de Moncada’s initial plan to translate into twenty tapestries the story of his ancestors was nonetheless extraordinary, matched only by the most illustrious commissions in the genre. The object of figurative tapestry, a representational art par excellence, was often to glorify the military and political exploits of the world’s powerful. Philip the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, thus had the Battle of Roosebeke (1382; tapestries 1384–86) commemorated, and John the Fearless did the same for that of Liège (1408; tapestries 1411). Under Emperor Charles V, the _Battle of Pavia_ (1525; tapestries 1528–31) was woven, as was the _Conquest of Tunis_ (1535; tapestries 1548–54). Seven tapestries depicting the _Battles of the Archduke Albert_ were woven, and a set was presented to the archduke in 1599.\(^6\) Army commanders followed that example. Especially well known from the Spanish period are the _Battles of the Duke of Alba_, woven by Willem de Pannemaker in 1567–73 and still housed in the Palacio de Liria in Madrid,\(^7\) as are the tapestries of the _Battle of Lepanto_, whose designs, commissioned by Giovanni Andrea Doria from Luca Cambiaso, were woven.
in Brussels in 1591. After a long time in Rome, those tapestries were returned to the Palazzo del Principe in Genoa. A resolutely genealogical series, the Deeds of the Sandoval Family, whose whereabouts are now unknown, once decorated the palace of the duque de Lerma, born Francisco Gómez de Sandoval y Rojas, the all-powerful minister plenipotentiary of Philip III. The tapestries were described in 1605 at the time of the baptism of the future Philip IV.

Almost contemporary to the History of the House of Moncada was the series of the Battles of the Torriani and Visconti, commissioned by the Thurn und Taxis family after models painted by Erasmus Quellinus II (d. 1678), woven by Willem van Leeuwen (d. 1688) and Jacob van der Borch in Brussels. Quellinus’s designs are in Brussels, in the Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium, and one of them is dated 1649. Both the tapestries and the lifesize paintings that served as cartoons are in the Schloss Thurn und Taxis in Regensburg. The tapestries were depicted in an engraving illustrating a banquet at the palace of the Thurn und Taxis in Brussels in 1686.

Commemoration of the great military deeds of the Moncada thus belong to a well-established tradition. Luis Guillén de Moncada wanted to glorify some of his ancestors who participated in the history of Sicily. He himself had been viceroy of the island, so his motives were very personal and specific. We have already noted that he also had a gallery of portraits painted of these ancestors. In his 1672 will, he stipulated that these portraits should forever remain in his palace in Palermo (doc. 11).

A PRECEDENT IN PAINTINGS FOR DON JUAN OF AUSTRIA?
Both the twenty models on copper and the six tapestries that were finally executed

Fig. 15. Throne canopy. Tapestry woven in the workshop of François van den Hecke, Brussels, 1665. Wool and silk, 285 x 385 cm. Collection of the duquesa de Medina Sidonia, Sanlúcar de Barrameda
capture the attention with the formal detail of each composition being surrounded by a unique border with its own attributes. Such variants in the borders were fairly common in Italian tapestry, but, as noted, they were unusual in Brussels, where a set was normally provided with the same border around each tapestry. It happens that the same decorative feature was selected for a group of four paintings that illustrate the deeds of Don Juan José of Austria (1629–1679), governor-general of the Spanish Netherlands (1656–59); these were executed by David Teniers II and are usually dated about 1656.\(^\text{12}\)

These paintings on canvas, 74 by 81 centimeters, are also considered models for tapestries that were apparently never woven (fig. 13). Luis Guillén de Moncada may well have been familiar with these paintings. Moncada and Don Juan of Austria had long known each other, both of them having resided at the court of Naples of the duque de Alcalá from 1629. Don Juan was himself viceroy of Sicily from 1648 to 1651, and the two would meet again later in Madrid, at the Council of State in 1666.\(^\text{13}\)

**LUIS GUILLÉN DE MONCADA, COLLECTOR OF FLEMISH TAPESTRIES**

Research on the *History of the House of Moncada* has revealed interesting documents regarding other tapestry purchases by Don Luis Guillén. During his lifetime, a few
important series were commissioned. The documentary mentions of them begin in 1656. A payment was made in May of that year for a tapestry he purchased from Don Juan José of Austria (doc. 1). Although unfortunately the subject is not given, this mention is not without interest, for that year Don Juan became governor-general of the Spanish Netherlands. And it was during his time there that he commissioned the series of paintings from David Teniers II that provides a parallel with those of the History of the House of Moncada.

In December of the same year, Luis Guillén purchased a fifteen-piece set of tapestries and a tablecloth ("sobremesa") whose subject is also not specified (doc. 3). This was probably the Proverbs set, later cited in his inventory. Another interesting acquisition, made in September 1660, was of a set of Forest Landscapes ("Arboledas y paises"), consisting of ten large hangings and six panels to go over windows, 330 ells in all (doc. 4). That set reappeared later in the posthumous inventory and appraisal of 1672. It is described there as "Alamedas de Amberes," a term repeated in the record of the tapestries' sale on December 6, 1681 (doc. 14). Landscape tapestry series woven in Antwerp were rather rare, but we know of one such piece signed by Pieter Kolvenaer, brother-in-law of Jan van der Grooten, who was active during the second half of the seventeenth century.14

In May 1665, Moncada had twelve armorial tapestries ("reposteros") moved from Flanders to Spain. When they arrived in the northern Spanish port of San Sebastián, there were apparently some damages ("averías"), for which he had to pay along with the shipment from Flanders and transport to his residence (doc. 8). Were these losses that occurred upon arrival or during the unloading in San Sebastián? This would be comparable to the damage suffered during the transport of the Apocalypse and Noah series to Laredo for King Philip II in 1559.15 If so, that could explain why twenty-four more reposteros were commissioned a few weeks later, on June 8, 1665, from the manufacture of François van den Hecke in Brussels, after models by Jan van Kessel (doc. 9). The later documents mention twelve pieces. Finally, in May 1668, Luis Guillén arranged payment of the considerable sum of 18,430 silver reales for "una tapiceria fina de la fabula de Aquiles y Hector" (a fine tapestry set of the fable of Achilles and Hector) in eight pieces, 307 varas in all (doc. 10).

That last set and others, of which all trace has been lost, were listed again in the posthumous inventory of May 4, 1672, and in the appraisal of the following October 2 (docs. 12, 13). Luis Guillén seems, according to these documents, to have been a connoisseur and enthusiast of the latest creations of Flemish tapestry. His beautiful collection was quickly dispersed, however. Between 1672 and 1683, Don Fernando de Aragón sold almost all his father's tapestries (doc. 14). The prices they fetched—for the most part much lower than those listed in the appraisal of 1672—were recorded, as were the names of the purchasers, and that has enabled us to locate some of these sets.

The set that was closest to Don Luis Guillén was assuredly the five armorial tapestries that survive in the collection of the duquesa de Medina Sidonia in Sanlúcar de Barrameda (fig. 14). They are what remain of the commission for twenty-four reposteros placed with the Van den Hecke workshop in 1665 (doc. 9); Jan van Kessel, the ornamentalist who had worked two years earlier on the paintings of the History of the House of Moncada, was enlisted to produce them. The Moncada coat of arms, surrounded by the collar of the Golden Fleece, is suspended by genii between two oak trees with ribbons. On the ground, three other genii busy themselves with military weapons: two of them are covering up a cannon, a gesture of peace, while the one on the left is extinguishing the fuse in a barrel of water. Luis Guillén's eight noble quarterings, mentioned in the 1672 inventory, are shown
separately in the floral border. That inventory also describes the baldachin of a throne showing the “retatro primero” (first portrait) of the family and a canopy with angels. The canopy, still extant, bears the initials FVH, the mark of François van den Hecke (fig. 13); it must have been commissioned about 1665, at the same time as the armorial hangings. Its iconography emphasizes yet again Luis Guillén’s interest in the genealogy of the family.

The “Triunfo de la Iglesia” of ten hangings plus four overwindows and two portieres can be identified as a set of the *Triumph of the Eucharist* that was designed by Peter Paul Rubens for the Infanta Isabella Clara Eugenia in 1625–27 for the convent of the Descalzas Reales in Madrid. About 1650, the cartoons for the *Triumph of the Eucharist* series became the exclusive property of the manufactory of François van den Hecke, the same weaver who delivered Luis Guillén’s reposteros and throne canopy in 1665. It may seem surprising that a set of such explicitly religious tapestries was bought by a Spanish nobleman, but that purchase—which we have not been able to date precisely—may have been made by Luis Guillén after his preferment to cardinal in 1667, that is, five years before his death in 1672. Not many rewavings of the *Triumph of the Eucharist* are known in Spain, but one of them might pertain to the Moncada collection. We know that Fernando de Aragón sold his father’s set to Don José Ponce de León, and that it was paid for on November 20, 1676 (doc. 14). The set was passed on to Don José’s brother Manuel Ponce de León (d. 1693), sixth duke de Arcos, and eventually to his descendant Antonio (d. 1780), eleventh duke de Arcos, thence to Antonio’s widow, María Ana de Silva. Their daughter, Cayetana de Silva, thirteenth duquesa de Alba, married José Álvarez de Toledo, eleventh marqués de Villafranca (a descendant of Luis Guillén de Moncada). Upon his death in 1796, the set of the *Triumph of the Eucharist* was cited as coming from his mother-in-law (doc. 22), and it would remain in the house of the Alba until the Paris sale of 1877, when it was dispersed.7 One of these tapestries, the *Victory of the Eucharist Overcoming Pagan Sacrifices*, currently belongs to the Dexia Bank in Brussels (fig. 16);8 and another, *Prophet Elijah Being Fed by an Angel*, is in the Residenzschloss in Fulda.

Another extant set from Luis Guillén’s collection is that of the *Proverbs* (“Adagios”). It was a creation of the other great tapestry designer in Antwerp, Jacob Jordaeus, who produced its cartoons in 1644. The 1672 Moncada inventory mentions fifteen large tapestries and six overwindows, twenty-one pieces of “Adagios” in all. The appraisal of the same year lists the “Proverbios” in fifteen tapestries, three “sobreventanas,” and three “sobrepuertas.” The entire set was sold in February 1673 to Fernando de Valenzuela (doc. 14). Also a member of the Spanish high nobility, Valenzuela was briefly first minister to King Charles II, but in 1678, after the revolt led by Don Juan José of Austria the previous year, Valenzuela was dispossessed of his property and went into exile, first to the Philippines for ten years and then to Mexico, where he died in 1692. In his 1677 inventory, an eighteen-piece set of “los Sentidos” is listed, its dimensions corresponding to Moncada’s “Proverbios.”9 At present, only two complete sets of that series are known. One was purchased in 1647 by Archduke Leopold Wilhelm and is in Hluboká Castle (Czech Republic). The other is now in the Cathedral of Tarragona and consists of eighteen pieces in all, and it is the largest of all the known sets of Jordaeus’s *Proverbs*. Undoubtedly it is the Moncada set (fig. 17). It was bequeathed to the cathedral in 1683 by Canon Diego de Rebollo, who must have acquired it at the Valenzuela sale in 1677–78, since at the time of Rebollo’s bequest it was also described as “Los Sentidos.” 10 The Tarragona set is made up of the eight *Proverbs* by Jordaeus that are also at Hluboká, plus ten narrow pieces that served as entretenéres or overdoors. If it is the set that was purchased by Luis
Guillén in 1636 (doc. 3), we may assume that it was made to measure to decorate a specific room of his residence, then the Palazzo Aiutamicristo in Palermo.

The Moncada *Story of Achilles* was unquestionably the same series that was woven often from about 1635 in Brussels after designs by Rubens. According to the register of orders of payment of Luis Guillén, now Cardinal Moncada, during 1665–81 (doc. 10), he purchased his set of the *Story of Achilles* in 1668 from the admiral of Castille, a title then held by Juan Gaspar Enríquez (1625–1691). One of the earlier sets of the *Story of Achilles* was commissioned in 1642 from the manufactory of Jan Raes in Brussels by Juan Alfonso Enríquez de Cabrera (d. 1647), admiral of Castille, father of Juan Gaspar Enríquez.\(^4\) We can accept that this was the set Moncada owned. In 1648 the same manufactory sold two sets to Spanish noblemen, one to the conde de Peñaranda and the other to Don Luis de Benavides. The latter set might be the one preserved at the Cathedral of Santiago de Compostela, but that link has not been established with certainty.\(^4\) Could it instead be the Moncada set?
Among the oldest tapestry series, let us note the eight-piece set of *Fructus belli*, made in 1546–49 for Ferrante Gonzaga, then woven again about 1600 by Maarten Reymbouts.\(^\text{1}\) A set was offered to Cardinal Mazarin by Don Luis de Haro at the time of the Peace of the Pyrenees in 1659. The Moncada set came to Luis Guillén from his second wife, Catalina Moncada de Castro, since it is listed in her posthumous inventory of 1662 (doc. 5). It is described there as “fina de Brussels” but also “algo gastada,” which suggests that this was an old weaving from the sixteenth century. Did it come from Catalina’s father, Francisco Moncada, marqués de Aytona, who was very active in the Spanish Netherlands from 1630 until his death in 1635? Luis Guillén de Moncada can, we may conclude, be counted among the great Spanish patrons of Flemish tapestries of his time, like Don Luis de Benavides and Don Luis de Haro. He acquired sets of tapestries woven after designs by the most renowned Flemish painters, such as Rubens and Jordaeus, and he commissioned tapestry designs from David Teniers II as well as from his less famous but equally productive contemporaries, including Jan van Kessel, Willem van Herp, and Luigi Gentile. Portions of the Moncada collection, dispersed over the centuries, survive in Paris, Tarragona, Sanlúcar de Barrameda, and probably a few other private collections on the Iberian Peninsula.

The translation from the French is by Jane Marie Todd.

\(^\text{1}\) The redaction of this paper was completed on April 18, 2008.


10. Most of the documents are in the archives of the dukes of Medina Sidonia, currently open to researchers in Sanlúcar de Barrameda, Cádiz; other complementary documents were discovered in the Archives Générales du Royaume in Brussels. We are most grateful to the late Luisa Isabel Álvarez de Toledo, twenty-first duquesa de Medina Sidonia and marquesa de Villafranca, for providing access to the family archives.


16. These thirty-three letters were discovered as this article was going to press, and they will be published separately by Margarita García Calvo (“Correspondencia entre Fernando de Aragón, 8º duque de Montalto, y su agente en Bruselas sobre la realización de la tapicería de la ‘Historia de los Moncada’”).


19. According to an entry in the Medina Sidonia archives, the buyers were the duque de Medina Sidonia (14 paintings), the duque de Fernán Nuñez (2), the duque de Frias (1), a certain M. Delacour (2), and the M. de Saint-Albin (1) who also acquired the tapestries. Scalis (*La Sicilia degli Heroi*, passim) was able to track down and reproduce fifteen of them. We thank the author and her publisher for providing the pictures of the copperplates related to the tapestries and of the tapestry in Tarragona.


21. Anne Connor, cat. 58, in *Copper as Canvas: Two Centuries of Masterpiece Paintings on Copper*, 1575–1775, exh. cat., Phoenix Art Museum, Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Mauritshuis (New York, Oxfords, 1999), p. 294. The paintings by Teniers in that exhibition measured 57 by 78 cm (Mauritshuis), 59 by 74 cm (private collection), and 106 by 129 cm (Museo del Prado, Madrid). The largest plates produced by the copper beater Peter Stas in Antwerp between 1587 and 1610 measured 87 by 73 cm; Jürgen Wadum, “Antwerp Copper Plates,” in ibid., p. 107.

22. Díaz Padrón, “Obras de Van Herp.” We sincerely thank the author, as well as Jehel Sanszalasar, for procuring the photographs of these works.


29. Relación de lo sucedido en la ciudad de Valladolid desde el punto del felicissimo nacimiento del principe don Felipe dominio victor nuestro señor, hasta que se acabaron las demostraciones de alegría que por él se hicieron, reprint with preface by Narciso Alonso Cortez (Valladolid, 1916), p. 65: “Convite que hizo el Duque de Lerma al Almirante de
Inglaterre"; p. 67: "En la quinta pieza que es una gran cuadra, estaban unas tapicerias de seda y oro, figurados en ellas los Hechos de los Sandovales, deviseros de Castilla." The writer does not specify the number of tapestries, but his description includes Lerma himself. That seems to indicate that the tapestries were commissioned by Lerma and that it was not an old series. In that case, one may posit a dating between about 1580, when Lerma became "gentilhombre de camara," and 1605.

30. Six of the eight tapestries bear the signature LVD BORCHT, which may refer to the Jacob van der Borcht who died between 1709 and 1713, or to Jacob van der Borcht I, known as "A Castro," who died in 1693.


32. One painting is in the Wallace Collection, London; two were sold at Christie’s, London, July 8, 2005. See also Kline and Lüdke, David Teniers der Jüngere, pp. 349–50.


38. Formerly Artesia Bank; Delmarcel, Flemish Tapestry, pp. 216–17.


40. Pedro Battle Huguet, Los tapices de la Catedral primada de Tarragona (Tarragona, 1946), pp. 55, 64–76, where the set is divided into two groups; Kristi Nelson, Jacob Jordaeus: Design for Tapestry, Pictura nova 5 (Turnhout, 1998), p. 101; Scalisi, relying on the online summary (http://www.studiesinwesterntapestry.net/bib_highlights.htm, posted January 30, 2008) of this paper presented at the Metropolitan Museum symposium in October 2007, reproduced several of these tapestries in La Sicilia degli Herer, pp. 30, 31, 33, 35, 43.


Appendix: Documents Relating to the Moncada Collection of Baroque Tapestries

ADMS—Archivo de Medina Sidonia, Sanlúcar de Barrameda
AGR—Archives Générales du Royaume, Brussels

The passages in **bold** in the extracts from the documents are marked that way by the authors for the convenience of the reader.

1. May 25, 1656, ADMS, doc. 227, "Registro de Libranzas del Cardenal desde 1656 a 1661," fol. 99. Luis Guillén de Moncada orders payment for a tapestry purchased from Don Juan José of Austria, governor-general of the Spanish Netherlands, 1665–59:

En 25 de mayo de 1656 se despacho un pasiente en cuenta a D. Gabino Farina de veinte y un mil cuatrocientos y ochenta en cuatro (21,484) reales y diez y ocho dineros por 2931 de plata doble que ha pagado a Riniego [?] Y son por el valor de 625
doblones a 31 reales y un cuartillo cada uno en la moneda doble, de los cuales dio letra de cambio para Barcelona, sobre pedro Fíces, pagables a D. Gabriel Sánchez Durán, a efecto de comprar para S. Ex. una tapicería del S. D. Juan de Austria . . .


se despacho libranza a Vicente Bronce tapi- cero, por haber limpiado y dado color a las tapicerías de la historia de Fructus belli

3. December 5, 1656, ADMS, doc. 227, “Registro de Libranzas del Cardenal desde 1656 a 1661,” fol. 127. Purchase of a 15-piece tapestry set and a table cover:

5 de diciembre de 1656. Compra de una tapicería de 15 panos y una sobremesa


En 25 de septiembre se despacho libranza a Pedro Blanial, tapicero de S. M. en Jusepe de Aguiar, tesorero, de doce mil quinientos y cuarenta (12,540) reales por el precio de una tapicería de arboledas y países, consistente en 10 panos y 6 sobreventanas, en todo 300 anas, a racon de 38 reales cada una———8360

5. July 25, 1662, ADMS, doc. 182, fols. 378–84. Appraisal of tapestries left by Doña Catalina de Moncada (d. 1660), wife of Luis Guillén de Moncada:

En la villa de Madrid a veinte y cinco de julio de mil y seisientos y sesenta y dos años. Los tapiceros y tasareros nombrados por el ex. Sr. Duque de Montalto para tasar las alhajas que quedan en casa de dicho señor duque de Montalto cuando murió la dicha Excelentísima señora Doña Catalina de Moncada su mujer

Tasaron las tapicerías que son las que siguen

una tapicería de asiete panos y seis anas de cayda fina de oro y seda con fajas negras que tiene doscientas cincuenta y cinco anas a ciento y ochenta reales cada una montan quarenta y cinco mil y nobecientos reales

otra tapicería de ocho panos y seis anas de cayda figuras grande fina de Bruselas y cenefas de columnas que tiene tres-

cientas y veinte y una anas a ochenta reales cada una montan veinte y cinco mil seis-cientos y ochenta reales

otra tapicería de quince paños y seis sobreptuertas, las tres de tres anas de cayda y las otras tres de a dos y media y la tapicería de cinco anas y media de cayda fina de Bruselas figuras grandes con cenefas de ramilletes que tienen quarentocientas quarenta y dos anas y media con sobreptuertas y todo y una sobremesa que anda con la tapicería y no es hermana con una porcelana de frutas en medio que tiene quince anas en nubecientos reales y la tapicería con sus sobrevestanas a ochenta y ocho reales el ana monta treinta y ocho mil nobecientos y quarenta reales

otra tapicería de la historia de fructus belli fina de Bruselas algo gastada de cinco anas de cayda que tiene doscientas treinta y dos anas y media a quarenta y quatro reales cada una montan diez mil doscientos y treinta reales

otra tapicería de ocho panos y figuras grandes de cenefas de elementos y cinco anas de cayad que tiene doscientas y once anas a quarenta y seis reales cada una monta nueve mil setecientos y seis reales doce reposteros de salamanca con las armas de su exa. aforadas en lienzo es a veinte ducados cada uno y el uno desaforado y roto a diez ducados. En todo montan dos mil quinientos y treinta reales

6. December 3, 1662, ADMS, doc. 4522, “Registro de Libranzas del Cardenal Moncada desde el año 1662 al 1665,” fol. 188. Payment to order some plates for a tapestry series of the *History of the House of Moncada*:

En 3 de Diciembre se despacho un pasente en quentas a Jusepe de Aguiar tesorero, de quince mil setecientos treinta y dos (15,632) reales y medio por 8680 de plata que ha pagado aian Cortispos por el valor de 786 ducados 18 sueldos y 9 dins [?] De a 222 gruesos por ducado moneda de Flan-dres de los cuales en noviembre pasado dio letra de cambio para Amberes sobre D. Antonio Suarez de Fonseca, payable a Miguel de la Planilla, de la secretaría de estado y guerras de aquellos estados. A efecto de mandar abrir unas laminas para una tapicería de la historia de la Casa de Su Exc. Qual cantidad se pago contando los doblones a 58 reales cada uno. Son de plata———8680

7. September 5, 1663, ADMS, doc. 4522, “Registro de Libranzas del Cardenal Moncada desde el año 1662
al 1665,” fols. 277–78. Payment for making some plates to be painted by David Teniers for a tapestry series of the History of the House of Moncada:

En dicho día se despacho un pascente en quenta a Josep Pujol tesorero, de catorce mil cuatrocientos setenta y dos (14.472) reales por 6912 de plata que ha pagado a Juan Bautista Cassani, por el valor de 659 ducados y once sueldos, de a 122 sueldos por ducado, moneda de Flandes, de los cuales en 29 de agosto pasado dio letra de cambio para Amberes, sobre Juan Bautista Cateane, pagable a Nicolas Dama a efecto de mandar hacer unas laminas que ha de pintar David Teniers para una tapicería de la Historia de la Casa de Su Ex. en tiempo del sr. D. Antonio de Moncada, Conde de Aderno, cual cantidad se pago contando los doblones a 65 reales cada uno. Son de plata —— 6912

8. May 4, 1665, ADMS, doc. 4509, “Registro de Libranzas del Cardenal Moncada desde los años 1665 a 1681,” fol. 107. Payment for transporting 12 armorial tapestries by sea from Flanders to San Sebastián:

En 4 de mayo de 1665 se despacho un pascente en cuenta de Josep de Aguiar tesorero de mil setecientos ochenta y seis reales y cuatro mil que ha pagado por mano de Domingo de Maguia agente de S. Ex. por el flete de 12 reposterias desde Flandes a S. Sebastián, por averías en dicho puerto, parte desde allí a esta Corte y derechos como parece por una memoria que se conserva en Contaduría cual cantidad se pago contando los doblones a 72 reales


En esta villa y corte de Bruxelas a nueve del mes de junio de mill seyscentos y sesenta y cinco, pareció por ante mi henrique duprenne, notario y escribano publico del Rey nuestro señor admitido por su consejo soverano de Brabante residente en dicha villa, y en presencia de los testigos de presente escritos el señor don Miguel de Planella, secretario de su magestad y de una parte, sr Francisco Vandenhecke, maestro tapicero en dicha villa, de otra, el cual se obligo como se obliga y promete por la presente de haçer fabricar segun las condiciones abaxo referidas veynte y

quatro reposterias con las armas del Exmo senor Duque de Montalto, bien y perfectamente a entera satisfacion del dicho senor Planella, conforme al modelo hecho para ellos de mano del Pintor van Kessel, que se le entregara mañana, a saber que cada reposteros ha de tener seys anas de cayda y cinco de ancho con sus cenefas que midiran 720 anas, todos muy bien trauaxados como conviene en deuida forma, y de la mas fina y curiosa seda que se halla, las coloras vermejas todas todas del mejor cromosy obra desta dicha villa, y el dicho senor de Planella en nombre y de la parte de su dicha excellencia obliga Y promete por esta de pagar al dicho senor Francisco vanden Hecke por cada ana de dichos reposteros veynte y un florines, Yportando en todo la suma de quince mil ciento y veynte florines de a veynte Placas moneda de Brabante, en tres pagamientos, el primero antes de empezar la dicha obra, la suma de Tres mil florines, y seys mil y sessenta florines quando la dicha obra esta media hecha, y el restante de los dichos quize mil ciento y veynte florines al tiempo que el dicho vanden hecke habra hecho a enterar satisfacion los veynte y quatro reposteros y entregados al dicho sr Planella, lo que le segundo compareciente promete en el tiempo y termino de diez meses después de la fecha desta, y finalmente esta condicio-

nado que si en caso el el dicho tapicero vanden hecke cometiere alguna falta, en no bien fabricar los dichos reposteros y quaze no sabieren conforme la condicion arriva declaradas, y uniforme del dicho dibujo, el dicho Senor de Planella podra hacerlos emendar y perfectionar y si no se pudiere hacer, el dicho vanden hecke esta contento de quedar con ellos y en lugar dellos hacer otros, sin ningun interes del dicho sr De Planella en cumplimiento de todo lo suso dicho, los dichos compartientes obligaron respectivamente sus personas y bienes muebles para que en sus nombres puedan renonciar y otorgar la presente antes quales[unque] tribunales y juezes que fuera menester alli por el efecto sobre dicho dejarse voluntariamente condemnaran renunciando para ello a todos privilegios fueros y leyes en contrario, y senalada-

mente ala regla de derecho diciendo que renunciation general no vale si la especial no preceda pro y en commun forma fecha en Brussels el dia mes y ano suso dicho en presencia del señor Nicolas Dama primer Visien [?] y chaufeüre [?] de los reales sellos de su majestad en su consejo privado y el
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senor don juan francisco dauiguegenti-

hombre de su dicha excelencia como testi-
gos deste efecto llamado y requeridos

aviendo firmado los dichos comparecientes

y yo el asuprascrito Notario este presente

contracto n el registro que queda en mi

power

franciscus vanden hecke

Miguel de Planella

Nicolas Dama

don Juan Francisco d’Arisque

Henrique du Prenne, notarius

10. May 3, 1668, ADMS, doc. 4509, “Registro de Libranzas del Cardenal Moncada desde los años 1665 a 1681,” fols. 335–36. Payment for the pur-

chase of an 8-piece set of the Story of Achilles:

En 3 de mayo de 1668 se despacho un pas-

sente en cuenta a Josep de Aguilar tesorero
de cuarenta y dos mil seiscientos diez y

nueve reales (42.619) y trece mil por diez y

ocho mil cuatrocientos y treinta de plata

(18.430) que ha pagado a Andrés Mal-

donado tesorero del Almirante de

Castilla por el precio de una tapiceria

fina de la fábula de Aquiles y Hector,

consistente en ocho paños de 307 varas y

sesna, que S. Exa. Mando comprar a 60

reales de plata cada una como parece . . .

11. April 24, 1672, ADMS, doc. 478. Extract from the will of Luis Guillén de Moncada (d. May 4, 1672):

Testamento otorgado en abril de 1672 de

D. Luis de Moncada y Aragón Cardenal
de la Santa Iglesia de Roma, Caballero del
Toisón de Oro, del Consejo de Estado y
Mayordomo Mayor de la Reina . . .

Quiero y es mi voluntad que todos los

cuadros, láminas y estatuas de la Gene-

alogía de mi casa queden vinculados como

yo desde luego para siempre jamás los

vuelco en mi casa y estados y mayorazgo

para todos los sucesores en ella para que se

coloquen en el cuarto de mi Palacio—que

tengo en la ciudad de Palermo y no se

puedan quitar de el ni donársol ni enajenar-

los en ningun tiempo por ninguna manera

ni razón que sea porque mi voluntad es que

queden perpetuamente para la descenden-

cia y esplendor de mi casa y de los sucesores

en ella y los dichos cuadros, láminas y

estatuas del vuelco son los siguientes que

tengo enviados y están colocados en el

dicho Palacio——

—Diez y seis cuadros grandes retratos de

los señores de la Casa de Moncada de los

personajes de cuerpos enteros en cada uno

—Otros diez y seis cuadros en láminas

retratos de los mismos señores de arriba con

sus marcos

—Diez y ocho cuadros grandes retratos

de los señores de la Casa de Moncada desde

que pasaron a Sicilia de un personaje de

cuerpo entero

—Otros diez y ocho cuadros en laminas

retratos de los mismos señores de arriba con

sus marcos de——

Diez y ocho estatuas de los mismos . . .

12. May 4, 1672, ADMS, doc. 185, fols. 141v–143r.

Extract from the inventory of the possessions of the late Luis Guillén de Moncada:

Inventario y tasación de los bienes del emi-
nentísimos Cardenal Duque de Montalvo. Se

hace en la villa de Madrid a cuatro días del

mes de mayo de mil y seiscientos y setenta

y dos a las cuatro de la mañana . . .

1—Una tapiceria de Bruselas historia del

triunfo de la Iglesia nueva de diez paños

cuatro sobre ventanas y dos sobrepuestas

que todo tiene trescientas y ochenta y seis

anas lo cual esta en cinco cajas iguales de

a dos cerraduras

2—Doce reposerios nuevos de tapiceria

finos con las armas de su Eminencia en

medio y ocho escudos de armas alre-

dedor de a seis anas de caida cada uno for-

rados en lienzo verde que estan en cuatro

cajas del mismo genero que las antecedentes

3—Un dosel grande de tapiceria fábrica

de Bruselas con el retrato primero de la

familia de Moncada en la cayda del el

cielo con unos angeles y sus goteras a

dos haces con su franja grande en otra caja

del mismo genero que la referida que es de

los reposerios de arriba

4—Otra tapiceria de la fábula de

Aquilos y Hector en ocho paños de seis

anas de caida que esta en tres cajas del

mismo genero que las antecedentes

5—Otra tapiceria de Adagios que tiene

veinte y una piedras las quince largas y las

seis sobre ventanas y demas tiene un lienzo

pintado a su imitacion que sirve de cenefa

del cinco varas que esta en cinco cajas

nuevas del mismo genero que las referidas

6—Otra tapiceria de arboledas y paises

diez y seis paños y seis sobre ventanas de

armas de cinco anas de caida que esta en

cuatro cajas del tamaño y genero que las

antecedentes

7—Otra tapiceria de fructus vell de

ocho paños de mas de cinco anas de caida

que esta en tres cajas del mismo genero que

las antecedentes
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8—Mas veinte y cuatro reposteros de
paño tepados [?] con las armas de su
Eminencia forrados en lienzo colorado
9—Doce reposteros de Salamanca con
las armas de su Eminencia los once de ellos
forrados en lienzo y el otro sin forro
maltratado

Appraisal of the tapestries of the late Luis Guillén
de Moncada:

En la dicha villa de Madrid el dicho día
dos de octubre del año de seiscientos y
dos y por ante mi Andres Salgado
maestro tapicero tasador nombrado para las
cosas tocante a su oficio que quedaron por
muerte del Eminentísimo señor Cardenal
por los señores interesados el cual las tasa
en la manera siguiente
1—Una tapicería de Bruselas historia
del triunfo de la iglesia nueva de diez
paños cuatro sobreventanas y dos sobreen-
puertas que todo tiene cuatrocientos y tres
anas tasada cada una a sesenta y dos reales
de plata y montan veinte y cuatro mil
novecientos y ochenta y seis reales

2—Un dosel fino hecho en Bruselas
nuevo que tiene setenta y nueve anas a
sesenta reales de plata cada uno que monta
cuatro mil setecientos y cuarenta reales
de plata

3—Doce reposteros echos en Bruselas
con las armas de su excelencia que tiene seis
anas de caída y cinco menos una sexma de
caida que hace cada uno veinte y dos
anas y todos trescientos y cuarenta y ocho
que a sesenta reales de plata montan veinte
mil ochocientos y ochenta reales

de plata

4—Una tapicería de la fabula de
Aquilus y Hector de ocho paños que
tienen trescientos y siete anas y una sexma
que tasada cada an a cincuenta y seis reales
de plata montan diez y siete mil doscientos
y un reales (17.201)

5—Una tapicería de alamedas echa
en ambareres de diez paños de a cinco anas de
caida cuatro sobreventanas y dos sobre-
puertas que todas hacen trescientos y veinte
y nueve anas y media a treinta reales de
plata cada una montan nueve mil ocho-
cientos y ochenta y cinco reales de plata

6—Otra tapicería de Proverbios de
quince paños echa en Bruselas de a cinco
anas y media de caída tres sobreventanas de
dos anas y media de caída tres sobrepuertas
de tres anas de caída que todas tienen cuat-
rocientos y cuarenta y cuatro anas que a
cincuenta reales de plata cada una montan
veinte y dos mil y doscientos reales de plata

7—Otra tapicería de ocho paños de cinco
anas de caída echa en Bruselas gastada
de los frutos de la guerra que tiene
doscientas y treinta y dos anas y media que
tasada cada un a treinta y dos de reales de plata cada una
montan siete mil cuatrocientos y cuarenta
reales de plata

8—Doce reposteros hechos en Sal-
amanca con las armas de su exa. de a tres
varas de largo y tres de caída gastados
tasado cada uno a diez ducados de vellon
montan mil trescientos y veinte reales d
vellon

9—Una sobre mesa de tapicería fina
hecha en Bruselas que tiene catorce anas y
dos tercias tasada cada una a treinta y dos
reales de plata montan cuatrocientos y
setenta reales de plata

14. 1672–83, ADMS, doc. 5995, fols. 9, 73, 114, 188,
213, 214, 231, 232, 236. Tapestrías de Luis Guillén de
Moncada sold by his son, Don Fernando de
Aragón:

1672 5 de diciembre
una tapicería de ocho paños de caída de
cinco anas hecha en Bruselas historia
fructus belli que tiene 232 anas y media a
32 reales de plata cada una en——7440

1673 2—febrero
a Ferdo de Balenzuela una tapicería de
Proverbios de quince paños hecha en
bruselas de a cinco anas y media de caída y
seis sobreventanas de dos anas y media de
caída que todas hazen 444 anas tasadas a 50
reales de plata, se le remató en 40 reales de
plata cada an que valen en 157560 [?]

1673 8 de junio
mas doce reposteros de salamanca con las
armas de su excl. de a tres baras de largo y
seis de caída muy gastados, tasados a 10 [?]
ducados se dieron en——7200

en 28 del dicho se cobraron de D. Andres
Maldonado mil y ochenta reales de vellon
de seis reposteros de paño trepados y
bordados con las armas de la casa de S.
exa. A ciento y ochenta reales cada uno

1676 fecha de—
20 de noviembre se cobraron del dicho
Antonio de Escobar testamentario de
D. Jose Ponce de Leon seiscientos y cin-
cuenta y cinco doblones y medio de a dos
escudos de oro, que hazen once mil seis-
cientos y setenta y seis reales de plata que se debían por papel de D. Diego Ignacio de Cardona de la tapicería de los triunfos de la Iglesia que compró dicho D. Jose Ponce de Leon de cuya cantidad otorgaron carta de pago mi hera la marquesa de los Velez y D. Pedro Miñano como testamento del Cardenal mi señor en dos destemeres ante Isidro Martínez escribano de provineia con que se abaco de cobrar esta partida

1681 en noviembre en 25 de noviembre de 1681 se cobraron de D. Juan de Gabaldón siete mil seiscientos y cincuenta y seis reales de plata que dio por los doce reposteros hechos en Bruselas con las armas del cardenal mi señor de seis anas de cayda que en todas son 348 anas tasadas cada una a sesenta reales de plata y se remataron a 22 porque no hubo quien diese mas

en dicho día se cobraron de D. Juan de Gabaldón mil setecientos y treinta y ocho reales de plata que dio por un dosel fino de la misma estofa hecho en Bruselas que tiene setenta y nueve anas taxado a los mismos sesenta reales de plata y se remato a los mismos 22 por la misma razón dicha en la partida antecedente

1681—en 6 de diciembre en dicho día 6 de diz. de 1681 se cobraron de D. Diego de Porras nueve mil ochocientos y ochenta y cinco reales de plata que dio por una tapicería de Alamedas de Amberes de diez paños de cinco anas de cada cuarto sobreventanas dos sobrepuertas que tiene 329 anas a treinta reales de plata cada una que es su tasa que hazen la dicha cantidad—allí

1683—21 de enero en 21 de enero se cobraron de D. Juan de Gabaldón diez y siete mil doscientos y un reales de plata en que se le vendió una tapicería de la fabula de Aquiles y Hector de ocho paños que tiene trescientas y siete anas y—a cincuenta y siete reales de plata cada una hazen diez y siete mil doscientos y un reales y medio

15. December 19, 1699, AGR, Notariat général du Brabant, 1646/1. Order for 12 cartoons of the History of the House of Monaca from Lambert de Hondt; Albert Auwercx is mentioned as weaver:

Comparut pardevant moy Jacques Laurent Janssens notaire et tabellion admis par le souverain conseil de sa majesté ordonné en Brabant résidant à Bruxelles et les testemoings ci après a denommer le Sr Jean baptiste Ysendor d’premier secrétaire ordinaire de sa Majesté audit souverain Conseil de Brabant, lequel En vertu des lettres luy escrites par Son Excellence le Seigneur Ducq de Montalto dates de Cartagena Respectivement du 15 de juin et 7 de octobre de la Presente année 1699 par lesquelles il requiert le Sr comparant de vouloir faire travailler par Les plus experts maistres de cette ville tant en Peintures qu’en tapisseries douze pieces de Tapiserrie représentants l’histoire de la Tres illustre et tres ancienne descendance de la Maison de sa dicte excellence selon les models peints en Douze lames de cuivre, à quelle fin est icy Pareillement comparu Sr Lamberto De Hondt Maître peintre en cette ditte ville lequel est convenu Avecq le sr comparant et entrepris de peindre les Susdites douze pieces sur de la bonne toile a ses Fraix tous de la hauteur de six aunes mesure De cette meme ville, et en largeur repartir en La maniere suivante: scavoir la première piece quotee n° 1 au dos de la premiere lame de cinq aunes de largeur au tour, celle de n° 2 de huict aunes, celle de n° 3 de sept aunes, celle de n° 4 sept aunes, celle de n° 5 huict aunes, celle de n° 6 de douze aunes, celle de n° 7 de neuff aunes, celle de n° 8 de six aunes, celle de n° 9 de onze aunes, celle de n° 10 de dix aunes, celle de n° 11 de cinq aunes et celle de n° 12 de six aunes faisant de largeur en tout les douze pieces la quantité de nonante quatre aunes et la hauteur d’icelles pieces quatre cent septante aunes faisant la hauteur et largeur desdites douze pieces cinq cent et soixante quatre aunes, et comme le second comparant travaillant et peinturant les dites douze pieces selon et en conformez des dites douze lames il pourroit parfois arriver que pour former et tirer entierement le model et postures d’icelles pieces il aurroit besoin d’applicquer une demie aune ou un quart plus de largeur qui est dit et exprimé cy dessus, ou d’oter un quart de lun ou de lauteur d’icelles pieces qu’il devrat quant au préalablement et avant tout advertis et donner connoissance au Sr premier comparant, et desuite de son consentement largir ou amoindrir lesdites pieces, selon que pour lors sera trouvé convenir. Il est aussi conditionné que le second comparant sera obligé de donner aux figures dans [fol. 2] le premier fond la hauteur de six
pieds chaque pied à onze pouces qui est selon le nature que sadite excellence le marque et les figures dans le deuxiesme et troisieme fond, ou eloiogement a proportion moindre comme la prospective l'exigeras sans cependant [s'éloigner] trop du naturel et de suivre exactement et pertinemment les dessins desdites lames tant a l'egard des peintures et contenance de l'histoire que des bords de chacun selon leur dessein aecq les armories et inscriptions tant en haut que par embas sans la moindre exception telle qu'elle pourrait estre et la largeur [du] bord devrait estre de trois quart d'aunes tout en bonne et belle perfection en observant exactement les couleurs habillements et ornements ainsi que le tout se trouve sur lesdites lames pareillement sans exception. Estant convenue le second comparant aurait pour chaque aune des dites pieces la somme de huit florins argent de change estant de meme pourparler et conditionne que lors que les tapisseries seront achevees et qu'il y manquerait quelque chose auxdits patrons que le second comparant en ce cas seroit aussy oblige de raccomoder en toute perfection sans aucun manquement les joindre ensemble selon qu'eserat marque par le sr premier comparant auquel il les devrait deliver en estant requis pour en faire selon sa volonte comme il trouverat convenir.

Estant pareillement comparu sr Albert Auwerx maitre tapisser en cette meme ville et nicolas Auwerx son fils aussi maitre tapisser lesquels ont de meme declare estre convenu aecq le sr premier comparant en la forme et maniere suivante. Scavoit qu'ils entreprennoient de faire les dites douze pieces de tapisserie selon les desseins cy dessus projectez et conceus aecq le maitre peintre l'obligeants de faire le cail de la plus fine soye, et ou l'art des ombrages le requierat de la plus fine laine, parifelle-ment aux figures, habillements, architecture, mers et autrement pour lesquels ils appliqueront les plus fines soyes et laines, et pour le reste de sufivre ponctuellement et exactement les modelles habillements, bordes, armoiries, inscriptions lettres, autres ornements et embellissements. Estant aussy convenu que les dits comparants, auront pour chaque aune dudit ouv[age] De tapisserie la somme de dix huit florins et demy pareillement argent de change [fol. j] comme devant. Il est de meme pourparler et conditionne que tant le dit maitre peintre que lesdits maitres tapisseries s'obligeant de parachever et livrer les susdites douze pieces de tapisserie es mains du sr premier comparant au commencement du mois de juin de l'annee dix sept cent et un supposant qu'on auroit receu la resolution finale de sadite excellence au commencement de ce present mois de decembre de cette presente annee 1699 s'obligeant en outre lesd maitre peintre et tapisseries de redresser a leurs frais les fautes quon pourrait trouver tant au dessein des peintures que tapisseries moyennant que le sr premier comparant s'oblige au nom de sadite excellence de payer en trois termes l'import des dites peintures et tapisseries scavoit qu'au commencement il payerat le premier terme en argent de change comptant, le second terme quand louvaige de lan et de lart serat a la moitie, et le troisieme quant ils delivreront les peintures et tapisseries, obligeants les respectifs comparants d'accomplir et satisfaire tout en ce que dessus soubz obligation de leur personne et biens presents et futurs scavoit le premier comparant au nom de sa dite excellence et les seconds de leurs propres constituantst tout porteur de cette en particulier pour comparer devant tous juges et justices qu'il leur plaira pour en cas de quelque manquement faire et laiser passer en condamnation volontaire renoncants a tous privileges benefices et autres exceptions aucunement contraires comme en la plus ample et meilleur forme.

Ainsy fait et passee en ladite ville de Bruxelles le ixneuvieme de decembre seize cent nonante et neuf en presence du seigneur Philippe de Malines, grand forestier de sa majeste en son duché de Brabant et du seigneur don francisco felix cajetano Ysendonc conseiller et commis des domaines et finances du Roy comme esmoings cy requis et appellez Ysendonc lambert de hondt Albertus auwerxc Nicolaes auwerxc Ph. De Malines, don Franco de Ysendonc Jansens notarius

16. 1713, ADMS, doc. 108. Tapestries listed in the posthumous inventory of Fernando de Aragón:

Bienes que quedaron del Duque de Montalto, D. Fernando de Aragón Tapisces
1. Una tapicería de la Historia de Animábal tejida de oro y seda que se compone de siete paños, que todos tienen 21 años y ma. De corrida y de caida que hace en cuadro 249 annas, q. a 88 reales cada una importan 210912 reales.

2. Otra tapicería de la historia de Alexandre Magno estofa de Bruselas que se compone de doce paños y 8 sobre-puertas y todos tienen 264 annas en cuadro que a 80 reales cada una importa 350120.

3. Otra tapicería estofa de Bruselas de escudos de Armas que se compone de doce paños q. cada uno tiene seis annas de caida y cuatro y tres cuartas de corrida y todos tienen 392 annas a 33 reales cada una monta 25650 reales.

4. Un dosel compañero de la tapicería antecedente con la fama y en la Rodela un escudo de las mismas armas que se compone de caida cielo y dos cenefas y tiene [?] annas en cuadro a [?] Reales cada una monta 50[?]200 reales.

5. es de la dote de la sra. Marquesa—Otro dosel estofa de flandes con la fama a cavallo y en la Rodela un escudo de armas de los Velez y se compone de caida cielo y seis cenefas que todo tiene 66 annas y ma. en cuadro q. a razón de [?] Reales cada una monta 20[?]655 reales.

17. December 3, 1718, AGB, Notariat général du Brabant (the document will be reprinted in its entirety in a forthcoming publication by Koenradi Brosens). The heirs of Albert Auwerx (d. August 1709) declare that on May 9, 1714, they agreed on a division of their parents’ goods. They jointly owned 6 panels of the History of the House of Moncada, which they sold to Catalina, daughter of the duque de Moncada and wife of the marqués de Villafranca, for 3,127 florins.

Op heden den derden december seienthien hondert achthien syn voor my ondergeschreven als openbaer notaris gedemiteer by syn eyserlycke ende koninklycke maesteyts souverynen raede geordenneert in Brabant, tot Bressel residerende, ende in de presente van de getuygen naegenomen gecompacteert in myn personen seigneur Nicolaus, Philipus, Joannes, Daniel Heer Carolus franciscus Prister etc., Guilelmus, Jaspur, joutffen: Magdalena, ende Maria Auwerx alle kinderen van wylen seigneur Albertus franciscus Auwerx, ende van jouffe: Clara van den Bossche, de welcke hebben verclaert, soo ende gelyck sy verclaren by desen over de goederen, penningen, ende effecten op hun verstorven, ende gesuccedeert uyt den hoofde van hunne voorcheid anderen met elkander onder hun respective signaturen gemaect te hebben eene partagie, scheydinge, ende deylingen op den negensten daghe der maent van may duysent sevenhundert vierteen in de manieren als volghe. . . .

Ten vieren om redenen alle de onder- schrevene moverende soo houden sy indi- vies de naevolgende effecten raekende den voors: vaders winckel van tapijerse, Inden eersten houden sy individus een somme van dry duysent een hondert en sevenentwintigh guldens wisselgeldt eens, welcke somme sy noch goetvinden op sese stucken tapty opgewerckt ten behoeve van den heere Duc de Montalto representeringe de Genealogie van den selven Duc, synde sese ellen hooghe ende metende in toor vierenvijftig ellen en vyff achtste van een elle, welcke sese stucken syn berustende ten huyse van de vyff eerste voorgenoeende. . . .

aldu ondertoeckent in Brussel op den negensten daghe der maent van may seven- thien hondert en viertien, ende waren ondertoe: kent Nicolaas Auwerx, Magdalena Auwerx, Maria Auwerx, Philip Auwerx, Jan Auwerx, Daniel Auwerx, Carolus Fran: Ciscus Auwerx, Guillum Auwerx, Jaspar Auwerx. Om welcke voors: partagie, scheydinge, ende deylinge des te stercker ende onverbreke- lycker te maecken, de voors: comparanten alnou hebben verclaert, de selve, in alle haere pointen te vernieuwen, aggreeren, ende approberen, ende elkander ander- mael aen te schryven, ende in eygandom toe te voegen de goederen, penningen, ende effecten, soo ende gelyck de selve daer inne syn aengeschreven ende toegevoeght met alle lasten, conditien, ende restrictien daer inne geinsereert, vertheyndende ende renuntierende desen volgens een elk anders partie ende gedeelten met gelofte van daer tegen nimmermeer te sullen come ofte opponen op wat pretexten het soude mogen wesen.

Ende alsoo nu alle de bovenstaende effecten gebleven indivies, t’sedert de voors: parta- gie syn verkocht met gemeyn consent te weten. . . .

Item datter ontfangen syn dry duysent een hondert en sevenentwintigh guldens
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wisselgeldt eens in voldoeninge van die sese stucken tapijt opgewerckt ten behoeve van den heere Duc de Montalto, welcke sese stucken geleverd syn aen sr: Gielis du Puis door ordre van de huysvrouwe van den heer markies du Villafranca als erfgenaem van den heer duc de Montalto haeren vader . . .

aldus gedaen ende gepaseeert binnen Brus-

312

Sele ten daege, maende ende jaere voors: ter presentie van sr: Philips Geeraerts ende sr:

Hieronimus de Rede ingestetene borgers
deser stadt als getuygen hier toe specialyck
geroepen ende geboden

Nicolaus Auwerccx
Magdalena Auwerccx
Maria Auwerccx
Philip Auwerccx
Jan Auwerccx
Daniel Auwerccx
Carolus Francisccus Auwerccx
Guillam Auwerccx
Jaspar Auwerccx
P. Geeraerts

 Dit is het merck van Hieronimus de Rede verclaerende niet te connen schryven
Et me presente notario quod attestor
[signature missing]

18. 1726, ADMS, doc. 158. A new series of 6 scenes of the History of the House of Moncada were ordered from Philippe de Hondt for the cartoons and Philippe Auwerccx for the weaving, but this commission was never carried out:


19. January 1727, ADMS, doc. 416. Extract from the will of Catalina de Moncada:

Capitulos—Mando se paguen todas las deudas que contare deber debiendo legítimamente al tiempo de mi fallecimiento, así por mi como por el exmo. Señor marques de Villafranca, mi marido y mi primo, vendiéndose para este efecto todos mis bienes libres hasta en la cantidad que necesite para la satisfaccion de todos los acreedores exceptuando como desde luego excepto y reservo las dos tapicerias que tengo con las armas de Montalto, las laminas de ellas y todos los retratos de los señores de esta Casa, pues desde luego quiero y mando se vinculen todas las referidas alhajas, agregandolas como las agrego al dicho mayorazgo de Montalto y solo en el caso de no alcanzar mis bienes a los acreedores es cuando quiero que sea nula esta clausula, pues pudiendo ser satisfechos en otra cualquier forma, quiero y es mi voluntad se cumplan inviolablemente la agregación de todas las referidas alhajas al dicho Mayorazgo de Montalto . . .

20. 1754, ADMS, doc. 416: Año de 1754. Mention of the 6 tapestries of the History of the House of Moncada in the entailed estate of Fadrique Vicente Alvarez de Toledo (1753), 9th marqués de Villafranca, grandson of Fernando de Aragón:

Tapices del Mayorazgo a la muerte de Fadrique Vicente Alvarez de Toledo (año 1754) 

Catorce laminas de la Historia de dicha exma. Casa de Moncada, que son dibujos de la subsiguiente tapiceria, dela fabrica fina de Bruselas, que contiene la historia dela Casa de los exmos. señores Duques de Montalto, que contiene 6 paños de seis anas de cayda cada uno, y cincuenta y dos anas de corrida, que hacen en cuadro trescientas y doce anas.

Otra tapiceria que se contiene de doce reposteros con el dibujo en medio de cada uno de las Armas de dicha exma. Casa de Moncada, de la fabrica fina de Bruselas, que tienen de cayda 6 anas y cincuenta y cinco de corrida, que hacen en cuadro trescientas y treinta anas. Un dosel de dicha fabrica fina de Bruselas, un paño de Cavecera, tiene por dibujo la fama, con las Armas de la Casa de seis anas y cayda y cinco de corrida y el techo del citado dosel tiene cinco anas de largo y cuatro y media de ancho, y las dos cenefas, del mismo dosel, tienen de corrida veinte y ocho anas y tres cuartas de cayda, que hacen en cuadro hecho todo un cuerpo ochenta anas
Inventario de Cuadros y láminas del Mayorazgo en la casa del exmo. Señor Marqués de Villafranca Montalto y Velez mi señor [Antonio Alvarez de Toledo, X marqués de Villafranca], hecho en 1754

Item veinte y seis láminas pintura en cobre que contienen la Historia de la Casa de Moncada, con sus marcos de madera tallada y dorada con sus cristales, tienen tres cuartas de alto y cerca de una vara de ancho

Yt. Cincuenta y dos láminas de pintura en cobre que contienen los retratos de todos los sres. de la Casa de Moncada, todos con sus medias cañas doradas y sus cristales delante de dicha pintura, tienen media vara de alto y mas de una tercia de ancho, todos iguales, y uno de ellos con las armas de la Casa

Sobrepuestas de lienzos pintados

Primero 15 sobre puertas de lienzos pintados en bastidores de madera que imitan a los reposteros de Flandes que por ser del Mayorazgo no entran en este inventario, tiene cada una 3 varas de largo y 5 cuartas de ancho

Yt otras 15 sobre puertas de lienzos pintados puestos en bastidores que imitan a la tapicería del vino, tiene cada una 3 varas de largo y 5 cuartas de ancho

Yt 5 sobre puertas de lienzos pintados de diferentes flores pintura fina viejas y malfamadas, tienen 3 varas de larbgo y 5 de abcho cada una

Inventario de las tapicerías, dibujos de tapicería de pintura fina en lienzo, cuadros, lamínas y estatuas de bronce que son del Mayorazgo en Casa del exmo. Sor. Marques de Villafranca Montalto y Velez mi señor

Yt otra tapicería que contiene su dibujo la historia de la Casa de Moncada, fabrica muy fina de Bruselas que se compone de 6 paños, que tiene cada uno 6 anas de cayda, y todos 52 anas de corrida, que hacen 312 anas en cuadro . . .

Yt. Otros 6 paños de lienzo pintado del mismo tamaño que los antecedentes que sirvieron de dibujos para hacer los sobredichos 6 tapices, por lo que contiene su pintura al olio, la misma Historia de la Casa de Moncada . . .

Primero una tapicería que contiene su dibujo la menor edad de Alejandro, que se compone de 9 tapices muy malfamados y dos sobrepuestas inservibles, tienen 39 anas de corrida y 6 de cayda que hacen 344 en cuadro

21. August 4, 1754–December 9, 1755, ADMS, doc. 416. Appraisal of the tapestries in the estate of Don Fadrique Vicente Alvarez de Toledo, 9th marquis of Villafranca:

una tapicería de doce paños, y ocho sobre-puertas, todos hermanos maltratados, y algunos de ellos podridos; Historia de Alejandro, fabrica de Bruselas, fina, tienen de corrida los doce paños sesenta y seis annas y media, y seis de cayda, y las ocho sobre-puertas tienen, en cinquenta annas y media. Juntamente un dosel de dicha fabrica que se compone de cielo cabecera y siete cenefas, tiene en quadro sesenta y cinco anas, que juntas con las de la tapicería y sobre-puertas, hacen en quadro quinientos catorce annas y tres quartas; vale cada anna según su trato a quarenta reales de vellon. Importan veinte mil quinientos noventa reales de vellon

La tasa la firma Antonio Morodo en Madrid a quatro dias de el mes de agosto de mil setecientos cinquenta y cuatro.

una tapicería de cinco paños bien tratados fabrica fina de Ambereses, en las cenefas delas corridas lazos con diferentes flores, y obalos en medio de ellas; y en las caídas, una estatuia imitada a prieda; Historia de el Rey Ciro, tiene de corrida veinte y siete annas y media, y seis menos misma de caída; que hacen en quadro ciento sesenta y dos annas y media, vale cada anna según su trato a quarenta y cinco reales de vellon que importan siete mil trescientos doce reales de vellon

La tasa la firma en Madrid a veinte días del mes de septiembre de mil setecientos cinquenta y cuatro Antonio Morodo.

diez reposteros de plata y oro, finos de Bruselas, con escudos de Armas, en medio, guarnecidos con culebras y obalos en las cenefas, y figuras en ellos, tienen de corrida treinta y ochenta anas, y quatro de cayda, que hacen en quadro ciento cinquenta y dos, vale cada anna según su trato, a quarenta reales de vellon y importan seis mil ochenta

La tasa la firma en Madrid a nueve de diciembre de mil setecientos cinquenta y cinco Antonio Morodo.

mas una tapicería de merina bien tratada, de seis paños forrados con seis sacramentos, repartidos en diez y seis piezas, tienen de corrida quarenta y dos varas y cinco de cayda, que hacen en quadro doscientas diez,
22. 1796, ADMS, doc. 4998. At his death, José Álvarez de Toledo, duque de Alba, marqués de Villafranca, owned a set of the *Triumph of the Eucharist*:

Inventario y relacion circunstanciada de los tapices y reposteros que existían el día 9 de junio del año de 1796, en que falleció el excmo. Señor D. Jose Alvarez de Toledo, Duque de Alba, Marqués de Villafranca, de los que se inventariarón y tasarón en el 1784 por muerte de la excm. Señora D. Maria Ana de Silva, Duquesa de Arcos viuda, con expresión del valor que se dio en esta ultima época: . . .

Otra tapicería fina de Bruselas que representa el *Triunfo de la Iglesia* con otras alegorías, según los dibujos de Rubens, y se compone de diez y siete paños hermanos y una columna que tienen ciento catorce anchas y tres cuartas de corredor por seis de caída, que con noventa y cuatro anchas y siete octavos mas que tienen en quadro diez sobrequedas compañeras de diferentes medidas, compone toda la tapicería setecientos ochenta y tres anchas y tres octavos, y no las seiscientas y setenta y dos anchas que expresa el inventario del año de 1784: pero se sacan los veinte y dos mil ciento setenta y seis reales en que se taso entonces .......... 24.720

23. 1821, ADMS doc. 5396. Inventory of the tapestries of Francisco Álvarez de Toledo, 12th marqués of Villafranca:

seis tapices fábrica fina de Bruselas tejidos de estambre y seda, representan los ecos historicos de la Casa de Moncada, miden—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tapices</th>
<th>Tapicería de Moncada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 de largo 6 de alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. April 21, 1870, ADMS, doc. 4806. Notes of the Drouot sale by a member of the Medina Sidonia family:

Venta de cuadros y objetos de arte del duque de Medina Sidonia, marqués de Villafranca y de los Vélez, Jose Álvarez de Toledo, en Drouot

6.1. Un tableau par David Teniers et Van Kessel, adjugé quatorze mille cinq cents francs à Monseigneur le Duc de Medina Sidonia.

7.2. Un tableau par David Teniers et Van Kessel, adjugé neuf mille cinq cents francs à M. le duc de Medina Sidonia.

8.3. Un tableau par David Teniers et Van Kessel adjugé neuf mille six cents francs à M. le duc de Medina Sidonia.

9.4. Un tableau par David Teniers et Van Kessel, aneuf mille francs à m. le duc de Medina.

10.5. Un tableau par David Teniers et Van Kessel, adjugé neuf mille trois cent cinquante francs à M. le duc de Fernan Núñez.

11.6. Un tableau par David Teniers et Van Kessel, adjugé neuf mille quatre cents francs à M. le duc de Medina.

12.7. Un tableau par David Teniers et Van Kessel, adjugé neuf mille francs à M. le duc de Medina.


15.10. Un tableau par Van Herp et Van Kessel, adjugé deux mille huit cents francs à M. le duc de Medina.


17.12. Un tableau par Primo dit Gentil et Van Kessel, adjugé deux mille trois cents francs à M. Delacour [?].

18.13. Un tableau par Primo dit Gentil et Van Kessel, adjugé deux mille francs à M. Delacour [?].


20.15. Un tableau par Van Herp et Van Kessel, adjugé deux mille deux cent cinquante francs à M. le duc de Medina.


22.17. Un tableau par Van Herp et Van Kessel, adjugé deux mille deux cent cinquante francs à M. de Saint Albin.

23.18. Un tableau par Van Herp et Van
Kessel, adjugé deux mille cent cinquante francs à M. le duc de Medina.
25.20. Un tableau par Gentil et Van Kessel adjugé quinze cent cinquante francs à M. le duc de Medina.
28.28. Une tapisserie de Flandre adjugé trois mille quatre cent dix francs à M. Vail [?].
29.29. Une tapisserie de Flandre adjugé trois mille neuf cent cinquante francs à M. Vail [?].
30.30. Une tapisserie de Flandre adjugé trois mille quatre cent francs à M. Flevre.
31.31. Une tapisserie de Flandre adjugé trois mille quatre cents francs à M. Heury.
32.32. Une tapisserie de Flandre adjugé mille cinq [?] cent francs à M. Bellenot.
33.33. Une tapisserie de Flandre adjugé trois mille sept [?] francs à M. Bellenot.
The Tapestry Patronage of Madame de Montespan and Her Family

Philippe Behagle was for some years at the head of a tapestry manufactory established in Tournai with the title Royal Manufactory, until he was summoned to take over the one at Beauvais. Previously he had held a similar post, also in the name of the king, at Oudenaarde; but he left this establishment when the town came under Spanish dominion. During the time he worked in Oudenaarde, he had an associate named Barthe [Jean Baërt], who was considered very skillful. The works that left their hands were esteemed by connoisseurs. Some tapestry sets that he made for Madame de La Valière [sic], then for Madame de Montespan brought him renown at court. That benefited him, and it is what determined his appointment for Beauvais.

—“Historical Details Concerning the Beauvais Tapestry Manufacture,” 1751

Madame la marquise de Montespan (1640–1707; fig. 1) was for six years the maîtresse déclarée of Louis XIV (r. 1643–1715), mother of four surviving legitimized royal children, and the epicenter of feminine fashion at the French court during the 1670s, but for historians her life was subsequently overshadowed by her alleged acquaintance with, at best, a circle of charlatan fortune-tellers or, at worst, professional poisoners, which by implication threatened the king. Her obituary in the Mercure galant described her as a lover and supporter of the arts without going into further detail, while biographers generally dedicate chapters to the so-called Affair of the Poisons but give disproportionately little discussion to her active interest in gardens and the performing arts, especially theater, opera, and ballet. She delighted in the flower gardens created by the landscape architect Le Nôtre at the Trianon de Porcelaine and at the Château de Clagny, as well as the cascade he designed in 1696 for her Château de Petit-Bour. Further, she performed in works by a litany of the period’s greatest talent including the dramatist Racine, the playwright Molière, the poet Boileau, the fabulist La Fontaine, the librettist Quinault, the composer Lully, and the singer and musician Lambert. But few specialists have investigated the significance of her artistic taste, patronage, and influence. The legacy of Madame de Montespan and her children as patrons and collectors deserves further study, since the family members, as independent consumers and arbiters of taste, were a dynamic force—beyond that of the king and crown—in the creation and dissemination of style in late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century France. This paper focuses particularly on their penchant for tapestry. As the account quoted above indicates, not only did the tapestry acquisitions of Madame de Montespan introduce new products, but they also played a role in determining a state appointment. Such insights expand our knowledge about who actually promoted the retail products of the fledgling textile enterprises established under Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619–1683), making them fashionable and desirable among the prosperous ranks of nobility, government ministers, and financiers—in
Fig. 1. Henri Gascard, Françoise de Rochechouart-Mortemart, Madame de Montespan, Reclining in Front of the Gallery at the Château de Clagny, ca. 1676. Oil on canvas, 318 × 222 cm. Private collection. Photograph: Giraudon/The Bridgeman Art Library

short, among those whose purchases would secure the economic success of such endeavors. Furthermore, by making a case study of Madame de Montespan and her family, we will see that their interpersonal relationships with Colbert and the tapestry entrepreneur Philippe Behagle (1641–1705) combined to exert a subtle but powerful and enduring influence that benefited the Beauvais tapestry manufactory.

This paper will first briefly describe the intermediary role Colbert served between the king and his mistresses, particularly Madame de Montespan, and how his actions in this capacity brought him into contact with the foremost female arbiter of taste at the French court during the period from the late 1660s until his death in 1683. It will then survey the textile and tapestry commissions of this trendsetting patroness before evaluating her considerable influence upon her sons the legitimized princes and their circle. Like concentric ripples in a pool of water, the patronage of the stylish Madame de Montespan and her children for Beauvais tapestries expanded their
popularity amid the highest levels of the nobility at court outward to the wealthy ministerial and financial ranks of Parisian society.

Surveys of French tapestry history typically begin a summary of the Beauvais manufactory with a reiteration of the economic incentives that prompted its establishment in 1664, during the reign of Louis XIV. After all, its mercantile origins were explicitly proclaimed in the first paragraph of the royal edict that founded the enterprise. French consumers of tapestries (a commodity considered in the document as necessary to physical comfort) would be weaned from their dependence on foreign suppliers with, instead, the products of locally established workshops. The same document named Colbert, that "dear and excellent soul, adviser [to the king] in all things, superintendent and general organizer of the [king's] buildings, arts, and manufactories of France," as the person most capable of identifying a competent director to ensure the new manufactory’s success. The king’s faith in Colbert’s plan and supervision was rewarded by the recognition and credit awarded him nearly ninety years later when, with the vantage of hindsight, the anonymous historian of the Beauvais manufactory wrote in 1751, “Monsieur Colbert formed this establishment on a plan conceived with much sagacity.”

Following the death of Louis’s long-serving first minister, Cardinal Mazarin (1602–1661), his successor, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, became the principal royal counselor. Colbert is generally acknowledged as the mastermind behind the protectionist mercantile policies of the 1660s that reorganized existing French luxury textile enterprises for silk, lace, tapestry, and carpet production or launched new ones. His unflinching diligence in support of these industries has been widely recognized. But what has been overlooked are those personal connections in his life that affected more than just his private affairs and that came to influence and to direct tapestry patronage among a wider circle of prosperous, fashionable society.

A loyal, close, and trusted confidant of Louis XIV, Colbert repeatedly attended to the most sensitive details arising from the royal relationships with mistresses from the 1660s to the early 1680s. Both Colbert and his wife became intimate with the first officially acknowledged maîtresse en titre, Madame de La Vallière (1644–1710), and they were even closer with her fashion-conscious and style-setting successor, Madame la marquise de Montespan. As the king’s intermediary, Colbert interacted with these two mistresses on a most personal level. Servants of Colbert, for instance, took responsibility for Madame de La Vallière’s first royal child, born in secrecy in 1663; Madame Colbert then undertook the education of Madame de La Vallière’s two subsequent children who survived infancy; later, in 1671, the king delegated Colbert to retrieve Madame de La Vallière from her self-imposed exile in a convent when she repented her conduct in the adulterous relationship. Subsequently, the king sent Colbert to clandestinely advise the Parlement of Paris on the legal separation of his next mistress, Madame de Montespan, from her husband (granted in July 1674). The monarch, writing from the campaign front that same year, then deputized Colbert, who had remained at court, to arrange for Madame de Montespan’s every comfort including the construction of a country retreat for her at Clagny. It was from Madame Colbert that Louis sought the recommendation of a worthy governess for his youngest children by Madame de Montespan. And when confronted by the chief of police with evidence against Madame de Montespan in the poisoning scandal, the king accepted Colbert’s advice to close the investigation and suppress the proceedings. The mutual trust developed between the Colberts and Madame de Montespan through the course of these events finally culminated in a marriage tie between the two families when in 1679 the Colbert’s third daughter, Marie-
Anne (1665–1750), wedded Madame de Montespan’s nephew Louis de Rochechouart (1663–1688), future third duc de Mortemart.

Given this context of familiarity, it is not surprising to learn that when Madame de La Vallière and Madame de Montespan took tapestries from two Oudenaarde native sons, Behagle and his “very skillful” associate Jean Baërt (alternatively Jan Baert, or Barhe), back to the French court in the 1670s, the hangings came to the notice of connoisseurs including, surely, the surintendant Colbert, who had the power to nominate directors to the royal workshops. It is possible that the royal administrator already knew Behagle from the weaver’s earlier years in Paris when he was employed at the Gobelins workshop during the period it was incorporated into the Manufacture Royale des Meubles de la Couronne. Behagle’s first chance for advancement coincided with Colbert’s scheme to reestablish tapestry-

Fig. 2. Louis XIV Departs for War from a set of the Glorification of Louis XIV. Tapestry design adapted from drawings attributed to Adam Frans van der Meulen, woven under the direction of Philippe Behagle, Tournai, ca. 1678–84. Wool, silk, and metal-wrapped thread, 462 × 288.3 cm. Speed Art Museum, Louisville, Gift of Susan Barr Satterwhite (1947.27)
weaving ateliers in the Flemish centers that had recently come under French control through the War of Devolution, 1667–68. Sent by the intendant Claudius Talon in 1672 back to his hometown of Oudenaarde (captured by the French on July 31, 1667, and officially under French rule since the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, signed on May 2, 1668), Behagle set up a business in partnership with Baërt.\(^\text{11}\) Regrettably, the types of tapestries produced in the Oudenaarde workshop under their joint directorship have yet to be identified. However, given the favorable appraisal of connoisseurs at the French court, it can be surmised that the weavings acquired by the royal mistresses were more extraordinary than the verdure landscapes already being exported from Oudenaarde to Paris through the network of tapestry merchants.\(^\text{12}\) Later, François Baërt, the father of Jean, was to claim their family’s products were of a higher quality than that of the city’s “communal” weavers.\(^\text{13}\) Although the mistresses’ tapestries have not been enumerated or described, we can gather that Colbert recognized in Behagle and Baërt the type of enterprising talent upon which the crown’s larger economic policies depended, for he recalled the pair (when Oudenaarde reverted to Spanish rule on September 17, 1678, under the Peace of Nijmegen) to a newly established workshop in Tournai and then, before his death, arranged for their transfer to Beauvais, when the manufactory there was facing financial insolvency in 1683.\(^\text{14}\) In Tournai (captured by the French on June 21, 1667, and, like Oudenaarde, officially under French rule since the Treaty of Aix-La-Chapelle), Behagle and Baërt operated a workshop with some fifty weavers, successfully producing grand allegorical, figured tapestries in wool, silk, and metal-wrapped thread, notably the series known as the Glorification of Louis XIV (fig. 2), after drawings attributed to the court artist Adam Frans van der Meulen (1632–1690).\(^\text{15}\) Colbert’s confidence in the two was not misplaced, for Behagle’s and his family’s long directorship at Beauvais, enduring through his widow’s and son’s tenure until 1711, coincided with the factory’s most inventive and successful period of its seventeenth-century history.

Who, then, was Madame de Montespan that she could exert so much influence in setting taste? Françoise de Rochechouart-Mortemart (who was known as Mademoiselle de Tonnay-Charante before adopting the name Athénaïs) arrived at the French court at the age of twenty in 1661 as fille d’honneur to Henrietta Anne of England (1644–1670; wedded Philippe I d’Orléans, 1661). A daughter of two ancient ennobled families, the Mortemarts and the Rochechouarts, the celebrated beauty married Louis Henri de Pardaillan de Gondrin, marquis de Montespan (1640–1701), in 1663.

![Fig. 3. Henri Bonnart, Louis-Antoine de Pardaillan de Gondrin, Marquis d’Antin, before 1701. Colored engraving and collage, 36.5 x 23.8 cm. Musée Carnavalet, Musée de la Ville de Paris. Photograph: Flammarion/The Bridgeman Art Library](image-url)
and bore him two children. The second child was a son, Louis-Antoine (1665–1736, future duc d’Antin; fig. 3), who would in 1708 become the director of the Bâtiments du Roi, heading an administration of nearly thirty years’ duration that oversaw the Gobelins workshops among other entities. In late 1664 or early 1665, Madame de Montespan was named one of the six dames d’honneur to the queen, Infanta Maria Theresa of Spain (1638–1683). Described by Louis de Rouvroy, duc de Saint-Simon (1675–1755), as “beautiful as the day until the last moment of her life,” Madame de Montespan came to the king’s notice about 1666. Her vivacious conversation, caustic wit, and notorious powers of mimicry initially intimidated but eventually won over Louis XIV. For about twelve years, from 1667 to 1679, she was the king’s mistress, although her official, public tenure in that position did not begin until the legal separation from her husband in 1674. Following the birth of her first royal child in 1669, she was honored with sumptuous accommodations at the pleasure pavilion of the Trianon de Porcelaine, the charming château at Clagny, and the palace at Versailles, where

Fig. 4. Polyphilus Assists at the Triumph of Bacchus from a set of the Story of Polyphilus. Tapestry design by Eustache Le Sueur, woven under the direction of Louis Hinart, Beauvais, ca. 1670. Wool and silk, 325 × 465 cm. Musée du Château-fort, Sedan (89.15.6). Photograph: Ville de Sedan, Jean-Marie Charlot
her suite of four or five rooms adjoined the king’s apartments. Louis indulged her with generous allowances for dresses and with loans of jewels. Indeed, her taste for gold cloth and jewelry reportedly knew no bounds, and she literally outshone the queen at state functions. Her prominence at court was such that in January 1671 ambassadors from an African kingdom in the region of Benin presented her, “the king’s second wife,” with pearls and sapphires. They, in turn, received a set of eight Beauvais tapestries representing the Story of Polyphilus (fig. 4) after cartoons by Eustache Le Sueur (1616–1655), and a Savonnerie carpet.” Though she enjoyed the luxuries of her court apartments, she did endure reduced quarters while accompanying the king on his military campaigns to the northeastern front, traveling in the entourage of the queen and her ladies. She was at Lille, Tournai, and Arras in 1667, again at Lille in 1670, at Tournai in 1673 (where she gave birth to a daughter), and at Cambrai, Lille, Tournai, and Oudenaarde in the spring of 1678 (prior to giving birth to a son in July).
It was probably during one of these tours that she encountered the tapestry entrepreneurs Behagle and Baërt.

She bore the king seven or possibly eight natural children, only four of whom survived to adulthood (fig. 5): two males, Louis-Auguste de Bourbon, duc de Maine (1670–1736), and his younger brother, Louis-Alexandre de Bourbon, comte de Toulouse (1678–1737); and two females, Louise-Françoise de Bourbon, Mademoiselle de Nantes (1673–1743), and Françoise-Marie de Bourbon, Mademoiselle de Blois (1677–1749). Beloved by their father, the elder ones were legitimized by the king in 1673 and the younger ones in 1681. Louis awarded titles, land grants, military ranks, and lucrative governorships to his sons early in life, and he married his daughters to their royal Bourbon cousins who were Princes of the Blood, the elder daughter in 1683 to Louis III, duc de Bourbon-Condé (1668–1710), and the younger in 1692 to Philippe II d’Orléans (1674–1723, duc de Chartes; future duc d’Orléans and regent of France). Also in 1692, the duc du Maine wedded into the Condé branch, taking Anne-Louise de Bourbon-Condé (1676–1753) as wife. These honors and alliances upset the traditional and closely guarded preeminence of rank and strict etiquette at court, creating potent and lasting jealousies. While official documents referred to these royal offspring as the legitimized princes and princesses, court chroniclers such as the duc de Saint-Simon invariably called them the bastards.18 Madame de Montespan, therefore, worked continually to assert and secure their place in the hierarchy. After her death in 1707, this issue grew more and more pronounced as the king aged and was predeceased in 1711 by his son and heir, in 1712 by his eldest grandson and eldest great-grandson, and in 1714 by his youngest grandson. Madame la marquise de Maintenon (1635–1719), former governess to Madame de Montespan’s elder royal children and morganatic wife of Louis XIV, promoted the duc du Maine over other contenders as governor to the surviving Dauphin (1710–1774; future Louis XV) during the regency or, if this young heir should die, as foremost in the line of succession.19 The struggle for control of the regency after the death of Louis XIV in 1715 ended the political—but not the social—aspirations of the legitimized cousins in favor of the duc d’Orléans.

Madame de Montespan’s role as maîtresse en titre ended in the spring of 1679, and in compensation for this loss in status, she was named surintendante of the queen’s household, the most powerful position a female courtier could achieve. She reportedly fulfilled the duties of the post, but the appointment was short-lived since the queen died in 1683. Madame de Montespan subsequently moved from her luxurious apartments to smaller quarters on the ground floor at Versailles in 1684/85, about the time the king secretly married Madame de Maintenon. Her lifestyle was similarly scaled back, although her allowance paradoxically increased and the annual sum granted separately for the care of her children jumped from 150,000 livres to 300,000 livres in 1685.20 From this time forth, she took up charitable causes and cultivated alliances that would advance her children. She was close to Louis’s son the Grand Dauphin (1661–1711), giving him in 1686 a set of furniture richly veneered with tortoiseshell, mounted with gilt bronze, and upholstered with velvet embroidered and trimmed with gilt-metal–wrapped thread, for his study at Versailles, as well as upholstery covers embroidered in blue and silver for his porcelain cabinet. According to the Inventaire général du Mobilier de la Couronne, the embroidery work for these gifts was executed in the Paris convent of the Filles de Saint-Joseph, a community that had benefited from Madame de Montespan’s generosity and patronage for some years.21 Described in a Paris guide book of 1723 as a house established in 1641 to take in young orphan girls, the sisters (also known as the Filles de Saint-Joseph de la Providence) taught their charges skills appropriate to
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their age and gender.22 Certainly the needle skills of the young ladies there did reach quite an accomplished level, and the facility served as a model for Madame de Maintenon when she set up the school at Saint-Cyr, but it is known that the Saint-Joseph atelier was supplemented by some eighteen to twenty male professional embroiderers and that the workshop delivered embroideries to the Garde-Meuble de la Couronne for Versailles.23 A set of seven surviving wall hangings exhibits the extraordinary quality achieved. This set was commissioned by Madame de Montespan for her personal use and accordingly followed an overtly propagandistic program that boldly celebrated the royal heritage of her children. The panels portray the king and their offspring as allegorical figures representing the Elements and Seasons, and they date to about 1685, when Mademoiselle de Nantes married the duc de Bourbon-Condé (fig. 6). They are worked in silk, wool, and metal-wrapped thread after designs once associated with the workshop of Charles Le Brun (1619–1690; premier peinture du roi, 1664) and more recently with François Bonnemer (1637–1689).24 At least four of the hangings were
transferred by 1718 to the country seat of Madame de Montespan’s younger son, the comte de Toulouse, at the Château de Rambouillet, located to the south of Versailles. In 1690, Madame de Montespan gave the Grand Dauphin another gift of upholstery covers, described as “embroidered paintings,” whose subjects were similar to her own order, for they represented “the Elements, Seasons, and other subjects with figures and children within round and oval borders,” though the Inventaire général does not specify whether these were the product of the same workshop.²⁵

A major tapestry commission of Madame de Montespan dating about ten years later exemplifies the strength of her aspirations for her children as well as her enduring eminence, which could still command designs from artists in the crown’s employ even after her retirement from court in 1691. In 1696 or 1697, Jean Bérain I (1640–1711; dessinateur de la chambre et du cabinet du roi, 1674) conceived a set of four tapestry cartoons portraying marine scenes from classical mythology in honor of the comte de Toulouse, who had been made Grand Admiral of the Navy as a child in 1683.²⁶ Collectively the four hangings are now known as the Marine Triumphs, but the individual subjects refer explicitly to the triumph of Venus, goddess of love, and her

Fig. 7. Venus Bringing Arms to Aeneas from a set of the Marine Triumphs. Tapestry design by Jean Bérain I, cartoon painted by Guy-Louis Vernansal, woven under the direction of Philippe Behagle, Paris, ca. 1697–98. Wool, silk, and metal-wrapped thread, 425 × 330 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris (OA 8981), on loan to the Banque de France, Paris. Photograph: Réunion des Musées Nationaux/Art Resource, NY; Bulloz
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son Aeneas, the Trojan hero who survived a monstrous storm at sea in order to ultimately establish a lineage that gave birth to the Romans (fig. 7). The theme poignantly reveals the marquise’s dynastic hopes for her offspring as they married into the ranks of the Princes of the Blood. But it was a slightly earlier set of tapestry cartoons conceived for a noble of the robe that inspired the Marine Triumphs. Bérand’s design directly echoed his previous series of maritime hangings created for the Secretary of State for the Navy, the marquis de Seignelay (1651–1690), son of the Grand Colbert. Clearly the familial ties and common marine affiliations prompted Madame de Montespan to place her commission with the same artist and the same Paris weaving shop as the Seignelay order. But owing to a mysterious subterfuge, the marquise’s tapestry commission was transferred from the Paris atelier of Jean-Baptiste Hinant (b. 1640; son of the first director of the Beauvais tapestry manufactory) to that of his competitor Philippe Behagle. Where the tapestries were first displayed is not known, but by 1723 they hung in the large study of the Hôtel de Toulouse, a Paris town house that, according to contemporary Paris guidebooks, was open to visitors throughout the eighteenth century.

In 1700, Madame de Montespan purchased the Château d’Oiron, in her native Poitou, which she renovated as a residence for herself. She enlarged the house with a chamber for the king in expectation of a royal visit that never occurred. The room was luxuriously furnished with a bed (hung with embroidered curtains and surmounted by a canopy with a crown), needlework hangings with images of the twelve Sibyls, and a set of Beauvais tapestries of the Conquests of Louis XIV. According to an inventory taken after her death in 1707, individual subjects of the set included the Capture of Condé, Palermo, and the Battle of Cassel, titles not usually associated with the series. The last of these was not delivered until 1706, one year before her death. The Conquests of Louis XIV tapestry cycle is not yet fully understood because confusion surrounds the number of editions produced, the dates of their execution, and the component subjects, since their titles varied. A Beauvais manufactory document from 1710 records that five designs for the Conquests of Louis XIV series were in storage, valued at 250 livres, though surviving sets indicate that wider subjects were sometimes made as two narrower hangings. Thanks to the descriptive captions woven at the bottom of extant hangings, the five subjects are readily identified as the capture of Doesburg (1672), the capture of Besançon (1674), the surrender of the garrison at Dole (1674), Messina rescued by the duc de Vivonne (1675), and the surrender of the garrison at Ghent (1678). Roger-Armand Weigert attributed the cartoons to Jean-Baptiste Martin (1659–1735; called Martin des Batailles) after engravings executed by Sébastien Leclerc (1637–1714) and sketches by Adam Frans van der Meulen. The scenes represent French victories against the Dutch in the United Provinces and against the Spanish in Franche-Comté and in Sicily, battles and naval action that occurred during the so-called Dutch War of 1672–78 and the 1674–76 conquest of Franche-Comté, both concluded with the Treaty of Nijmegen in 1678. Two of the three titles named in the Oiron inventory could therefore be variant names for the siege of Besançon, principal city of Franche-Comté (if mistakenly transcribed as Condé), and the rescue of Messina rather than Palermo. But surviving Conquests tapestries have not been traced back to the commission of Madame de Montespan, so it is difficult to determine exactly which scenes constituted her complete set, since the inventory titles could also refer to the specific locations of other related victories, each of which would have been an acceptable substitution or new, additional subject appropriate to the theme of the tapestry series: the taking of Condé-sur-l’Escaut by Louis XIV in 1676, the decisive naval victory off Palermo in 1676, and the land victory over William III of
Orange (1650–1702) at Cassel in 1677. An example of the Battle of Cassel bearing the arms of the comte de Toulouse and the signature of Behagle is preserved in the Musée du Louvre (fig. 8).14

In any case, the series appealed to Madame de Montespan because the victories coincided with the height of her liaison with Louis XIV and because she had traveled to Flanders in the train of the king during at least two of the campaign seasons—1673 and 1678—and to Franche-Comté in 1674. The reason that the one naval scene, Messina Rescued by the Duc de Vivonne (fig. 9), was included in the series even though the subject was not directly a conquest by Louis XIV but rather an early success of his fledgling navy can undoubtedly be explained by the fact that it portrays a victory by her brother Louis-Victor de Mortemart, second duc de Vivonne (1636–1688; General of the Galleys, 1669). For this he was named Maréchal de France in 1675 and viceroy of Sicily in 1676, when, under his command, French warships attacked and partly destroyed the combined Dutch-Spanish fleet off Palermo. These tapestries show that Madame de Montespan commissioned new designs in order to proclaim the heritage of her royal children as well as Mortemart service to the monarchy, which included that of her brother and of herself as maîtresse déclarée.

Madame de Montespan also ordered weavings from popular cartoons such as two country scenes after David Teniers II (1610–1690) or his son David Teniers III (1638–1685) that were still on the Beauvais looms in 1706.15 The first Beauvais set of Teniers subjects to enter the royal collection arrived after April 1697 and was described as

---
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Fig. 9. *Messina Rescued by the Duc de Vivonne* from a set of the Conquests of Louis XIV. Tapestry design after Sébastien Leclerc, cartoon attributed to Jean-Baptiste Martin, woven under the direction of the Behagle family, Beauvais, by 1711. Wool and silk, 465 x 400 cm. Present location unknown. Photograph: after sale cat., Hôtel Drouot, Commissaire-Priseur Lair-Dubreuil, Paris, March 11-12, 1912, no. 212

"[a] tapestry set of verdures and landscapes with small figures, of low-warp, of wool and silk, made at the Beauvais manufactory of Behagle, representing different subjects in the manner of Tannières [sic] . . .," which may well have prompted her purchase.66 Though the *Inventaire général du Mobilier de la Couronne* does not list the number or the subjects of hangings in the set, the factory had cartoons for six pieces in 1710.67 It is uncertain whether Madame de Montespan's two were delivered by the time of her death in May 1707. She died intestate, and her only son born in wedlock, the future duc d'Antin, inherited the properties she had purchased, including the Château d'Oiron and the Château de Petit-Bourg, while the Château de Clagny, originally a gift from the king, went to their natural son the duc du Maine.68 Her textile and tapestry holdings surely contained more than is summarized here, and further research is needed in order to trace the collection in the inadequately described inventories of her children, though evidence shows that several pieces survived through the comte de Toulouse.69
Madame de Montespan instilled in her family a passion for the medium of tapestry, whether representing mythological stories, contemporary historical subjects, or popular country scenes. Her legitimized offspring, as children of the king, grew conditioned to an extremely elite lifestyle, on a par with the Grand Dauphin, their half-brother, and with the royal princes and dukes, their cousins and nephews. Her sons, in particular, decorated their domestic quarters with a rich profusion of tapestries, of French—especially Beauvais—but also of Flemish origin. Royal inventories, contemporary travel guides, after-death inventories, and factory memorandums combine to reveal the wealth and array of these holdings. First the elder legitimized son, the duc du Maine, and then the younger legitimized son, the comte de Toulouse, continued to patronize Behagle at Beauvais, and their selections from among existing cartoons promoted the factory by making its retail products fashionable with court society. Two Beauvais sets of suitably sylvan or country themes adorned the apartment of the duc and duchesse du Maine at the hunting château at Marly in June 1700: the mythological Metamorphoses of Ovid after the designs of Laurent de La Hyre (1606–1656), consisting of the Nine Muses and the Pierides Turned into Magpies, Cephalus and Procris, Hercules and Omphale, and the Education of Bacchus, and a set of diverse verdure subjects with small figures by an unnamed designer showing travelers, hunters, and villagers. The latter may have been inspired by Teniers II, as were the two surviving Beauvais tapestries woven with the arms of the comte de Toulouse and the signature of Behagle, the Villagers’ Banquet and the Villagers’ Dance (fig. 11). In February 1703, unpaid weavers confiscated Toulouse’s Villagers’ Dance and delayed its delivery. Furthermore,

Fig. 10. The Villagers’ Dance. Tapestry design in the manner of David Teniers II or David Teniers III, woven under the direction of Philippe Behagle, Beauvais, ca. 1703. Wool and silk, 330 x 435 cm. Mobilier National, Paris (GMTT 1123)
motivated by the arrival in June 1696 of a set of Beauvais golden-colored Grotesques after Jean-Baptiste Monnoyer (1636–1699) for the king’s use at Marly, the comte de Toulouse followed suit and purchased his own set of seven pieces for his Château de Rambouillet. Both the duc du Maine and the comte de Toulouse owned five-piece Beauvais sets of the monumental, large-figured Conquests of Louis XIV, which they prominently displayed in their Paris town houses: in the Hôtel du Maine on the rue de Bourbon and in the antechamber of the grand apartment in the Hôtel de Toulouse (now the headquarters of the Banque de France). The former, woven without metal-wrapped thread, was valued at 6,000 livres in 1736. The latter was woven in about 1703–6 with the Toulouse coat of arms in gilt-metal-wrapped thread (fig. 11); its version of the Surrender of the Garrison at Dole tactfully omitted the queen and her carriage from the scene. The subjects had even greater
meaning to the king’s sons than to their mother, for the military and naval actions showed the courage, prowess, and leadership of their father and their maternal uncle. These weavings, therefore, overtly proclaimed the sons as heirs to the bravery of their forebears.46 In 1702, Toulouse himself was in charge of the squadron that fought off Palermo and Messina in the War of the Spanish Succession. Behagle, too, basked in reflected glory, for the Beauvais manufactory rivaled the Gobelins in supplying the legitimised princes with tapestries of superlative quality and materials after grand designs created by artists in the employ of the crown.

Above and beyond these commissions that fell within traditional princely tastes, the sons launched an entirely new fashion for chinoiserie in tapestry. As an impressionable young teenager during the mid-1680s, the duc du Maine witnessed the cross-cultural exchanges between the court of Versailles and representatives of Siam and China with the arrival of envoys from Phra Narai, king of Siam (r. 1656–88), in early 1684; of Michael Alphonus Shen Fu-Tsung (1658–1691), a Chinese convert to Christianity traveling through Europe in the company of Père Philippe Couplet (1623–1693; a member of the Jesuit mission in China), in September 1684; and of the ambassadors from Siam in September 1686. These encounters broadened the intellectual and aesthetic horizons of the young duke and ignited his fascination for the Far East. Indeed, du Maine actively recommended sending a corresponding French mission to Siam and China, comprising the chevalier Alexandre de Chaumont (1640–1710; who coincidently served in the navy and participated in the action off Sicily with his uncle the duc de Vivonne in 1675), Père Joachim Bouvet (1656–1730), and five other French Jesuit mathematicians and scientists. According to Père Bouvet, du Maine, “. . . having learned from the discourses of Père Couplet that there were many rare and curious things in China, . . . did not stop saying that it was necessary to send French Jesuits there expressly to inform themselves. He spoke of this many times to the king, so that he really had a large part in the whole plan and the final resolution taken to send us could be considered his doing.” Du Maine was so engaged in the Jesuit-Qing mutual interest in astronomy and cartography that he presented the departing Bouvet with one of his own scientific instruments in 1685.47 He and his mother both appreciated the rich gifts of porcelain, lacquer, and silk distributed by the Siamese ambassadors, furthermore, and even had a ceiling at Clagny painted to record the event.48 Surely they were aware of the Siamese ambassadorial tour to the Beauvais manufactory in October 1686, a visit that may have played a part in stimulating the production of Behagle’s remarkable Story of the Emperor of China series. The duc du Maine’s purchase of the nine-piece editio princeps woven with gilt-metal-wrapped thread reputedly cost 20,000 livres.49 At the time of the duke’s death in 1736, the set was valued significantly less, at 8,100 livres, and was divided between the Hôtel du Maine and his country seat at the Château de Sceaux (a property he acquired in 1699 from the Colbert-Seignelay family).50 This set is not known to have survived, although the fourth edition does. It was executed for the comte de Toulouse about 1697–1705 at a cost of 10,565 livres and was displayed at his Château de Rambouillet (fig. 12).51 The series rapidly gained in popularity as the taste for chinoiserie expanded, and it is conservatively estimated, based on the number of surviving examples, that more than eighteen sets were woven by 1732, when the cartoons, considered “the manufactory’s most agreeable,” were worn beyond recognition—presumably from repeated use.52

In keeping with the display of tapestries, both old and new, encountered in the public rooms of the royal residences, both princes also purchased hangings from the Gobelins manufactory for their own use, ones that either duplicated famed earlier sets
in the crown’s collection or reproduced newer monumental sets that glorified their king and father, Louis XIV. The duc du Maine had five Gobelins pieces, woven with gilt-metal-wrapped thread, identified in his after-death inventory as the Conquests of King Louis XIV, that were undoubtedly from the series more commonly known as the History of the King. They were hung in his Paris town house and were valued at 5,400 livres in 1736.39 Surviving tapestries made for the comte de Toulouse are readily identifiable today by the presence of his coat of arms and/or his cipher, which appear repeatedly in their borders. His arms, for instance, adorn the borders of a reweaving made at the Gobelins of the renowned sixteenth-century tapestry cycle of the months of the year, the so-called Hunts of Maximilian, woven in Brussels after the designs of Bernaert van Orley (1488–1541).40 The prized set entered the French royal collection in 1665 and was displayed in the Grand Apartments at Versailles before 1678. Attesting to the esteem in which the tapestries were held is the fact that the Gobelins manufactory reproduced it in eight sets, the first one with gilt-metal-

Fig. 12. The Astronomers from a set of the Story of the Emperor of China. Tapestry designed by Guglielmo Vernansal, Jean-Baptiste Monnoyer, and Jean-Baptiste Belin de Fontenay, woven under the direction of Philippe Behagle, Beauvais, ca. 1697–1705. Wool and silk, 442 x 319 cm. The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles (83.DD.338)
wrapped thread for the Grand Colbert; another was woven about 1722 for the duc d’Antin. The date of Toulouse’s commission is not exactly determined, but as he purchased the post of Master of the King’s Hunt in 1714, he may well have found the series especially appropriate from that time forward. He hung his set at his hunting château at Rambouillet; the set is now divided between the Musée Condé, Château de Chantilly (hung in the gallery of stags; fig. 13), and the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Chartres. Toulouse also commissioned a reweaving from the Gobelins manufactory of another highly regarded Brussels sixteenth-century cycle of months of the year in the French royal collection, the so-called *Months of Lucas* (fig. 14). Like his mother, he had a passion for tapestries that lasted his entire life; his set of the *Months of Lucas* was ordered within five years of his death in 1737. It is now divided between The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and the Mobilier National, Paris.
In addition to French tapestries, the collection of the duc du Maine included many sets of Flemish origin. Of the five sets inventoried at the Château de Clagny after his death, four of them were expressly identified as such: a six-piece Flemish set of Hunts with small figures valued at 300 livres; a six-piece Brussels set of Sacrifices valued at 1,140 livres; an eight-piece Brussels set of Animal Hunts valued at 750 livres; and a six-piece set of Scenes from the Metamorphoses from Antwerp valued at 800 livres. Since he inherited Clagny upon his mother's death, some of these sets could have been acquired by Madame de Montespan and transferred with the contents of the property in 1707. Another Brussels set belonging to the duc du Maine was divided between his town house, the Hôtel du Maine, and his apartments in the Arsenal (where he lodged as Grand Master of the Artillery). The subject was the Fable of Phaeton in six pieces illustrating the Ovidian myth of the troubled offspring of Apollo who, having won recognition of his paternity, borrowed his father's chariot only to die in a spectacular fall from the stratosphere. It was a most curious theme for the natural son of the Sun King, and perhaps the duc du Maine displayed the set so prominently within his Paris residences as a cautionary reminder of his own precarious
 footing at court. The set could have been acquired originally years before by Madame de Montespan, about the time Jean-Baptiste Lully (1632–1687) and Philippe Quinault (1635–1688) composed an opera based on the story, with the addition of an elaborate marriage tie for Phaeton that required the approval of his mother’s royal husband, Meroeps, king of Egypt. After Louis XIV expressed his satisfaction when the opera was first performed at Versailles on January 6, 1683, the production moved to Paris, where it was received with acclaim.64 Considering the height of the set (3½ French aunes, according to the 1736 inventory, or approximately 415.8 cm) and tapestry production in Brussels about this time, it is conceivable that the tapestries in question were a reweaving by Jan Leyniers II (d. 1686) of a sixteenth-century series designed in the style of Pieter Coecke van Aelst (1502–1550) (fig. 15).65

The tapestry collections of the duc du Maine and the comte de Toulouse reflected their princely status. The brothers were raised at court and exposed daily to the woven

---

Fig. 15. The Fall of Phaeton from a set of the Fable of Phaeton. Tapestry after a design in the style of Pieter Coecke van Aelst, woven under the direction of Jan Leyniers II, Brussels, ca. 1650–75. Wool and silk, 408.9 x 513 cm. Formerly with French & Company, New York, 1932 (stock no. 17698); present location unknown. Photograph: Research Library, The Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles (97.P.7) © J. Paul Getty Trust
treasures of the crown, and their taste was deeply affected by their environment and then further developed by their mother, who taught them to set fashion in their own right by patronizing the young Beauvais manufactory, which, under Behagle's direction, was in pursuit of new design sources. The wealth and diversity of their tapestry holdings both proclaimed their rank and expressed their personal preferences. Their acquisitions spanned a wide range of subjects, from popular Teniers scenes and yellow-ground grotesques to grand contemporary history subjects, from copies of the most prized and revered but old sets to completely novel compositions. And, as peers, ministers, clergy, foreign dignitaries, and even tourists visited their residences, this broad selection of tapestries had an impact on a wider circle of consumers.

The legacy of Madame de Montespan and her children as patrons of tapestry deserves further study. Acting independently of the Garde-Meuble de la Couronne, the family's simultaneous roles as private consumers and arbiters of taste plot the creation and dissemination of style in late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century France. Additional work is needed in properly identifying the French and Flemish hangings in the family's inventories, including those of Madame de Montespan's legitimized daughters, the duchesse de Bourbon-Condé and the duchesse d'Orléans, as well as those of her first-born son, the duc d'Antin. Let us not forget the influence of d'Antin, under whose tenure at the Bâtiments du Roi the Gobelins manufactory launched its most successful series of the eighteenth century, the *Story of Don Quixote*, with narrative scenes after Charles-Antoine Coyel (1694–1752; *premier peinture du roi*, 1722). He personally commissioned the edition princeps. But that would be another story.

lorsqu’il fut appelé pour venir relever celle de Beauvais. Il en avait précédemment tenu une pareille, et aussi au nom du Roi à Oudenaarde; mais il avait quitté cet établissement Lorsque cette place passa sous La domination Espagnole. Du temps qu’il avait travaillé à Oudenaarde, il avait eu un Associé nommé Barthe qui passait pour être fort habile. Les Ouvrages qui sortirent de leurs mains étoient estimés des Connoisseurs. Quelques Tentures qu’il avait fait pour Madame de La Vallière ensuite pour Madame de Montespan L’avoient fait connaître à la Cour. Celle-ci lui vouloit du bien: et c’est elle qui détermina Le choix qu’on fit de lui pour Beauvais.” Archives Nationales, Paris, O° 858, “Details historiques sur la manufacture de tapisserie de Beauvais,” October 4, 1751, p. 9; unless otherwise specified, translations are by the present author.


seils, surintendant et ordonnateur general des nos bastimens, arts et manufactures de France”; as reprinted in Dubos, Notice historique sur la Manufacture Royale de Tapisseries de Beauvais (Beauvais: L’Imprimerie d’Ach. Desjardins, 1834), pp. 2–3.


7. Born Louise de La Beaume-le-Blanc, the future Madame de La Vallière, duchesse de Vaugouars, came to court in 1661 as fille d’honneur to Princess Henrietta Anne of England, the first wife of the king’s brother Philippe I, duc d’Orléans. She became mistress of Louis XIV about 1662, though she did not gain official recognition as maîtresse en titre until the death of the queen mother, Anne of Austria, in 1666. She bore the king four children, two of whom survived infancy: Marie-Anne de Bourbon, Mademoiselle de Blois (1666–1719; legitimized 1667; future wife of Louis-Armand, prince de Conti [1661–1685]), and Louis de Bourbon, comte de Vermandois (1667–1683; legitimized 1680). She retired from court permanently in April 1674, joining a Parisian convent of Carmelite nuns.

8. Expenditures from the Bâtiments du Roi for the improvement of the Château de Clagny and its garden brimming with orange trees amounted to 1,986,209 livres over the seven-year period 1674–80, as compared with 16,228,574 livres, the amount spent on the Château de Versailles during that same time. A letter of August 7, 1673, from Madame de Sévigné to Madame de Grignan describes the former’s visit to the grove of orange trees planted in tubs and to the flower beds in front of them. This garden, originally laid out by André Le Nôtre, survived into the nineteenth century, though the house, by Jules Hardouin-Mansart, became derelict and was demolished about 1767–69 by order of Louis XV. Jules Guiffrey, Comptes des Bâtiments du Roi sous le règne de Louis XIV, vol. 1, Colbert 1664–1680 (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881), pp. 1372–73, 1380–81; and Williams, Madame de Montespan, pp. 122–23.


12. Through trade connections with a third partner named Georges Blommaert, it is known that Behagel and Baërt also dealt in tapestries woven in Brussels. Information courtesy of Koenraad Bronsen; and see Bronsen, “Nouvelles données sur l’Histoire de Cépèdre de Poersson: Le réseau parent et la tapisserie bruxelloise à la française,” Revue belge d’archéologie et d’histoire de l’art 74 (2005), pp. 63–77. Even after Oudenaarde reverted to Spanish rule in 1678, the town’s tapestry merchants continued to export tapestries to France; twenty-two merchants shipped out more than three hundred weavings between 1679 and 1680 alone; Vanwelden, “Le XVIIe siècle ou un renouveau en mineur,” p. 84.


14. According to the 1731 “Details historiques sur la manufacture de tapisserie de Beauvais,” Colbert deliberately forced the early retirement of the Hinart family from Beauvais in favor of Behagel and Baërt. “Il y eut de si fortes dissensions de fonds, de matières et d’ouvragess fabricuqués, que c’est été fauit d’elle si Le ministre ne fut venu à son secours, et n’est retiré le Privilège de Hinards”, Archives Nationales, Paris, O, 858, p. 8. When the town of Oudenaarde refused to increase his allowance, Behagel left for Maintenon and Glatigny, where he spent fifteen months before moving to Tournai; Vanwelden, “Le XVIIe siècle ou un renouveau en mineur,” p. 79; and Jean Coural and Chantal Gastinel-Coural, Beauvais: Manufacture nationale de tapisserie (Paris: Centre National des Arts Plastiques, 1992), p. 17.

15. On Behagel in Tournai, see Elsa Vandermeersch-Lantmeeters, “Kunstenaarsfamilies van Oude-
naarde IV: De familie Behagle l," *Handelingen van de Geschied- en Oudheidkundige Kring van Oude-
of *Glorification of Louis XIV* tapestries, see Edith A. Stenden, "The Tapestry Weaver and the King: 
Zrebiec and Scott Erbes, *Conquest and Glory: 
Tapestries Devoted to Louis XIV in the Collection of the Speed Art Museum* (Louisville, Ky.: 
Speed Art Museum, 2000).

16. Saint-Simon arrived at court in 1694, when 
Madame de Montespan was fifty-three, so his 
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complets et authentiques du duc de Saint-Simon sur le 
siècle de Louis XIV et la Régence* (Paris: Hachette, 
1836-38), vol. 6, p. 44.

17. Mossiker, *The Affair of the Poisons*, p. 95; and Jean 
Vitte, "Les tapisseries de la Couronne à l’époque 
de Louis XIV: Du nouveau sur les achats effectués 

18. See, particularly, the duc de Saint-Simon’s 
*Mémoires*, vol. 1, chap. 10. "D’ou naît le rang 
intermédiaire des Bâtards," pp. 171-76. But 
according to Antoine Furetière, "The bastards of 
kings are princes: those of princes are gentle-
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*Furetière, Dictionnaire universel, contenant généralement 
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Princes of the Blood. The Parliament of Paris reg-
istered the edict the following month, but it was 
anulled in July 1717; Roland Mousnier, *The 
Institutions of France Under the Absolute Monarchy 
1588-1789*, vol. 2, *The Organs of State and Society* 
(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 
p. 92-100.


21. In 1691 Madame de Montespan retired from 
court and took up part-time residence in an 
apartment within the convent’s hôtel in the rue 
du Mobilier de la Couronne sous Louis XIV (1665-
1715)* (Paris: Imprimerie de l’Art, 1885-86), vol. 2, 
pp. 357 no. 1178, 360 no. 1182; Roger-Armand 
Weigert, "La retraite de madame de Montespan, 
la Communauté des Filles de Saint-Joseph dites 
de la Providence, à Paris (1641-1793)," *Bulletin de 
de la Société d’Étude de XVIIIe Siècle*, nos. 5-6 (1950), 
pp. 142-47; Véron-Denise and Vitte, "Versailles, 
les broderies de Saint-Joseph et Jean Lemoine 
le Lorrain."

Versailles, de Marly, de Vincennes, de S. Cloud, et des 
environ*, new ed. (Paris: Chez Saugrain l’ainé, 
1723), vol. 2, p. 482.

23. Weigert, "La retraite de madame de Montespan" 
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24. Four panels are in the Metropolitan Museum, acc. 
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Edith Appleton Stenden, *European Post-Medieval 
Tapestries and Related Hangings in The Metropolitan 
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relevé...", Guiffrey, *Inventaire général*, vol. 2, 
p. 399, no. 1441. The taste for rich embroideries 
passed to the children of Madame de Montespan. 
For instance, the comte de Toulouse owned a 
set of bed hangings described as paintings worked 
in embroidery with delicate figures. They were in 
his Paris town house, the Hôtel de Toulouse, in 
1723. See Le Rouge, *Les curiosités de Paris*, vol. 2, 
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Weigert, "La retraite de madame de Montespan, 
la Communauté des Filles de Saint-Joseph dites 
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26. Under Louis XIV, the Grand Admiral of France 
was one of the great officers of the crown, the 
naval equivalent of the Maréchal de France, but 
the admiralty shared power with two new cre-
ations, the General of the Galley and the Secre-
tary of State for the Navy. Louis XIV awarded 
the rank of Grand Admiral to his newly legitimiz-
ed son by Louise de La Vallière, the comte de Ver-
madois, in 1669. Upon the death of Vermadois in 
1683, the king transferred the position to the
comte de Toulouse. Similarly, the duc du Maine was named General of the Galleys in 1688, on the death of the incumbent, the duc de Vivonne, his maternal uncle.


36. “Verdures et paysages à petits personnages. Une tenture de tapisserie de verdure et paysages à petits personnages, de grosse lisse, de lame et soye, fabrique de Beauvais, manufacture de Behagle, représentant divers sujets, manière de Tan-nières . . .”; Guiffrey, *Inventaire général*, vol. 1, p. 361, no. 177, translated by the present author. Examples of Teniers tapestries bearing the woven signature of Behagle are known. See, for example, the *Game of Bowls*, sale cat., Christie’s, London, November 14, 2002, no. 195.


39. The inventory taken at the Château d’Oiron after the death of Madame de Montespan in 1707, for instance, listed six tapestries woven in the 1680s of the *Story of Psyche* (artist/weaver unspecified), but as the Gobelins, Beauvais, and Brussels workshops were all producing or had produced sets of this subject at the time, it is not possible to identify them; Clément, *Madame de Montespan et Louis XIV*, pp. 424–30. For tapestries and textiles that passed to her heir the comte de Toulouse, see the catalogue of the sale after the death of his
great-grandson Louis-Philippe, Maison d’Orléans: Catalogue des tapisseries anciennes... et tapis, Domaine de Monceaux, January 28, 1832.
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pp. 50–59.
62. Virginia Scott, “The Fall of Phaeton: The Son of
the Sun God in the Theatre of the Sun King,”
63. A Fall of Phaeton bearing the signature for Jan
Leyniers was acquired by the New York based
dealer French & Company from J. P. Morgan in
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The Duc d’Antin Don Quixote Tapestries, sale cat.,
Tapestry as a Medium of Propaganda at the Court of Louis XIV: Display and Audience

Textual and visual descriptions of displays of tapestries during the reign of Louis XIV permit us to study the changes over those years in the subjects selected and to evaluate the royal administration’s ambition to exploit religious and secular festivities to celebrate and glorify the king. An increasingly complex iconography in newly created tapestries, I will argue, complicated viewers’ understanding of them, particularly the ones with allegorical images, which needed written explanations to successfully reach a wider audience.

The coronation of Louis XIV (1638–1715), celebrated in the richly decorated Reims Cathedral on June 7, 1654, presents one well-documented royal ceremony famous for its sumptuous display of tapestries that took place early in the life of a king who would exploit this traditional medium for his political propaganda.1 An etching by Jean Le Pautre (1618–1682; fig. 1) of this important political event shows that the walls of the nave were hung with tapestries in two tiers, including, among other series, the Acts of the Apostles after Raphael and the Triumphs of Scipio after Giulio Romano, the two most valuable sets of sixteenth-century Flemish tapestries in the French royal collection.2

Views of this (fig. 2) and of later political events were themselves depicted in tapestry in the History of the King, a visual history of Louis XIV’s early years as a monarch that was woven at the Gobelins manufactory, first between 1665 and 1680.3 In the panel the Alliance with the Swiss, which depicts the signing of the peace treaty between Louis XIV and delegates of the Swiss cantons on November 18, 1663, in Notre-Dame in Paris, the cathedral was decorated as for a royal ceremony (fig. 3).4 The opulent decoration, as much as the inclusion of this event among the fourteen represented in the History of the King, testifies to the importance of

Fig. 1. The Coronation of Louis XIV at Reims, June 7, 1654, by Jean Le Pautre, 1655. Etching, 63.1 × 47.9 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1953 (53.600.67). Photograph: The Photograph Studio, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
this diplomatic affair and the treaty. The setting of its signing reminds us of the varied uses to which that important church was put. The choice of tapestries, the Acts of the Apostles, indicates the customary furnishing with precious textiles from the Garde-Meuble de la Couronne (royal wardrobe) but implies that the young Gobelins manufactory, founded in 1662, had not yet produced tapestries that expressed the intricate iconography of the royal imagery and propaganda for which the manufactory in the coming decades would become known. Also depicted as part of the History of the King was Louis XIV's meeting with Philip IV of Spain on June 7, 1660, to discuss Louis's marriage, two days later, to Philip's daughter Infanta Maria Theresa (fig. 4). In addition to the politically significant meeting it commemorates, the tapestry is particularly noteworthy for the textile decoration it depicts. As Daniel Meyer has pointed out, the French stood before and on a French tapestry and carpet, while behind and beneath the Spanish were a tapestry and a Persian carpet from the Spanish royal
collection, suggesting that their textile wealth supported the royal splendor of both parties. The initial scheme for the History of the King included, and indeed ended, with the War of Devolution, a military conflict between France and Habsburg Spain, fought in the Spanish Netherlands in 1667 and 1668. The first weaving of the History of the King was not yet complete when, in July 1677, individual pieces decorated courtyards and buildings at the Château de Versailles to celebrate the Dutch War with a large procession, so none of the War of Devolution campaigns were included in the display. The Mercure galant, a Parisian journal founded in 1672 for the purpose of entertaining the court and the literate Parisian bourgeoisie with reports of royal activities and of distributing royal propaganda, described a march through tapestry-hung streets. The article lists thirteen sets of tapestries, some of which were early productions from the Gobelins, including the History of the King and the Story of Alexander, which celebrate—one directly, the other by
metaphor—the civic, political, and military achievements of Louis XIV.

All the courtyards through which the procession passed were decorated with some of the most beautiful tapestries of the king. Mr. du Metz, superintendent of the royal wardrobe, ordered Mr. Coquino, keeper of the wardrobe, to transport them to Versailles. Here are those that were set out: the Acts of the Apostles by Raphael, Psyche by Raphael, the Grotesques by Raphael, the Triumphs of Scipio by Giulio Romano, the Fruits of War, which belong to the king of Spanish, the Story of Constantine by Rubens, & the Months of the Year that once belonged to Monsieur de Guise. All these sets are woven with gold. They are accompanied by the Hunt by Holbein, the famous German painter. The modern tapestries that were shown that same day & that were made after the designs by Mr. Le Brun & woven at the Gobelins, representing the entire ensemble of the History of the King, were: the Coronation of His Majesty; the Conference, or the Interview of the King with the King of Spain; the Marriage of the King; the Audience that His Majesty Gave at Fontainebleau to the

Cardinal Legate; the Alliance Made with the Swiss. All the Conquests of the King in different pieces, in which His Majesty is represented naturally, with all that is found in the ceremonies, sieges, and combats that one admires in these weavings. They are all woven with gold as nicely as the following: the Story of Alexander, the Royal Residences, the Muses, the Seasons, and the Five Senses. The last are still made after the designs by Mr. Le Brun, First Painter to the King, & they are worked with such art and delicacy that they are as lively as the painting.9

According to Jean-Marie Apostolidès, tapestries were perceived in the same way as stage sets, suggesting that the display of tapestries, like theatrical and operatic performances as well as public access to the Château de Versailles, aimed to address and influence interested members of courtly society.10 Just as in the ancient Roman theater, where trophies of war in the form of Greek sculptures were integrated into the stage settings, the display of domestically produced political imagery conveyed propaganda values, such as achievements in domestic politics and social matters (the Four Elements and the Four Seasons), victories in warfare and diplomacy (the History of the King), and the richness and splendor of the crown (the Royal Residences).11

A different kind of display of tapestries was documented in an etching by Sébastien Leclerc (1637–1714) that commemorated the official visit by the marquis Édouard Colbert de Villacerf to the Gobelins manufactory, where as superintendent and director of buildings (1691–99) and thus also of the royal manufactories, he was guided through the workshops and into the Galerie des Gobelins to be shown a set of Alexander tapestries (fig. 5).12 Whether a truthful representation or an idealized memorandum,
Leclerc’s etching, in showing the Story of Alexander in these surroundings, drew attention not only to the king’s noble qualities as a war hero and to the height of Gobelins production during the 1670s and 1680s, but also to the existence of a large showroom for tapestries. The image depicts a long gallery with an ornate ceiling and lifesize sculptures alternating with at least nine windows; on walls without windows, the five-piece weaving of the Story of Alexander was hung for the benefit of the recently appointed administrative head of the royal workshops. The etching testifies to the importance of displaying works of art and to the necessity of having a dedicated exhibition space. In addition, it is worth noting that, despite the existence of a gallery for larger official visits to the Gobelins, such as the king’s in 1665 and 1667 (fig. 6), the exterior courtyards in the Hôtel des Gobelins were used to extend the display space, as happened also at the Salons at the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture.

The idea to celebrate political and military events in this opulent style and, by
extension, this kind of artistic display originated in France with the Valois kings and the church. Louis XIV—Dieu-donné (God given)—developed these traditional methods of propaganda and employed them for his royal festivities. Under his rule, public and ecclesiastical spaces were adapted as venues for his entrées, military processions, and diplomatic visits, as well as regularly for religious festivals. While Louis XIV’s political events also made use of tapestries with religious content, the character of spiritual events became more secular because increasingly tapestries with worldly subjects were displayed. From the 1670s on, the visual contents of political image making at Louis’s court and the production and display of tapestries from the Gobelins manufactory changed, and for religious celebrations, which traditionally had been decorated with textiles representing religious subjects, an ever-increasing number of secular topics were displayed.

A description of the Feast of Corpus Christi in 1648 mentions that the procession passed the tapestries of the Apostles—admittedly, a suitable subject for the occasion—but, as a commemorative print shows, these where hung in the courtyard of the Palais Royal in Paris, that is, on royal, secular ground (fig. 7). This example demonstrates that the tendency to combine religious celebration and state-political ambition existed before the Sun King’s absolutism and might have been legitimized by Henry IV’s heroic success of ending the Religious Wars.
(1662–98). In 1665, after the administrative changes following the commencement of Louis XIV’s personal reign, an eyewitness report testifies to the fact that some religious context was provided by decoration for the Feast of Corpus Christi that year but that a political exploitation and independence of iconographic contents was also evident:

Among the curious things and the rich decorations on view in various locations during the two days of Corpus Christi, Mademoiselle, as pious as she is illustrious and gracious, had us see at the Luxembourg [Palace] a rich and beautiful altar. Le Brun, whose beautiful painting imitates nature so well that his art has nothing of the ordinary in it, executed it at the Gobelins. His ornaments in embroidery and his rich tapestry depicting the Acts of the Apostles, his Stateira, and his Alexander, in which the beauties can astonish the spirit as much as the eyes of the learned and the curious. From his admirable scenes made with his [Le Brun’s] peerless hands, and his silver-gilt basins, this altar was well adorned.  

Interestingly, Le Brun is introduced and “his Alexander” is named at a time when very few Gobelins tapestries after his designs were completed. More typically in this period were reports like the one in the Gazette de France, a journal similar to the Mercure galant, which recorded the Feast of the Assumption celebrated at Saint-Germain on August 15, 1668. It describes the church and procession as decorated in the “accustomed manner”—meaning with large tapestries from the royal collection—but with few tapestries with political imagery. It was in this month also that the king’s subordination to God was emphasized in the Gazette de France, where it was written deceitfully that “his piety equals his luster.”

However stated in 1668, “luster” was certainly in the forefront, and in the coming years, it would overrule piety. Change was manifest in the 1670s, as indicated by the description of the victory procession at Versailles in 1677 quoted above. Further, the decoration of the Feast of Corpus Christi in 1677 indicates that just the ten tapestries of the History of the King were on display in the Château de Versailles, which was in contrast to the many different sets hung out in the streets, mentioned above. So while the church had traditionally supported its orally delivered messages by showing depictions of scenes from the Bible to aid the illiterate, all visual material in this display glorified the king. To the people who saw it, this presented an incoherent or contradictory message and instead reminded them of the crown’s material wealth and the king’s political advances.

Another category of religious festival was the commemoration of name days, which perfectly characterized the interchange between political, worldly presentation and ambition and the Catholic tradition. For the king’s name-day celebration on August 25, 1679, the church of Saint Hippolyte near the Gobelins was decorated only with tapestries from the History of the King. Rather than celebrating a saint on his day, focus was shifted to Louis XIV, who was given an elevated, saintlike status and more publicity.

Publications such as the Gazette de France, the Mercure galant, and Lettres en vers to the duchesse de Nemours testify to the importance of tapestries because in their descriptions of royal events and festivities they included reports of the tapestries displayed as well as the effect of tapestries on visitors to religious festivals and royal appearances. Lettres en vers had nothing to do with the private correspondence, but, like the Gazette de France and the Mercure galant, it was yet another weekly publication to report on activities at the court. These journals were distributed publicly and proved popular among the aristocracy and courtiers in Louis’s circle. The style in which the Mercure galant was organized and the time periods it covered imply that its readership...
was acquainted with—if not actively participating in—the king’s public appearances, travels, and diplomatic exchanges.58 Whereas such publications must be seen as propaganda in themselves and lacking in objectivity, these sources demonstrate and even propagate the importance of tapestries and their deployment by the mid-1660s as a highly significant medium for the distribution of royal imagery. The status of tapestries was maintained despite the rising importance of history painting and remained an official international currency in terms of diplomatic gifts. Whereas paintings became increasingly popular in more intimate interior spaces, the tapestry sets allowed for the possibility of creating immensely impressive displays in both indoor and outdoor settings, propagating royal patronage and wealth, while particular pieces within the sets commemorated specific royal successes in domestic and foreign affairs (such as the Alliance with the Swiss and the Meeting with Philip IV). Regardless of their size, tapestries could easily be rolled up and stored or transported, and those pieces intermittently displayed could be brought out occasionally for temporary decoration for religious festivals and political functions.59

A drawing illustrating the coronation of Louis XV in 1722 demonstrates the ongoing use of tapestries and shows the continuous uneasy alliance of secular decoration displayed within ecclesiastical buildings (fig. 8). Again in Reims Cathedral, where Louis XIV had been crowned, the long south wall was hung with tapestries from the royal collection. This time the display included many of the Gobelins tapestries from the 1660s

Fig. 8. Louis XV in Front of the Altar at Reims Cathedral, October 25, 1722, from Album of the Coronation of Louis XV, by Pierre Dulin, ca. 1722. Ink and wash with white heightening, 43.5 x 71.5 cm. Département des Arts Graphiques, Musée du Louvre, Paris (26309.1). Photograph: Réunion des Musées Nationaux/Art Resource, NY; Gérard Blot
through the 1680s, and some of the recognizable ones depicted in the drawing in figure 8 are among the most iconic in the history of Louis XIV’s propaganda. Notable are the Tent of Darius from the Story of Alexander, after the painting the Queens of Persia at the Feet of Alexander that led to Le Brun’s promotion to First Painter in 1661, hanging in the choir above the Meeting of Louis XIV and Philip IV (June 7, 1660) and his victorious crossing of the Bruges Canal in the Defeat of the Comte de Marsin (August 31, 1667), civic and military victories commemorated in the History of the King. Thus, as displayed in these tapestries in this cathedral setting, Louis XV is presented in direct succession to Louis XIV, Alexander the Great, and God.

The textile decoration of other festivals, one being “Les fêtes de l’Amour et de Bacchus” at Versailles on July 18, 1668, exemplifies that it was the propagandistic iconography more than the medium in which it was executed that determined an effective display. During the first two decades of Louis XIV’s personal reign and during enlargement of the Château de Versailles, which lacked a theater, gallery, or ballroom, the king entertained out-of-doors in temporary spaces constructed in

Fig. 9. Les fêtes de l’Amour et de Bacchus, Versailles, July 18, 1668, by Jean Le Pautre, 1679. Etching (modern impression), 30.6 × 42.5 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris (RM003928). Photograph: Réunion des Musées Nationaux/Art Resource, NY; Gérard Blot
the newly planted gardens. For "Les fêtes de l’Amour et de Bacchus," the temporary theater built for the evening in the Petit Parc west of the château is of particular interest with respect to the use of tapestries and textiles painted to look like tapestries. Built entirely of wood, the theater imitated the grand architecture planned for the future château. Some of the precious materials that would be used, such as marble and lapis, were imitated by wood architectural details finished with plaster, paint, and wax. Although in Jean Le Pautre’s etching Les fêtes de l’Amour et de Bacchus (fig. 9), none of the materials used in the decoration can be identified, payments from the royal account testify to the fact that the textiles hung above the cornice were painted like cartoons to simulate tapestries. The pastoral scenes to either side of the stage seem to extend the wooded side grounds on the stage, but the tier above illustrated the virtues of the king in mythological scenes similar to those represented in the tapestry series of the Four Seasons. Since tapestries took a long time to produce and were very expensive, they could not be woven for a single event, and existing panels were instead borrowed from the Garde-Meuble by the Menus-Plaisirs du Roi, the organizer of royal festivities. In this instance, an appropriate modern set such as those of the Four Elements or the Four Seasons was not yet available to satisfy the newly established propaganda needs, suggesting that the importance of the iconography prevailed over that of the value of the medium at this time.

Beginning in 1663, the Petite Académie, a small circle of scholars drawn from the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture, was charged by the finance minister and superintendent of buildings Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619–1683) to conceive and organize the production of textual and iconographic programs celebrating the king. Initially, the Petite Académie created propagandistic themes representing the young king’s moral virtues and political power through allegorical subjects such as the tapestry series the Four Elements and the Four Seasons and by allusion through classical history such as the Story of Alexander. Given that the Petite Académie invented and oversaw the execution of visual schemes, the distinction between woven tapestry and painted canvas (toile) might have been of interest to only a few people that July night at Versailles. More important with regard to the reception of the textiles would likely have been the understanding of their iconography. Wolfgang Brassat describes the development of royal festivities into a medium of communication. The question remains whether or how much of the political content was—or is, indeed, today—understood when courtiers and the public were exposed to the kind of propagandistic tapestry woven for the court of Louis XIV at the Gobelins in the 1660s and 1670s.

During the 1650s and early 1660s, displays of tapestries for secular and religious celebrations were typically made up of incoherent subjects selected according to the availability and condition of textiles in the Garde-Meuble, but from the mid-1660s onward, the choice of subjects was conditioned by the desire to exert political influence. Whereas a viewer’s understanding of religious subjects, such as the Acts of the Apostles and Scenes from the Old Testament, drew upon knowledge transmitted by the Catholic Church and its schools, and other sets, including the History of the King and the Royal Residences, were intended to be self-explanatory with the aid of simple French inscriptions, more iconographically complex pieces would certainly have had their limits as means of communication. The iconography of the Four Elements and the Four Seasons was exceptional in its complexity, and explanations seem to have been envisaged from first conception of the tapestries (fig. 10). These sophisticated publications were produced at great expense and to satisfy the ambition to disseminate woven imagery in a more accessible medium. Furthermore, as I would like to argue, they
testify to the need to explain these newly conceived Gobelins tapestries.

In 1665, the historian André Félibien (1619–1695) published a thirty-one-page book, *Les quatre éléments peints par M. Le Brun et mis en tapisseries pour Sa Majesté*, that contain engravings of Le Brun’s designs by Sébastien Leclerc and Latin inscriptions written by Félibien in the borders of the four tapestries. Félibien’s descriptions were reissued in 1667 and 1700; these books included extensive prefaces providing further explanation of the political allegory of the main scenes. The image *Water*, for example, was said to represent the calm and the return of order and prosperity that followed Louis XIV’s successful suppression of the Fronde in 1653 and the peace treaty he signed with Spain in 1660, as well as the pacifying consequences of his marriage to Maria Theresa that year. The later editions of *Les quatre éléments* also included madrigals by Charles Perrault on the virtues of piety, magnanimity, kindliness, and valor depicted in the medallions in the corners of the tapestry borders (fig. 11).

Félibien’s 1670 publication proved greatly successful and was reprinted in Paris in 1679, 1690, and 1727. In the register of diplomatic gifts, numerous copies of these
later prints of the *Four Elements* and *Four Seasons* were recorded as royal presents and, together with prints after other tapestry series, such as the *Story of Alexander* and the *History of the King*, were often bound in morocco leather and finely tooled and decorated with the coat of arms of Louis XIV. As such they distributed this royal imagery together with its explanation in Europe and, through French Jesuit missionaries, as far away as China, in an attempt to achieve a higher level of understanding.43

Félibien’s panegyric publications on the *Elements* and *Seasons*, significant among his writings, stood out as aids to understanding the tapestries.44 Neither the *History of the King* nor any other subject woven during Louis XIV’s reign was given explanatory, analytical texts to the same degree, for they were not needed for the tapestries to be understood.45 Circulated mostly among educated courtiers in France and abroad, Félibien’s texts present a phenomenon unique to the court of Louis XIV.

The two-page pamphlet that was published to accompany the display of tapestries on the occasion of the Feast of Corpus Christi in 1705 indicated the broader public’s need for explanation of woven iconography.46 This text was distributed among the participants in the procession, inhabitants of the city of Paris of more diverse social backgrounds than the better-informed courtiers. Its brief descriptions facilitated the identification and understanding of the tapestries displayed in courtyards at the Louvre palace and the Gobelins manufactory and named their religious and secular subjects and, occasionally, the painters responsible for their designs. It served as a useful tool to communicate complex propagandistic themes and provided a valuable souvenir to secure the longevity of this information.

Altogether, the displays of tapestries signify that all public appearances of the king—religious and secular—became politicized throughout the second half of the seventeenth century. The texts on the other hand indicate that the change of content demanded explanation to facilitate the understanding and the wide distribution of Louis XIV’s propaganda.

1. Wolfgang Brassat described this event, saying that among many royal guests attending the celebration were twelve of the higher pairs (peers) and twelve of the lower pairs, high officers, the gardes...
des sceaux (keepers of the seals), as well as the cardinals Grimaldi and Mazarin; Wolfgang Brassat, Tapisserien und Politik: Funktion, Kontexte und Rezeption eines repräsentativen Mediums (Berlin, 1992), p. 181.


4. Lady St. John discussed this image as one of the most beautiful produced under Le Brun’s artistic directorship; Lady St. John, “The Gobelin Factory and Some of Its Work,” Burlington Magazine 10, no. 47 (February 1907), p. 286.

5. Despite the rich holdings of the Garde-Meuble of five sets of Apostles tapestries from Louis XIII’s, Mazarin’s, Fouquet’s, and Colbert’s collections, the Gobelins removed the Acts of the Apostles in 1667–69 (Inventaire général du Mobilier de la Couronne, no. 52), after designs by Raphael, which had first been transformed into tapestry for Pope Leo X in Brussels in 1515–21, testifying to the continuous importance of their iconography. See Maurice Fenaille, État général des tapisseries de la Manufacture des Gobelins depuis son origine jusqu’à nos jours, 1600–1900, vol. 2, Période de Louis XIV, en 1662, jusqu’en 1699 . . . (Paris, 1903), pp. 43–45; also Jules Guiffrey, Inventaire général du Mobilier de la Couronne sous Louis XIV (1663–1715) (Paris, 1888–86), vol. 1, pp. 293, 299, 300, 303, nos. 1, 30, 34, 35, 37, 38.

The same series was reweoven at the Beauvais manufactory beginning in 1692; see Charissa Bremer-David, “Manufacture Royale de Tapisseries de Beauvais, 1664–1715,” in Campbell, ed., Tapestry in the Baroque, p. 414.

6. The clothes are also distinctly French and Spanish, and the infant wears diamond jewels (an engagement present from Louis XIV) and an embroidered white satin dress; see Meyer, L’histoire du Roy, pp. 22–26.

7. For the weaving of the History of the King, see Fenaille, État général des tapisseries, vol. 2, pp. 126–27.

8. “Description de tout ce qui a perdu, à Versailles aux Processions solennelles qui s’y sont faites, avec les Noms de toutes les Tapisseries de la Couronnes, & des grands Peintres qui en ont fait les Dessins,” Menon galant, July 1677, pp. 64–76.

The custom of hanging textiles in the streets existed in Spain and Italy during the Renaissance. For the Spanish tradition, see, in this volume, “Spanish Family Pride in Flemish Wool and Silk: The Moncada Family and Its Baroque Tapestry Collection,” by Guy Delmarcel, Margarita García Calvo, and Koenraad Brosens. In Italy, however, a different manner could be observed in Venice, where mostly Islamic carpets imported from Turkey and the Near East displayed the material wealth and social standing of the republic’s ruling merchant class and its dominance over, and decorative contribution to, political events, such as the selection, inauguration, and public procession of a doge. See, for example, the Procession of the Doge to the Bucentoro on Ascension Day, with a View of Venice, a woodcut by Jost Amman, Nuremberg, ca. 1565 (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1949 [49.95.3]). This view of Venice shows the sumptuously decorated ducal palace and the shop of a glass merchant, one of the city’s prosperous trades, in the Piazza San Marco. Parallels to Amman’s representation can be found in several portraits, primarily of doges, by the Venetian painter Giovanni Bellini (1430–1516), as illustrated, for example, in Oskar Batschmann, Giovanni Bellini (London, 2008).

d’or aussi bien que celles qui suivent. / Les Batailles d’Alexandre. / Les Veuves des Maisons Royales. / Les Muses. / Les Saisons. / Et les cinq Sens de Nature. Ces dernières ont enor esté faites sur les Desseins de Mr le Brun Premier Peintre du Roy, & elles sont travaillées avec tant d’art & de délicatesse, que la Peinture n’a rien de plus vif,” “Description de tout ce qui a pour à Versailles,” Mercure galant, July 1677, pp. 68–73.

The Mercure galant article lists “les cinq Sens de Nature” as one of the sets displayed that was woven after designs by Le Brun. However, both the fact that no other surviving documents name a weaving of the Five Senses and the fact that the set is cited together with the Seasons—a series that is complementary to the Elements—strongly suggest that the article speaks of a set of Elements, of which four, or possibly five, pieces might have been shown on the procession. The only surviving tapestries known as the Five Senses are those also titled The Lady with the Unicorn, of which one set is preserved at the Musée Cluny in Paris and another at The Cloisters, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. However, none of these tapestries is mentioned in the French royal inventory (1664–1715), and it seems unlikely, therefore, that they were shown in Paris in 1677. See Guiffrey, Inventaire général, vol. 1, pp. 293–374.


13. Leclerc’s depiction of Colbert’s visit to the Gobelins was published along with his illustrations of the five Alexander tapestries, clearly aiming both to record the superintendent’s visit and to publicize the tapestries. A set of Leclerc’s etchings was advertised in the Mercure galant, August 1696, pp. 167–71.


15. The chronicle of Gian Lorenzo Bernini’s visit to France in 1665 describes his visit to the Gobelins and also refers to the king’s recent visit there; see Paul Fréart de Chantelou, Diary of the Cavaliere Bernini’s Visit to France (1665), ed. Anthony Blunt, trans. Margery Corbett (Princeton, N.J., 1985), p. 278.

A brief article in the Gazette de France (October 1667, pp. 1189–90) described the king’s visit to the Gobelins, which made the foundation of royal manufactories, and therefore of weaving propagandistic imagery in tapestry, part of the king’s history.

The Salons of the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture—a separate topic and particular phenomena in themselves—are worth mentioning here, because, despite the fact that they aimed to present contemporary art and to set standards in contemporary artistic practice, in 1699, lining the walls of the Grande Galerie at the Louvre were the Acts of the Apostles and the Triumphs of Scipio, two old tapestry sets with religious and historic subjects used as the backdrop for a secular modern art show; Thomas P. Campbell, “Continuity and Change in Tapestry Use and Design, 1680–1720,” in Campbell, ed., Tapestry in the Baroque, p. 497. For exhibitions at the Académie de Peinture et de Sculpture, see Thomas E. Crow, Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris (New Haven, 1995), pp. 36–39.

16. Both the king and the Dauphin exploited religious festivals for their propagandistic purposes. When the Dauphin moved his principal residence from Choisy to Meudon, he contributed to the celebration of Saint Martin there in order to express his piety. The church of Saint Martin was decorated with tapestries from the royal collection, namely, the Acts of the Apostles after Raphael—“cette tenture est estimée l’une des plus précieuses et des belles”—and the Story of Moses after Poussin, and the event was described in the Mercure galant, November 1695, pp. 238–39.

17. Brassat, Tapisserien und Politik, p. 47. Typologically, the entrees derived from the Entry of Christ into Jerusalem; thus, processions such as those of Corpus Christi and royal parades transform a city into a “heavenly Jerusalem”; ibid., p. 58.


19. “Entre les choses curieuses / Et les parures précieuses / Que l’on vid en differant lieu / Les deux jours de la Feste-Dieu, / Mademoizelle, / aussi pieue / Qu’elle est illustre & graceieue, / A Luxembourg nous a fait voir / Un riche et fort beau Reposoir. // Le Brun, dont la belle Peinture / Inite si bien la Nature / Que son Art n’a rien de commun, / Aux Gobelins en a fait un. // Ses ornements en broderie / Et sa riche Tapisserie, / Où sont artisement dépeints / Des Apôtres les
Actes saints; Sa Statira, son Alexandre; Dont les beautez peuvent surprendre / L'esprit aussi bien que les yeux / Des chansons et des curieux, / Outre ses Tableaux admirablez / Faits de ses mains incomparables / Et ses bassins vermeil doré, / Rendront c't Autel fort paré"; "Lettres en vers a son alessie Madame la Duchesse de Nemours par / La Grevelle de Mayolas, 14. juin 1665," in Nathan / James Edouard de Rothschild, ed., Les continuateurs / de Loret: Lettres en vers de la Grevelle de Mayolas, / Robinet, Boursin, Perdu de Subligny, Laurent et / autres (1665–1689) (Paris, 1881–82), vol. 1, cols. / 43–44. Il. 153–76; translation by the present author.

Another article ("La réparation du Sacréliga," Gazette de France, August 31, 1668, pp. 817–32) describes the holy sacrament of Saint Martin in the cloisters of Saint Marcel. The church was decorated with tapestries (p. 824) and the streets were lined with tapestries (p. 827), but no particular series or individual pieces are named. More than a hundred Gobelins workers participated in the procession, carrying large white wax candles through the neighborhood from the church of Saint Marcel past the church of Val-de-Grâce and the cemetery of Saint Martin, then back to the church of Saint Marcel (pp. 829, 831, 832).
23. "Description de tout ce qui a paru, à Versailles aux Processions solennelles qui s'y sont faites, avec les Noms de toutes les Tapisseries de la Couronne, & des grands Peintres qui en ont fait les Des- seins," Mercure galant, July 1677, pp. 64–76; also, "Tapisseries exposées à Versailles sur le parcours des processions" (in 1677), Mercure galant, January–March 1677, p. 281.
24. "L'Eglise se trouva toute tendue des plus riches Tapisseries qui se fassent aux Gobelins. Elles représentaient l'Histoire du Roy, & furent admirées aussi bien que la Musique, de tous ceux qui se rencontrent en ce lieu-là" (The Church of Saint Hippolyte) is decorated with the richest tapestries made at the Gobelins. They represent the History of the King and are admired as is the music (by Marc-Antoine Charpentier), and by all who meet in that place; "Description de la Feste de S. Louiis," Mercure galant, September 1679, p. 56.
25. By contrast to the Mercure galant's report of the Feast of Saint Louis in 1679, its description of that feast day in 1682 focused on the magnificent festival at the Paris residence of the duc de Créquy and its sumptuous textile decoration. The Dauphin attended the dinner and ball there, accompanied by members of the aristocracy. Unlike records of previous celebrations, the description of this event clearly testifies to the fact that individuals were paying tribute to the king as they celebrated the royal family on Louis XIV's name day. "Toutes la longueur du devant de la Terrasse de cet Hôtel [Hôtel de Créquy] estoit tapisée de Velours rouge cramoisy, avec les Armes de M' le Duc de Créquy. Elles estoient or & argent, & toutes relevées en bosse. Il y a avoir un Tapis de Velours bleu au milieu de la Terrasse, avec une Frange d'or tout autour. Un Dais de Velours rouge-cramoisy, couvert d'espace en espace d'un large Galon d'or, estoit attaché au dessus. Ce Dais estoit préparé pour Monseigneur le Dauphin... Les Fenestres des Galeries du Louvre opposées a cet Hôtel, estoient toutes ornées de Tapis... [Monseigneur le Dauphin] devoit le soir venir de Versailles pour le Spectacle du Feu... La Balustrade [du Louvre] estoit ornée d'un Tapis entichy de ses Chiffres, & environnée de plusieurs rangs de Lampes"; "Feste de S. Louiis," Mercure galant, August 1682, pp. 257, 258, 301.
26. A further example of this was the royal visit to the Gobelins manufactory, which was commemorated in the thirteenth tapestry in the History of the King and described in the Gazette de France, October 22, 1667, pp. 1189–90.
27. For a description of Lettres en vers, see Brassat, Tapisseries et Politique, p. 145, n. 47.
28. Time periods covered by the Mercure were often framed by Louis's public appearances or travels, suggesting that, like the religious holidays, these dates were widely recognized and understood. See, for example, "Contenant plusieurs histoires veritables, et tout ce qui s'est passé depuis le premier janvier 1672 jusques au depart du Roy," the subtitle of the very first number of the Mercure galant in 1672.
29. Among the administrative papers relating to the Gobelins manufactory in the Archives Nationales in Paris, several payments document that porters received money for transporting—usually by cart—tapestries between the storerooms of the Garde-Meubles and the Gobelins manufactory, and sometimes to Versailles; see Archives Nationales O° 20464th.
30. Guy Walton suggests that in the early 1670s, plans for the enlargement of the royal palace included an opera house and a ballroom, which, however, were never built; see Walton, Louis XIV's Versailles (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, 1986), p. 74.

Some of the royal festivals were described by Féliebien, Georges de Scudery, and an anonymous author in the Mercure galant, who referred to individual works of art employed in the extraordinarily
splendid decoration. Félibien's *Relation de la feste de Versailles du 18e juillet 1668* (Paris: Chez Pierre Le Petit, 1668) was conceived as a propaganda piece and commissioned as the first text Félibien published as "historiographe des Bâtiments du roi." It describes a sequence of six celebrations, attended by 1,500 guests, given on July 18, 1668, to commemorate the French victory at Aix-la-Chapelle on May 2, 1668. Widely distributed at the time, this detailed text was illustrated with five engravings by Jean Le Pautre for the second edition in 1679. André Félibien's *Description de la grotte de Versailles* (1672) and *Les divertissements de Versailles* (1674) followed.

31. Félibien, *Relation de la feste de Versailles*, p. 22. The woodwork was related to the paneled interior of the cabinet des filigrènes and commissions known to have been executed by Domenico Cucci, one of the principal cabinetmakers of the Gobelins workshop.

32. Le Pautre was paid for several engravings in 1679. Although none is described as showing the comédie, the payment for two that were specifically described in the royal account book as representing the collation and the illuminations at the Versailles fête of 1668 suggests that other pieces paid for at the same time related to the same commission. See Jules Guiffrey, *Comptes des Bâtiments du Roi sous le règne de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1881–1901), vol. 1, col. 1207.

33. As Félibien pointed out in *Relation de la feste de Versailles* (p. 43), the statues between the pairs of columns on each side of the stage, Victory on the left and Freedom on the right, clearly related to the French victory at Aix-la-Chapelle, which was the reason for the festival. The accuracy of Le Pautre’s etching is in question, because his depictions of the 1668 fête at Versailles did not appear until 1679, suggesting that he worked from memory rather than from drawings produced eleven years earlier. His depiction of hangings was based on the series of the Four Elements and the Four Seasons, not the painted hangings that were actually used to decorate the theater. The first sets of the Elements and the Seasons were not completed until 1669, when they were a diplomatic gift to the grand duke of Tuscany, and so would not have been available for the 1668 festival. See Fenaille, *État général des tapisseries*, vol. 2, pp. 57–58.

34. That tapestries were not specially woven for Louis XIV’s festivals is further supported by the fact that a limited number of objects—notably chandeliers—were newly commissioned for such celebrations and only a few artists received payment. By contrast, the substantial sum of 1,205 livres 7 sous 6 deniers was distributed to porters for transporting decorative objects from Paris to Versailles, indicating that these might have been borrowed from the Garde-Meuble. See Guiffrey, *Comptes des Bâtiments*, vol. 1, cols. 304–7.


36. However, because of the complexity both of formulating and of understanding such concepts, the academicians seem to have put these ideas aside and to emphasize a more overt celebration of Louis in the form of the tapestry series the *History of the King*.


38. David Harvey Ball has written that "symbolic meanings were only comprehensible if they were read at leisure in an illustrated commemorative book" and that the "book medium added an aura of permanent legitimacy to the transient spectacles they recorded." The same observation is true for the allegorical iconography that was presented as diplomatic gifts. See Ball in *Festivities: Ceremonies and Celebrations in Western Europe 1500–1750*, exh. cat., Department of Art, Brown University, Bell Gallery (Providence, R.I., 1979), p. 11.


40. In 1667, in addition to the second edition of *Les quatre élémens peints par M. Le Brun et mis en tapisseries pour Sa Majesté*, Félibien also published his descriptions of the Four Seasons in *Les quatre saisons peints par M. Le Brun et mises en tapisseries pour Sa Majesté*. This book included the madrigals written by Charles Perrault for the virtues of piety, magnanimity, kindliness, and valor depicted in the corner medallions of the Seasons tapestries. Perrault’s madrigals and Félibien’s Latin inscriptions in the borders of each tapestry were reprinted in Jean de La Fontaine’s *Recueil des poésies chrétiennes et diverses* in 1671. In 1668, Félibien’s Latin inscriptions were reworked by the miniature painter Jacques Baille and the calligrapher Nicolas Jarry as part of a manuscript presented to the king (Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris, Cabinet de Manuscrits, Français 7819); see Jean Cordey, "Un manuscrit à miniatures du XVIIe siècle: ‘Devises pour les tapisseries du Roy’," *Bulletin de la Société de l’Histoire de l’Art* in the Baroque.
Français, 1926, pp. 84–90; and also Jacques Vanuexem, "Emblèmes et devises, vers 1660–
1680," Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art
Français, 1934 (1935), pp. 60–70. The manuscript edition is reproduced in facsimile in Marianne
Grivel and Marc Fumarioli, eds., Devises pour les

The edition of 1670 was titled Tapissieries du
roi où sont représentées les quatre éléments et les quatre
saisons avec les devises qui les accompagnent et leur expli-
cation and presented both the Four Elements and the
Four Seasons, each on a double-page spread. Fol-
lowing each group of four are Perrault's madrigals
for the four virtues associated with that group,
each accompanied by a half-page illustration above
Perrault's text. Whereas the large plates of the
Elements and Seasons are inscribed with at least one
of Le Brun's, Leclerc's, or Jean Goyton's names as,
the accompanying text by Perrault, the madrigals
are not, as they were in the previous editions.
The title page does not give the authors' names,
only referring to Sébastien Mabre-Cramoisy as the
printer. See Charles-Antoine Jombert, Catalogue
raisonné de l'œuvre de Sébastien Le Clerc, chevalier
romain, dessinateur et graveur du Cabinet du Roi (Paris,
1774), vol. I, no. 98, pp. 134–40; Maxime Préaud,
Inventaire du fonds français: Couleurs du XVIIe siècle,
vols. 8 and 9, Sébastien Leclerc, Département des
Estampes, Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris, 1980),
vols. 9, nos. 1579–97, pp. 68–77; Stefan Germer,
Kunst, Macht, Diskurs: Die intellektuelle Karriere
des André Félibien im Frankreich von Louis XIV

Félibien's descriptions of the Elements and the
Seasons, but without Leclerc's illustrations, further
formed part of Félibien, Description de divers
ouvrages de peinture faits pour le Roi (Paris: Sébastien
Mabre-Cramoisy, 1671); Félibien, Recueil de
descriptions de peintures et d'autres ouvrages faits pour
le Roi (Paris: widow of Mabre-Cramoisy, 1689); and
Félibien, Description du château de Versailles, de
ses peintures et d'autres ouvrages faits pour le Roi
(Paris: Mariette, 1696).

Félibien presented the Elements as Fire, Air,
Water, and Earth, but Jacques Bailly, in his Devises
pour les tapissieries du Roy ou sont représentées les qua-
tre éléments et les quatre saisons de l'année, peintes en
mignature par I. Bailly, peintre du Roy en son Acadé-
mie Royale de Peinture et sculpture. Et gravées par
S. Le Clerc, a Paris, de l'imprimerie de C. Blgeart,
rue S. Jacques. Et se vendent aux galeries du Louvre
chez ledit Bailly, avec privilege de Sa Majesté, 1668,
changed the order, showing Air first, then Fire,
Water, and Earth. The plates are signed neither by
him nor Leclerc; the madrigals have Perrault's
name with them. For a detailed description, see
Jombert, Catalogue raisonné de l'œuvre de Sébastien le
Clerc, vol. 1, no. 88, pp. 93–101; Préaud, Inventaire

41. "Cette Peinture doit estre considérée comme vne
figure de calme que la Paix & le Mariage de S.M.
on mis dans l'estat après le troubles & les agita-
tions des guerres civiles. Et ces poissons jetter sur
le rivage & hors de l'eau sont comme vne image
de ceux qui avoient esté jetter de leurs paiz par ces
bourasques si fascheuses, lesquels S.M. par vne
bonté toute royale & des soins dignes d'un veri-
table pere a rappelée auprès d'elle & remis dans
leur Element" (This painting must be considered a
depiction of calmness which the tranquility and
the marriage of His Majesty brought to the state
after the discord and unrest of civil wars. And
these fish thrown up on the beach and out of the
water are like a picture of those who have been
displaced from their lands by these disturbing
squalls, which His Majesty, by royal benevolence
and the care worthy of a true father, has brought
back and returned to their Element); Félibien,
Les quatre éléments (1667), p. 24. See also Germer,
Kunst, Macht, Diskurs, pp. 231–33.

42. See "Registre des Livres de figures et Estampes
qui ont esté distribuées suivant les ordres de
Montaigne le Marquis de Louvois, depuis
l'Inventaire fait avec M' l'abbe Verais au mois
d'août 1684," in Bibliothèque Nationale de

43. A reference to the popularity of prints after Van
der Meulen's images of the Conquêtes du Roi
among foreign collectors is found in "Quatrième
Suite de l'Histoire des Estampes," Mercure galant,
November 1686, p. 143.

44. For Félibien's writings, see Germer, Kunst, Macht,
Diskurs, pp. 514–21.

45. One of the panels in the Story of Alexander, the Tent
of Darius, was the iconic depiction of the young
leader's appearance at the tent of the defeated
Persian general, representing Alexander's moral
principles, which the royal French administration
sought to project upon Louis XIV from the early
1660s on. In 1663, Félibien wrote a book of some
thirty pages to explain the subject and the quali-
ties and standing of its characters, particularly
of Alexander, as well as an analysis of the work's
painterly qualities. However, the publication does
not emphasize the relationship between Louis
and Alexander that was communicated elsewhere,
for example in the tapestries. It was nevertheless
translated into English in the early eighteenth
century and was thus also available outside
France. See André Félibien, Les Reines de Perse
aux pieds d'Alexandre. Peinture au Cabinet du Roy
(Paris, 1664), translated by Collonel [sic] Parson as
The tent of Darius explain'd, or, The queens of Persia
at the feet of Alexander (London, 1703).

46. Brassat, Tapiserrien und Politik, p. 134; Campbell,
"Continuity and Change in Tapestry Use and
Design," in Campbell, ed., Tapestry in the Banque,
p. 499.