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The Iconography of an Altarpiece by Botticini

HERBERT FRIEDMANN
Director of the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History

The foreground of the altarpiece illustrated in Figure 1, by the fifteenth-century Florentine painter Francesco Botticini, is filled with little plants and animals, of a number and variety unusual in Tuscan devotional art. As we shall see, there is reason for their presence, and this article is directed to the elucidation of some of these items of iconographic interest—and, in several cases, of rarity—in Italian art.

Critics now universally agree that the altarpiece, The Madonna and Child Enthroned with Saints and Angels, is not only an authentic work by Botticini but also one of the best examples of his late, mature period. Some differences of opinion as to the date of this altarpiece have been expressed, the extremes being 1470 to 1475 and the middle of the 1480s. The latter date is based on the argument that some of the details in it are adopted from Botticelli’s Barnabas altarpiece, which is dated 1483.

It has been traditionally assumed, without any documentary evidence, that the painting was originally in Santissima Annunziata, the church of the Order of the Servi in Florence. The choice of saints represented in the picture—from left to right, Benedict, Francis, Sylvester, and Anthony Abbot—neither supports nor refutes this provenance, as none of them has any particular relation or importance to this order. In addition, none of the seven wealthy Florentine noblemen who instituted the Order of the Servi in 1232 bore the names of any of these four saints. It is not known who commissioned the altarpiece, and hence it is not possible to learn if the saints provide clues to the baptismal names of members of the donor’s family. This particular combination of saints seems to be, so far as I have been able to learn, unique. Of the four, Sylvester is the one least often portrayed in Florentine art, although the fact that an entire chapel in Santa Croce was given over to frescoes of his life and legend by Maso di Banco is evidence that he was regarded with some esteem in quattrocento Florence.

All the saints are holding large closed books, a somewhat unusual insistence on ecclesiastical scholarship and erudition in a devotional altarpiece. The book held by Anthony Abbot is a regular part of his portrayal and hence calls for no comment. That Francis
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1. Madonna and Child Enthroned with Sains and Angels, by Francesco Botticini (about 1446-1497), Italian (Florentine). Tempera on wood, 110½ x 69 inches. Gift of George R. Hann, in memory of his mother, Annie Sykes Hann, 61.235
also holds a book is a little less usual: this favorite saint is more frequently depicted without a large tome in his hand, although in many instances, both before and after the date of Botticini’s altarpiece, he does have such a volume. Similarly, the presence of a book is a variable feature in representations of Sylvester, a scholarly individual with interests beyond the immediate scope of his religious teaching; he was pope and bishop of Rome, and is usually shown, as he is here, as an elderly pope trampling on a dragon. Scholarship was a personal interest of Benedict, but there was no mention of the pursuit of learning in his original rules for his order; it was long after his death that the thriving Benedictine monasteries began to study and copy the available classical manuscripts. In his right hand Benedict holds an elaborate aspersillum, one of his usual attributes, so that, in effect, he is equipped with the means of overcoming evil both by sprinkling holy water with his right hand and by combating it by erudition with his left. Botticini has shown Benedict in the black robe of the order’s original habit, which, many centuries before the altarpiece was painted, had been changed to a white one after the creation of the “Reformed Order.” Why Botticini deliberately chose the original black robe when some of his contemporaries in Florence, such as Filippo Lippi (see Figure 3), depicted Benedict in white is impossible to say.

Strangely enough, none of the saints looks toward the Virgin and Child. Francis has his eyes turned heavenward in a state of meditation, Sylvester gazes off to the right, while Benedict and Anthony Abbot regard the observer as if calling attention to the opportunity to see the Madonna and Child, made possible by the two angels holding back the curtains that would otherwise conceal them from sight.

These curtains are trimmed with ermine fur, pure white with the black tail tip of each pelt still attached. The weasel, whose fur is brown in summer and white in winter (when it is known as ermine), was a well-known symbol of purity and chastity, and was accordingly often held by ladies in portraits as a pictorial reference to these virtues. The best-known instance of this usage is Leonardo da Vinci’s Cracow picture; another is one by Luini in the National Gallery of Art in Washington (Figure 4). The weasel was associated with the motto “Better death than dishonor.” In Carpaccio’s great painting of a young knight (Figures 5, 6), there is an ermine and behind it a cartellino bearing the inscription Malo mor quam foedari (“I would rather die than be disgraced”), the motto adopted by the Knights of the Order of the Ermine, founded in 1483 by King Ferdinand I of Naples.

Leonardo da Vinci alluded to the moral significance of the ermine in his notebooks; among his aphorisms we find, “Moderation
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to prevent the birth of Hercules to the mortal Alcmena, beloved of Jupiter. She sent Lucina, the goddess of childbirth, to Alcmena’s door, and there Lucina, disguised as an old hag, sat holding her knees tightly together. Alcmena’s maid Galanthis recognized this gesture as having a potentially disastrous effect, impeding childbirth, and she deliberately misled Lucina by telling her that the baby had already been born. Lucina then rose, and at that moment Alcmena gave birth to her son. Her indignation at being deceived caused Lucina to change Galanthis into a weasel, which was doomed thenceforth to deliver her offspring through the ear, since the maid had deceived the goddess through her ear by false words.

Through the centuries this legend was retold and altered and given Christian connotations. An example occurs in the early thirteenth-century bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc:

About the weasel is a great marvel,
For she brings forth by the ear. . . .
Are they fools, who go affirming
That she receives and discharges
The seed through the hearing?
Surely this is not the case.
With this [creature] are compared
Sundry [folk] who are zealous
To behave well, to serve God,
And to hear the word of God.

The story even came to be looked upon as a foreshadowing of Mary’s conceiving Christ through the Word. This probably accounts for the growth of the thought that the weasel is stainless and unsullied, and therefore a suitable symbol of the Virgin herself.

The weasel’s white ermine phase served to reinforce further the virtues imputed to the animal because of its pure whiteness, in itself a symbol of purity. It is therefore eminently appropriate in a picture of the Virgin to border the curtains of her throne with ermine. Because of the associated concepts of honor and steadfastness, royalty and nobility were often represented with ermine on their robes of state, and ermine edging was often used to enhance the rich textiles of the draperies that surrounded them. At the time that Botticini painted this altarpiece the traditional use of ermine was so well established that he might have used it as he did even if he were not consciously aware of its symbolic meaning.

Botticini’s design of the Virgin’s throne incorporates a naturalistic motif in its half dome shaped like a scallop shell. The scallop shell – or pecten shell – was an old symbol of the religious pilgrim, the contemplative voyager through life. In art it was usually shown as an emblem worn by St. James of Compostela, the patron saint of pilgrims, or by St. Roch to suggest his wanderings in the service of the plague-stricken. In this work the shell has been modified for architectural purposes, but it still reveals its origin.

The earth in the lower portion of the picture is rich with numerous and varied animal forms as well as many flowers. St. Anthony’s pig at the extreme right of the painting, although compositionally closely related to the figure of the saint, may be regarded as part of the array of living creatures, as may the dragon, whose head appears to the left of St. Sylvester’s feet.
7. Head of dragon below St. Sylvester, detail of Figure 1


9. St. Anthony Abbot's pig, detail of Figure 1
The dragon is an old and widely recognized symbol of evil and of Satan. In art it accompanies many saints who overcame the archfiend, and is a usual pictorial attribute of Sylvester. Botticini has accentuated its malicious aspect by making the eye bloodshot and fiercely hostile, the forehead heavily wrinkled, and the face snarling, with a hooked beak and a mouth full of wicked-looking teeth. Botticini improvised on the usual rendition of this mythical beast by giving it a pair of bristly, long, pointed ears. Florentine artists, to limit ourselves to his more immediate, and hence more comparable, colleagues, varied greatly in their concept of what dragons should look like: some gave them no ears at all; others gave them small and curled, almost scalelike ears; still others, like Botticini, gave them long ears, but the pointed, hairy tips are rare.

The pig (Figure 9) is the usual attribute of St. Anthony Abbot and represents the temptations of sensuality and gluttony that the holy man overcame. As such it was readily understood by the people of fifteenth-century Italy. It has, however, one additional point of interest, since Botticini copied it from a work by his teacher, Neri di Bicci (Figure 8). William Suida dated Neri’s painting “after 1480,” but Roberto Longhi placed it considerably earlier, between 1460 and 1470. Except for its smaller tusk and the fact that only the front half is shown, Botticini’s pig is nearly identical with his teacher’s version both in pose and in appearance. This similarity is too close to be accidental, but suggests rather that Neri’s painting was a recent creation used as a model by his follower. If so this might support the late date Suida gave Neri’s picture.

In that painting the lesson to be read from the saint and his pig is pointed up by the words inscribed on St. Anthony’s open book: Lasciate i vitti, le virtu pigliate, Vostro avvocato so se qvesto fate (“Give up evil, embrace virtue, I am your protector if you do this”).

The white dove (Cover) drinking from a little stream at the bottom of Botticini’s picture is not the usual white dove of Italian religious art. This bird ordinarily appears as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, especially in paintings of the Annunciation, where it is traditionally given a nimbus or halo; here it has no such distinguishing mark. It would seem that the dove is included here because of the presence in the painting of St. Benedict, and that it is a reference to his twin sister, St. Scholastica, the head of the first organized community of Benedictine nuns. The story is that after her untimely death her brother saw her soul in the form of a white dove fly up to heaven. Scholastica is usually shown in art holding a crucifix or a lily, with the dove pressed to her bosom, resting at her feet, or flying toward heaven. She was not often included in altarpieces, but a good example showing her with the dove appears in a polyptych by the Venetian Bartolomeo Vivarini (Figure 10), dated 1485. It is decidedly unusual to replace the saint, as it were, by the dove – in fact, I do not know of another painting in which St. Scholastica is represented in absentia in this way – but this is what Botticini has done. We can only assume that the faithful would recognize her by inference because of Benedict’s presence. The decision to depict the dove on the ground may well have been dictated by the composition of the altarpiece: had the bird been shown in heavenward flight, it would have distracted attention from the holy personages in the main part of the picture. Its act of drinking from the stream is a reference to the old concept of the “water of life” emanating from the true religion, providing spiritual nourishment for its followers.

In his rendition of the dove, as in his depiction of the other plants and animals, Botticini shows himself to be a careful observer and accurate portrayer of nature. The lifelike pose and the drawing of the drinking dove are striking if one takes the trouble to compare this highly naturalistic little creature with the stylized dove of the Holy Spirit usual in countless other paintings.

To the right of the dove stands a goldfinch (Cover), and there is a second some distance to the left, nearer the base of the Virgin’s throne (Figure 11). The symbolism of the goldfinch is unusual in its richness and diversity of implications. It is sufficient, in this connection, merely to note that it was a symbol of the soul, of resurrection, of baptism,
of the Passion of Christ, even of fertility. Its chief claim to popularity, however, was as a savior bird against the ravages of the plague. For these reasons, many hundreds of votive pictures included this colorful bird, usually held by the Christ child, or attached by one leg to a fine string that he holds. Children were given just such tethered, wing-clipped live birds as playthings, and this was a manner of humanizing the Infant Jesus in art. At the time that Botticini created this painting, however, Florence was not suffering from the plague and the need for an amulet against the disease, held in divine hands, had largely subsided. In this altarpiece the two goldfinches probably are symbolic of resurrection, a usage appropriate to a devotional picture. As we shall see, the lizard near them is a salvation-seeking creature, so they go together very well. (In a painting of the Nativity attributed to a follower of Filippo Lippi, now in the Louvre [Figure 12], there is the same combination of a goldfinch placed close to a lizard.)

It is unusual in fifteenth-century Florentine art to find, as one does here, more than one goldfinch in a single painting. There are also two goldfinches in Botticini’s tondo of the Madonna Adoring the Child, in the Pitti Palace (Figure 13). As may be seen from the detail of that picture (Figure 14) the left goldfinch is almost identical with the left one (Figure 11) in the Metropolitan’s altarpiece. It is not improbable that Botticini included two goldfinches, when one would have sufficed from a purely symbolic standpoint, simply because the pretty colors of these birds made them desirable as decorative elements with which to enliven and embellish his pictures.

Botticini’s goldfinches are not only well done from a purely naturalistic standpoint — much more so than many of those by his fel-
low Florentines—but they are also remarkably lifelike in the way they are placed. They are neither held in the hand nor tethered: they are depicted just as small birds might appear naturally in a flowery meadow. The freedom of treatment would hardly have been permissible in an altarpiece a generation earlier, but by the time this one was designed the goldfinch was such an easily interpreted symbol that it could resume, in an outward sense, its natural, nonmystical existence without loss of significance. Botticini was here, and in the tondo in the Pitti Palace, far more original and daring than one would expect a Florentine painter of his time to be.

To the left of the dove appears a lizard (Figure 11), meticulously copied from nature, which is identifiable as the wall lizard, *Lacerta muralis*, a well-known species of southern Europe, common in Italy. The wall lizard is the same as the “sun lizard” described in the ancient *Physiologus*, the basic source from which practically all of the European medieval bestiaries stemmed. According to Edward Evans, the name “sun lizard” arose from the legend that when the creature becomes old and its eyesight begins to fail, it creeps into a crevice of a wall facing to the east and “stretches its head to the rising sun, whose rays restore its sight.” The legend continues, “In like manner, O man, thou who hast on the old garment, and the eyes of whose heart are obscured, seek the wall of help, and watch there until the sun of righteousness, which the prophet calls the dayspring, rises with healing power, and removes thy spiritual blindness.”

In Botticini’s altarpiece the lizard has not climbed onto a wall, but is making its way toward the Virgin’s throne and seems intent in its concentration on the Infant Jesus: it is the only one of the beings in the whole picture, animal or human, that is looking directly at the Christ child. The lizard clearly fits the spirit, if not the literal description, of the legend in the *Physiologus*, and it is to Botticini’s credit that he did not deem it necessary to include even a fragment of a wall. That Botticini was not always so discriminating is demonstrated by his tondo in the Pitti Palace (Figure 13). There two lizards, one much
smaller than the other, may be seen on the right side of the base of the ornate stone wall surrounding the Virgin’s “enclosed garden.” They seem to be wholly unaware of the group in the foreground and look like mere bits of discursive naturalism with no direct symbolic reference.

An example of a literal rendition of the “sun lizard” seeking a niche in a wall occurs in the Nativity by a follower of Filippo Lippi (Figure 12). Here we find one lizard climbing up the ruined wall of the stable housing the traditional ox and ass, and a second in an opening above. In this case the artist has been content to depict the lizards on a wall, without attempting to connect them in an emotional sense with the seeking of righteousness, as neither appears to be overly aware of the Nativity scene in the foreground.

The last animal to be discussed is the tortoise (Figure 15), shown just below the figure of St. Francis. This creature was very rarely used in devotional art, and, without making an extensive search, I can recall only two other Italian fifteenth-century religious compositions in which it appears. One is a painting of The Holy Women at the Sepulcher by an imitator of Andrea Mantegna (Figures 16, 17), now in the National Gallery, London, and the other is a bronze relief of St. Jerome in Penitence by Francesco di Giorgio (Figures 18, 19), in the National Gallery of Art, Washington. Further evidence of its general absence from Christian art is the fact that a search through the Princeton Index of Christian Art—the comprehensive file of iconographic themes through the fourteenth century—revealed no entries for the tortoise in religious paintings or sculpture.

Although its rarity in religious iconography suggests that the tortoise was relatively unimportant in the idiom of allegory and symbolism, it did have a great variety of meanings. The tortoise was a symbol of reticence and of chastity. In his influential and frequently copied emblem book, Andrea Alciati shows Venus with her foot upon a tortoise (Figure 20), an image derived from Pausanias, a Greek writer of the second century of the Christian era. The accompanying motto is Manere domi, et tacitas decet esse puellas (“Girls should stay at home and be silent”); the emblem signifies that women should remain at home (the tortoise cannot leave its shell) and be chary of speech (the tortoise is a silent animal). Although Alciati’s great compendium of pictorial allusions did not appear until some decades after Botticini’s painting, it may be cited as pertinent because its author compiled from earlier and current usages far more than he invented.

That this figure of Venus connected with the “stay-at-home” tortoise came to be looked upon as a symbol of chastity may be sensed from William Painter’s sixteenth-century collection of classical and romance tales in The Palace of Pleasure. Venus, “her fote vpon a Tortose, [signifies] the duety of a chaste Woman . . . hir feet not straying or wandering . . . to keep hirselfe within the limits of hir owne house.” A similar statement by Painter’s contemporary, the prolific writer Robert Green, tells us that chastity is represented as a woman treading “vpon the Tortose,” keeping to her own house and not straying “abroad with every wanton giglet.” Many other writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries made essentially similar references to the Venus-tortoise icon. A curious elaboration of this concept occurs in French folklore, which regarded the tortoise as an animal with a heart so small as to be almost imperceptible—a suggestion that the maintenance of chastity can be explained by a reduced capacity for love.

The tortoise was also connected symbolically with the Church, although this symbolism was little or seldom expressed. Isidore of Seville, the great Spanish encyclopedist of the sixth and seventh centuries, wrote in his Etymologies that the testudo or tortuga (tortoise) is so called because of the archlike shape of its shell, and that the transverse arch of the church, testudo, was constructed by the ancients after the design of the tortoise’s carapace in order to create an architectural image of heaven, which is similarly convex. In ancient times the name testudo was also applied to the shield carried by soldiers in warfare for protection; while Isidore does not elaborate on this, he usually connects the subjects he
discusses with moral issues, and in this case we may assume the carapace, testudo, would symbolize a shield against evil.

In the medieval bestiaries, and in their ultimate source, the *Physiologus*, there is a creature called the aspedochelone, a monstrous sea tortoise, which sailors were said to mistake for an island. In Guillaume le Clerc’s thirteenth-century bestiary, the mariners moor their ship and build a fire on what they presume is an island. The beast reacts to the heat by plunging down into the ocean, carrying them to their death, and Le Clerc draws this parallel:

In the same way are deceived
The wretched miserable unbelievers
Who in the devil put their trust . . .
With them right down he plunges
Down to hell’s greatest depth,
They are lost who go in there.

The tortoise also conveyed the meaning of steady, if slow, progress. Eugène Rolland mentions three French medieval emblematic devices that make this point: one represents a tortoise climbing a hill, accompanied by the motto *Elle ira enfin sur le haut* (“It will eventually reach the heights”); another shows a tortoise moving slowly, with the legend *Festina lente, avec la patience on vient à bout de toutes choses* (“Make haste slowly; with patience one arrives at the end of all things”); and still another shows a tortoise with the motto *La meilleure maison est elle qu’est à soi* (“The best house is your own”). The last recalls the Venus-tortoise icon, with its admonishment to stay home. It may also be mentioned that the motto *Festina lente* was used on the escutcheon of Pope Gregory XIII (reigned 1572-1585).

The tortoise was also a symbol of wisdom – ever since Pliny it had been considered wise – but, on the other hand, it was also a symbol of evil. This was particularly true of those tortoises that lived in the mud of swamps and streams, and to some extent this interpretation was derived from their unsavory environment. The tortoise connoted heresy, a particularly prevalent and dangerous form of evil. St. Jerome wrote of the animal: *haereticorum gravissima peccata significat, qui suis en coeno et volutebro luti erroribus immorant,*
condemning it as a heretical creature of the gravest errors, dwelling by choice in disgrace and filth and scum like that of a pigsty. In Francesco di Giorgio’s bronze plaque showing St. Jerome in Penitence (Figures 18, 19) the animals probably are meant to suggest the wilderness into which the penitent saint retreated. The tortoise’s position near a scorpion and a snake, however, seems to stress its unfortunate connotations, quite probably as symbolic of the arch evil of heresy with which Jerome connected it.

In fourth-century mosaics in the Cathedral of Aquileia, the tortoise was depicted in combat with a cock. Rudolf Egger interprets this as an early Christian symbol of moral combat, the forces of darkness represented by the tortoise, and those of light represented by the cock, the herald of dawn.

These evil connotations served to connect the tortoise with the idea of death and the tomb, and yet in keeping with the curious ambivalence of the logic of allegory, it was also associated with the concept of emergence from the tomb, a symbol of resurrection. Thus, in The Holy Women at the Sepulcher (Figures 16, 17), the tortoise shown on the bank of a pond is the common pond turtle of Europe, not a true tortoise — an entirely dry-land creature — like the one in Botticini’s painting. It seems likely that the pond turtle conveys both the idea of the tomb (in keeping with Christ’s sepulcher, the focal point of the picture), and the idea of the Resurrection, because this creature hibernates in an underground burrow. Hibernation is symbolically equivalent to death, and emergence from it to resurrection.

The tortoise had still another possible meaning. This was the ancient belief, recorded by late classical writers, that the tortoise, like the ostrich, was able to hatch its eggs merely with its glance. (Pliny, apparently not convinced, reported that “some persons” held this opinion.) Inasmuch as the thought of life hatching out of the egg was, in the case of the ostrich, sometimes looked upon as a sign of resurrection, such a mystical interpretation could have been equally applied to the tortoise. I have not found the tortoise so used in religious art or texts; while this does not mean that it never


17. *Turtle*, detail of Figure 16
occurs, it does suggest that such usage was rare at best.

We can hardly guess which of this abundance of meanings for the tortoise Botticini or his advisors may have had in mind. In its reference to wisdom the tortoise suits the fact that all four of the saints are holding books, tokens of erudition; in its meaning of chastity the tortoise agrees with the ermine edging of the curtains and hence with the Virgin; in its connotation of resurrection it is in harmony with its neighbors the lizard, the goldfinches, and even with St. Scholastica’s dove (the symbol of her ascending soul); in its implication of evil and heresy it belongs with Sylvester’s dragon and Anthony Abbot’s pig. The resemblance of its convex carapace to the transverse arch of a church serves to connect the tortoise symbolically with the Infant Jesus, who was the Church Incarnate.

We may now turn to the plants among which these animals are placed. Even with assistance from two botanical experts, I have not been able to identify many of them. Indeed, small flowering plants were more apt than animals to be included—and even improvised upon—by artists for purely decorative effect. A richly flowering mead, like the

one at the bottom of Botticini’s picture, in itself suggested the world under the influence of the new religion as opposed to the barren environment of the old, a contrast emphasized in a number of paintings where both were shown. The verdant ground around the Virgin’s throne in Botticini’s picture was in keeping with established artistic usage.

Depicted at the lower left corner of the painting, immediately below Benedict, is a clump of thistle, *Centaurea* (Figure 21). Thistles of various kinds were looked upon as medicinal plants, the seeds of which were dried and powdered and used in wine as a remedy for “stone” (either kidney, gall, or bladder stones, as these were not differentiated at that time). Thistles are mentioned in several passages in the Bible, and in medieval writings the spiny nature of these plants caused them occasionally to be compared, and symbolically equated, with the crown of thorns that was placed on Christ’s head before the Crucifixion.

Near the big toe of St. Francis’s right foot is a plantain, *Plantago* (Figure 22). Legend relates that this common, lowly plant grows by preference in places frequented by men and thrives even when trodden upon, thus symbolizing the multitudes who seek the path to righteousness. There was also a belief that every seventh year a plantain may become a bird. Since the bird is an old symbol of the soul, and particularly of its freedom from an earthbound condition, there may be here a suggestion of future bliss from following the right path. This is only a suggestion, as I know of no documentary evidence for this thought in fifteenth-century Italy.

Below the plantain and to the left of the tortoise is a bulbous buttercup, *Ranunculus bulbosus*, a plant that was dedicated in medieval times to the Virgin, and given the name “Mary bud,” according to Richard Folkard. It was also connected with St. Anthony Abbot and was called “St. Anthony’s turnip,” because pigs—the saint’s iconographical symbol—were especially fond of its root.

To the right of the tortoise is a hawkweed, *Hieracium*. The generic name stems from the Greek word *hieras*, “hawk,” and refers to an ancient belief that hawks ate these plants to sharpen their vision. An infusion of hawkweed was used by medieval falconers to strengthen and to clear the eyesight of their hunting birds, and here it may be a reference to the clearer vision resulting from the Christian religion.

Below the tortoise is a little plant that was at times called lady’s mantle, “lady” standing for Our Lady. In the Middle Ages this herb was associated with the Virgin Mary because the lobes of its leaves were thought to resemble the scalloped edges of her mantle. This group of plants, *Leontopodium*, includes as one of its best-known species the much prized Alpine edelweiss, which even today retains a connotation of spotless purity.

Some distance above the dove’s head are six flowers of the daisy, *Bellis* (Cover), used in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as a remedy for aches and pains, and also made into an ointment for wounds, gout, and fevers. Immediately behind the dove’s tail is the coltsfoot, *Tussilago*. So much was it used medically that in France pictures of it were sometimes painted on the doorposts of shops to indicate that these were apothecary establishments.

Close to the goldfinch perched below An-
Anthony Abbot's staff are five blossoms of the bindweed, *Convolvulus* (Cover), one of the wild relatives of the colorful garden morning-glory. This plant was known as "Our Lady's nightcap" because of its cuplike white flowers, which were said to last but a single day. To the right of the bindweed is a clump of ten flowers of the wood anemone, *Anemone nemorosa*, a widespread species formerly used to cure headaches, ague, rheumatic gout, lethargy, and even leprosy.

These are the plants for which I am able to offer reliable identifications. The others have either baffled my botanical advisors or have induced them to arrive at conflicting identifications. It would be good to know what all of them are, but it must be obvious from the nine kinds discussed here that Botticini used very considerable discretion in his choice of plants in this work.

The number and variety of animals and plants in this altarpiece are so unusual that one asks why the artist went to such trouble to include them all, and this makes one search for similar examples with which to compare the painting. Discursive naturalism for its own sake was not so characteristic of Florentine art as it was of north Italian, especially in the paintings of Veronese and Venetian artists. Multitudes of flowers do, however, occur in many Florentine paintings, especially those representing the *hortus conclusus*, or walled garden symbolic of the Virgin, and in pictures by artists from Fra Angelico to Raphael who painted pleasant rural settings for their compositions of sacred personages. It is also true that Benozzo Gozzoli made extensive use of such items—but not in formal, devotional altarpieces—and it is true that Uccello was so interested in birds and other pets that his colleagues bestowed on him the nickname (*uccello* means "bird") by which he is still called. The only subjects in religious art that typically included many animals were St. Francis Preaching to the Birds, the Creation of Animals, Noah's Ark, and St. Jerome in the Wilderness, and all these are so very different from the traditional, almost stereotyped, Madonna and Child altarpiece that we need not be concerned with them here.
I have not been able to find a fifteenth-century Florentine devotional altarpiece similar in zoological richness to this painting of Botticini's. The most comparable one is a Venetian work that could hardly have had any influence on, or have been influenced by Botticini's painting. It is the Madonna and Child Enthroned with Angels by Antonio da Novo (Figure 23), in the church of San Francesco della Vigna in Venice, a very different but roughly contemporaneous picture, in the lower foreground of which is a remarkable assemblage of at least six kinds of birds! The two altarpieces have one thing in common: the animals with which they are so richly adorned are not essential to their main figures or to their design. Yet these creatures were not merely idle whims of the artists; they had significance, they conveyed meanings to the people of fifteenth-century Italy, and their inclusion was probably passed on and approved, if not actually requested, either by those who commissioned the paintings or by the clergy, or by both. A very large part of the audience for whose eyes these works were intended was illiterate; people were accustomed to “read” pictures and probably looked more intently at all parts of the paintings than we are apt to do today. We may see only decoration in paintings that were once understood as richly symbolic.

Looking back over all the details discussed above, it becomes clear that Botticini’s Madonna and Child Enthroned with Saints and Angels presents several uncommon iconographic features. These are the unusual degree of reference to the erudition of the saints; the representation of St. Scholastica in absentia by a white dove; the number of goldfinches and the notable freedom in their treatment; the emphasis on the mystical rather than the literal presentation of the “sun lizard”; the inclusion of the rarely used tortoise; and the symbolically meaningful plants.

Reviewing this array of novelties causes one to wonder whether our minor master, Francesco Botticini, may not have been a more remarkable and alert and interesting artistic personality than has hitherto been suspected. Certainly his place in fifteenth-century Florentine art is not among the leaders, either aesthetically or intellectually. No one would elevate him to the rank of Leonardo, Botticelli, or Pollaiuolo; he has not generally been considered a peer of such lesser men as Domenico Ghirlandaio, Benozzo Gozzoli, Filippino Lippi, or Piero di Cosimo. Yet in this altarpiece he shows unexpected awareness of relatively unusual symbols, and independence and boldness in their pictorial presentation. In the majority of his works he remains a pedestrian figure in the dazzling ranks of artistic geniuses of quattrocento Florence, but in this painting he rises to a much higher level. The Metropolitan's altarpiece may well be Botticini's most revealing work.
It is true that in some early statements about this painting attributions to other artists were suggested, but these were made before current concepts of Botticini's work were adequately formulated. For instance, in 1883, in the album of the Toscanelli Collection, the picture was attributed to Domenico Ghirlandaio, and three years later Wilhelm von Bode gave it to the Master of the Rossi Altarpiece. More recent statements by Raimond van Marle (1931), Bernard Berenson (1963), and Everett Fahy (1967) all confirm the authorship of Botticini, as does Federico Zeri's account of this painting in his forthcoming catalogue of Italian pictures in The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

I am indebted to Elizabeth E. Gardner, Associate Curator of European Paintings of the Metropolitan Museum, for her cooperation in supplying information about the Botticini altarpiece.


23. Madonna and Child Enthroned with Angels, by Antonio da Negroponte (active second half of the xv century), Italian.

Guido Reni’s Painting of the Immaculate Conception

HOWARD HIBBARD  Professor of Art History, Columbia University

Guido Reni is hardly among the Italian painters most popular with today’s art lovers. Yet Reni was once so esteemed that a sensitive contemporary biographer, G. B. Passeri, could write that he was “the noblest, most majestic painter who ever lived – not only in my own opinion, but by common consent.” Reni’s name was long a household word – even the author of Fanny Hill invoked Guido as a synonym for extreme delicacy and refinement of color, and Stendhal found a painting by Reni to have “absolument la sensibilité à la Mozart.” But times were changing and Reni fared poorly with writers whose judgment was charged with Protestant morality. For Ruskin he was prominent in the “School of Errors and Vices,” and not long ago Bernard Berenson wrote, “Our grandfathers were thrilled by Guido Reni’s ecstatic visages, whose silly emptiness now rouses our laughter.” A painter who can earn such praise – and such opprobrium – deserves attention. The Metropolitan Museum’s painting presses the issue to the utmost: Reni’s large Immaculate Conception (Figure 1) is precisely the kind of image that his admirers loved and his detractors loathed. It is also a documented work of historical importance and high quality.

Guido Reni, who was born in Bologna in 1575 and died there in 1642, was first apprenticed to Denis Calvaert, an excellent Flemish mannerist who had settled in Bologna. By the time he was twenty, Reni had moved to the more modern studio of the Carracci, and he was doubtless the most gifted of their pupils. About 1599, shortly after leaving the Carracci studio, he painted his first Assumption of the Virgin (Figure 2), which has all the qualities of the Carracci grand manner. Its power of design makes it clear that in his early twenties Reni already rivaled his teachers. Soon after painting this picture he went to Rome, where he changed his style rapidly, influenced by Caravaggio but also attracted by antique works and their High Renaissance counterparts. Reni prospered; from 1608 until 1614 he was the leading painter in Rome, executing a brilliant series of fresco decorations in the Vatican, the Quirinal, and Sta. Maria Maggiore. His Roman career was crowned by the linear poetry of his famous

1. The Immaculate Conception, by Guido Reni (1575-1642), Italian. 1627. Oil on canvas, 105 x 72½ inches. Victor Wilbour Memorial Fund, 59.32
Aurora painted on the vault of a dining loggia in Cardinal Borghese's garden on the Quirinal hill (Figure 3),

which alone
Is worth a tour to Rome, although
no more a
Remnant were there of the old world's
sole throne.

Byron, Don Juan, xiv:40

And yet, although Reni was widely acclaimed the best painter in Italy, he was not content. Rome had strengthened, deepened, and varied his style, but he seems not to have relished the challenges and competition of life in the art capital of the world. He hated fresco painting, the medium of his great Roman decorations. Other, psychologically complex reasons may also have influenced his retreat from Rome: his neurotic and even psychotic tendencies are well documented by his biographer, Carlo Cesare Malvasia. Reni left late in 1614 to return home and, quite literally, to mother; and Bologna remained his home until his death.

A large Assumption in Genoa (Figure 4), painted in 1616-1617, shows how thoroughly Bolognese Reni again became once he was back. It is a mature and powerful variant of his early, pre-Roman Assumption in Pieve di Cento (Figure 2). The ample figures are less mannered and the composition is if anything spatially simpler than the earlier picture. In both pictures the clouds recede as they rise around the Virgin and change color from gray to gold, a symbol of her transition from earth to heaven.

In the decade between 1617 and 1627 – the years between the Genoa Assumption and the Museum's Immaculate Conception – Reni stopped painting in fresco and increasingly avoided the demands of complex, large-scale composition. In the years around 1620 he painted a number of canvases rich in emotional variety: The Rape of Dejanira (Figure 5) for the Duke of Mantua, and religious pictures for several patrons. These works show a virile style influenced by the great Venetians that may owe something to his competition with the vigorous young Guercino. (In the end, however, it was Guercino who succumbed to Reni, as the visitor to the Museum can see

in Guercino's splendid late work hanging on the wall opposite Reni's painting.) But in the mid-1620s Reni's art underwent a decisive change of direction. He began to concentrate on single figures – Judith, Lucretia, the Magdalen – shown just before or after a climactic event. His ostensible models were Niobids and other antiquities he had studied in Rome.

Among Reni's preferred subjects during these years were the Virgin of the Assumption and of the Immaculate Conception, which he rendered as variants on a single theme. Around 1623, apparently without much transitional experimentation, Reni isolated the Virgin on the clouds from the larger group in the traditional interpretation of the Assumption (Figure 4). The first of a series of similar paintings is the Immaculate Conception in Forlì (Figure 6). It is based on a picture by Denis Calvaert, Reni's first master (Figure 7). The formula was repeated with variations in the Assumption that was set up on the high altar in the parish church of Castelfranco Emilia, just outside Bologna, in May of 1627 (Figure 11).

The Metropolitan's Immaculate Conception is a refined version of the picture in Forlì. It is beyond reasonable doubt the painting ordered by the Spanish ambassador to Rome for the Infanta of Spain and executed during the latter part of 1627, while Reni was temporarily in Rome to paint an altarpiece for St. Peter's. According to a circumstantial account in Malvasia's Felsina pittrice, the ambassador continually pestered Reni for a picture, but Reni would not be hurried. When he finished the ambassador's picture and applied for payment, he was told to wait, whereupon Reni sent the work to Bologna in a fit of pique that was not altogether unusual. This hasty action probably threatened to cause an international incident since relations between Spain and the papacy were already strained. Cardinal Francesco Barberini, nephew of Pope Urban VIII, had to send for the painting and have it carried back. Malvasia's story is confirmed by records in the Barberini archives that document a payment of fourteen scudi in December 1627 to two porters for carrying "il Quadro della Concess[io]ne di Guido Reni" (the picture of the [Immaculate] Conception by Guido Reni) from Bologna to Rome. Presumably the picture was then sent to Spain, where it seems to have aroused little comment; a later account indicates that it was in

the Cathedral of Seville, but old guidebooks do not list it. Early in the nineteenth century the picture is reported to have made its way from Spain to France and thence to an English private collection. Lord Francis Egerton, later Earl of Ellesmere, acquired the Immaculate Conception in the 1830s, and it adorned Bridgewater House for over one hundred years until the Ellesmere sale in 1946. Contrary to persistent rumor, the picture is in decent condition. Its somewhat wrinkled surface was caused by the high heat of a fire set by bombs that hit Bridgewater House during the last war. This unfortunate but relatively minor defect is not noticeable when the picture is viewed from an appropriate distance.

It would be hard to decide which aspect of Reni’s Immaculate Conception – style or content – is more remote from the modern viewer. In any successful work of art the two are, of course, united. Since modern writers tend to discuss Reni’s paintings almost exclusively from a stylistic point of view, however, I shall begin with a note about the subject and meaning of the Museum’s painting.
Whatever else Reni may have been trying to do, he was certainly attempting to paint a picture of the Virgin that would satisfy his own vision of heaven. Reni was devout, and his faith centered on the Virgin. We hear of a miraculous cure performed on Reni by a painting of the Madonna; and Reni’s Assumption in Castelfranco (Figure 11) was the agent of a miracle on the day of its unveiling. All of this is very far from most of our experiences today. To get an idea of the man and the frame of mind in which he painted we cannot do better than to quote Malvasia, who knew and admired him for qualities that would now call for psychiatric treatment:

When he was a little boy, for seven years straight he heard knocking at his door every night of the Christmas season, and . . . for several years he awoke each night to see above his bed a kind of light the size of an egg. . . . He was most devoted to Our Lady the Virgin Mary and in his youth went every Saturday to worship her image on the Monte della Guardia and every evening infallibly, as long as he lived, worshiped in Santa Maria della Vita. For this reason
many believed – I don’t know if with overzealous thought – that since he too was a virgin that she had deigned to appear to him. Certainly no painter of any century knew how to show her so utterly beautiful and modest; and it is unbelievable that anyone ever will again.

Mary’s Immaculate Conception became church dogma only in 1854, but the idea goes back to the Middle Ages. Its popularity derives from Mary’s traditional role as mediator between God and man. Mirella Levi D’Ancona wrote in her pioneering book on the iconography of the Immaculate Conception that Mary embodied the idea of feminine beauty, purity and love and was considered as a complement to the work of the Lord in the salvation of mankind. The first sin had been committed with the help of a woman, and only another woman who had known no sin could be chosen by the Lord to become His Mother and give birth to the instrument of salvation, Christ. The devotion to the Virgin Immaculate is a sublimation of femininity in its two aspects of maidenly purity and motherly love. Every woman may have either of these qualities, but Mary alone of all women embodied both together.

It took centuries – as may perhaps be imagined – for theologians to settle the controversy over how, and in what sense, Mary was Immaculate, that is, free from original sin at her conception, as opposed to her sinless conception of Christ. Abelard had identified Mary with the loved one in the Song of Songs: “Thou art all beautiful, my love, and there is no spot in thee,” but belief in Mary’s Immaculate Conception, with its delicate combination of popular credulity and theological nicety, was not favored by the learned doctors of Rome. Although popular demand had finally forced grudging papal acknowledgment of the existence of a philosophical problem late in the fifteenth century, the subject might never have had much vogue in art had not the Protestant Reformation made Mariolatry an issue and the “Immacolata” a point of pride. The idea of the Immaculate Conception was particularly popular in Spain, where it had been the subject of an enormous controversy in the second decade of the seventeenth century. Various Spanish factions pressured the pope to rule on the status of the concept, but no definitive judgment was laid down, despite a noticeable preference for the wording “The Conception of the Immaculate Virgin” over “The Immaculate Conception of the Virgin.” Nevertheless, under Urban VIII Barberini (1623-1644) there was some evidence of papal indulgence for the view that Mary had been immaculately conceived: the Barberini subsidized the new Capuchin church dedicated to “Santa Maria della Concezione” and Urban VIII even laid the cornerstone late in 1626. After this date Roman artists increasingly painted the subject: Lanfranco, Poussin, and others produced versions late in the 1620s.

Back in the mid-sixteenth century, early in the Counter Reformation, artists were still not sure how to depict the Immaculate Conception. Giorgio Vasari gives us an explicit account of his own troubles in 1540, when he first painted the subject (Figure 8). It was no easy matter, he wrote, and, after seeking the advice of learned men he finally painted it in this way:

In the middle of the picture I put the tree of original sin and at its roots, as the first sinners against God’s commandments, I showed Adam and Eve, nude and bound. Then I showed Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, David, and succeeding kings – all tied by both hands with the exception of Samuel and St. John the Baptist, who are tied by only one hand since they were sanctified in the womb. Wound around the trunk I showed the old serpent, and since he is half human, his hands are tied behind his back. Above, the glorious Virgin rests one foot on his head, the other on a moon; she is clothed with the sun and crowned with twelve stars. The Virgin is held in air by a glory of nude angels, illuminated by the rays coming from her. The rays pass through the leaves of the tree and give light to the captives, seeming to loose their bonds by their virtue and grace. In the sky at the top of the picture are two putti holding banners on which is written:
Such a picture, so explicit in its theological complexity but so confusing as an image, was not apt to attract the faithful. During the next half century painters simplified and refined the iconography, and the subject began to take on an important role in Counter-Reformation art (see Figure 10). Mary's representation as the Immacolata became stabilized as the great wonder in heaven revealed to St. John on Patmos: “A woman robed with the sun, beneath her feet the moon, and on her head a crown of twelve stars.” The identification with Mary was inevitable since John goes on to say that “She gave birth to a male child, who is destined to rule all nations.” These attributes became standard for the Immaculate Virgin, and the Madonna was often shown Immaculate even when seen in a vision of a different sort (Figure 9).

In its formal representation the Immaculate Conception became the counterpart of the Assumption: one shows Mary before her life on earth, the other after it. This accounts for the similarity in iconography between Reni’s Assuntas and his Immacolatas. Even the same scriptural allusions served for both – on the frame below Reni’s Assunta in Castelfranco Emilia is inscribed a passage from Judith: *Tu honorificentia populi nostri*; these words are repeated during the mass for December 8, the feast of the Immaculate Conception: “Thou art the glory of Jerusalem, thou art the joy of Israel, thou art the honor of our people. . . . Thou art all fair, Mary, and there is in thee no stain.” Reni’s iconic solution became a standard for later artists to follow. He reduced both the Assumption and the Immaculate Conception to a minimum of external references and symbols, refining the worship of Mary to its essentials.

In the Museum’s painting Mary stands on the crescent moon, hands pressed together and eyes raised in adoration. (The upward gaze, a constant in Reni’s religious works, derives from Raphael’s St. Cecilia, a picture Reni had copied as a young man and which was then,

Cloud pictures—again derived from Raphael. In the painting in Forlì (Figure 6), Mary is closely surrounded by the clouds and angels, but in the Castelfranco Assumption (Figure 11) the space around Mary was widened to make room for her expansive gesture. This more extensive space is kept in the New York painting even though the gesture is changed.

The deep golden light that plays so large a role in all these paintings by Reni seems to be an equivalent to the traditional gold ground of medieval religious panels. It emphasizes the other medievalizing qualities of the Metropolitan's picture: its lack of depth, its formal, symbolic composition, its insistence on threes and twelves.

Like the arias of an opera (an art that was rapidly developing at just this time), Reni's new use of color beginning in the mid-1620s was embroidery—the enrichment of a theme. Abandoning the Venetian warmth of his pictures done a few years earlier (Figure 5, for example), he adopted an increasingly blond tonality, using colors that are bright and clear on the larger forms, delicate in subordinate areas, sometimes elusively changing. The Virgin traditionally wears intense blue and red: here her deep blue mantle falls over a pinkish-violet robe. During these years Reni began to push the close harmony and differentiation of related hues farther than any contemporary painter was willing to go, as can be seen in the light blue of the girdle against the Virgin's robe and in the pale drapery of the angel at the left, where shadows become the lightest of violets and the flesh reflects greenish tones. This cool and fragile harmony of blues, yellows, and greens is set off violently by the hot gold of the glowing empyrean behind. The uniquely subtle color contrasts in the drapery are accompanied by a treatment of flesh that becomes brittle and even porcelaneous in its delicately precise finish, without either the human warmth and accessibility of Reni's earlier figures or the softly transparent, broader handling of his latest works. The Museum's painting is perhaps the apogee of this peculiarly remote phase in Reni's quest for visionary perfection.

Reni's tendency to stabilize and then elab-
orate iconographic themes is continued in two final Assumptions. One of these (Figure 12), sold by Reni in 1637, is a free version of the Castelfranco picture. Although painted by an assistant or pupil, it must have been designed by Reni, since the drapery foreshadows his ultimate interpretation, which is now in Munich (Figure 13). Finished in 1642, this picture is apparently the last to have been sent from Reni’s studio before his death. It closes the series begun almost forty-five years earlier with the altarpiece in Pieve di Cento (Figure 2). In the Munich picture Mary emerges like a Venus from her cowrie shell of blue drapery. The gracious, boneless angels pay homage to Reni’s master Ludovico Carracci, but the mellifluous fall of drapery is his own. Painted on silk, an innovation that Reni hoped would give his pictures added permanence, this great cantilena is shaped by the loosely brushed outlines of his late manner. Lacking the exquisitely diaphanous coloration of the Metropolitan’s Immacolata, without interest in textures, it combines the blond tonality and the clear impact of the Metropolitan’s painting with a freedom of movement that was noticeably missing in the archaizing pictures of 1627.

As we look back on Reni’s career, he seems to have been destined to develop a personal and idiosyncratic style that could not have been pursued in the official environment of Rome. His brief return there in 1627, during which he produced our Immacolata, must have confirmed his sense of estrangement from the Roman scene. At the very moment of the birth of Roman baroque painting Reni was undergoing his most profound stylistic crisis, which he met by reviving a heraldic and relatively linear style. If we compare his Rape of Dejanira of 1621 with the Metropolitan’s picture (Figures 5 and 1), we see the amazing change of direction in his art, which took him from a commanding position in the neo-Venetian tendency to a style that seems almost its antithesis. The same contrast can also be found between the Immacolata and the freely brushed, complex, recessional, and asymmetrical art of Nicholas Poussin and Andrea Sacchi (see Figure 14), who were working in Rome in this very period. While these younger men were enlivening painting through the invigorating study of Annibale Carracci, the Venetians, and antiquity, Reni turned to the rigid compositions of Scipione Pulzone and the feminine grace of Calvaert. Reni’s introverted attention to the purification of his art produced the increasingly blond tonality that may have exerted an influence on painters of the 1630s in Rome; Reni himself must have been out of sympathy with Roman painting in those years. After painting our Immaculate Conception he destroyed what little he had begun of his altarpiece in St. Peter’s, refounded his advance, and went back to Bologna—apparently for good.

But it would be misleading to leave the

matter there and say that Reni left the mainstream and reverted to an earlier style. Pictures such as ours are extraordinarily eloquent above an altar, with far greater immediacy and mesmerizing power than the machines of Reni’s previous period. In this Immacolata, Mary’s mouth, like those of the angels, is partially open, as if voicing a prayer or supplication. The revelation of human warmth and frailty—the humanization of the divine—is a characteristic of seventeenth-century art and Reni was one of the innovators. Reni’s life-size figures stand in a shallow space that helps to induce an empathetic response at once human and religious. Gianlorenzo Bernini, the presiding genius of the Roman baroque, admired Reni’s figures and even appropriated them for his own use. (There was a lively give-and-take between painters and sculptors of the period; Bernini’s sculpture has always been considered primarily pictorial, but among the painters only Reni regularly produced figures that can be thought of as painted statuary.)

The Metropolitan’s picture may even show an influence in the other direction: Mary’s silhouette is more agitated and irregular than that of the immediately previous Assumption (compare Figures 1 and 11). The change may derive from Bernini’s statue of St. Bibiana, which had been set up in the church of that name during the previous year (Figure 15). Nevertheless, the differences between their styles are considerable: Reni’s later art is iconographically traditional and even iconic; Bernini’s became increasingly novel and dynamic. Before Bernini’s mature works, the viewer responds with an overwhelming personal identification with a religious event, whereas Reni’s later works evoke no such reaction. Reni’s figures, never sensual, became increasingly flaccid, impersonal, and removed from reality by their grace and unnatural color.
The historian, noting a surge in the 1620s toward what we now identify as “the baroque,” may be tempted to call any other tendency “classical” or “classicizing,” but this is not a good label for the later Reni. Even the archbaroque painter Pietro da Cortona was far more concerned with archaeology than Reni had ever been. The contrast between Reni’s Immacolata (Figure 1) and a sculpture by a vital artist using truly antique inspiration (Figure 17) makes the point. An intermediate position, parallel with Reni’s, was taken by Reni’s younger compatriot, Alessandro Algardi. Algardi’s first major work in Rome, a Mary Magdalen (Figure 16), shows the extent of his submission to Bernini at a time when his own ideal was still very close to that of Reni’s Immacolata; the resemblance of the heads (Figures 16 and 1) is particularly close.

Looking around the gallery in which the Museum’s Immaculate Conception is hung, we are struck by the relative emptiness of Reni’s large picture, which a number of art lovers may tend to equate with vapidity. Even in the Bolognese galleries his pictures look depopulated. Only Reni brought amor vacui to such a pitch, and his paintings are for just that reason highly potent images with great carrying power. The Museum’s picture is painted in what was called by contemporary biographers Reni’s “second manner”; although individual works in this style were highly prized it was generally agreed that Reni’s earlier style was better. The critics preferred paintings that seemed to develop the stylistic heritage of the Carracci and found it hard to understand Reni’s lonely search for ineffable loveliness. Their opinions have been echoed ever since—and we may admit that most of the blood has been squeezed from Reni’s art in this unearthly phase. From the
beginning, Reni’s paintings had been suffused with a grace and elegance that was the despair of his rivals. Unlike Annibale Carracci, who had made a conscious and successful stylistic break with the mannerist style (such as Calvaert’s painting in Figure 7), Reni never lost his feeling for the poetry of the maniera. While he had accommodated himself brilliantly to the demands made upon him in Rome, he returned with obvious relief to a less adventurous artistic milieu and ultimately produced pictures like the Metropolitan’s that are his own versions of an older tradition. When we discuss Reni’s career from this point of view, it becomes clear that his later style is the purest expression of his individual genius, the logical result of his personal stylistic predilections.

Reni’s growing concern with the abstract aspects of art and of religious representation made him more universal than many of his Roman contemporaries, but the timelessness of his compositions raises an aesthetic question that must be faced. Reni’s reputation fell faster and farther than that of any other artist, at least in part because of the perennial suitability of his devotional pictures for reproduction and worship. His pietistic images were loved for their almost hieratic display of the figure in an easily understood composition. They were easy to reproduce, endlessly copied, and ultimately found their place as the typical religious chromo. Perhaps no artist has suffered so long or so unfairly for the cruelties of his imitators. Even today one occasionally discovers a Harnett-like still life nailed to a wall, made up of a calendar, odd notes, and a Reni Madonna reproduced in color. Such broad devotional appeal illuminates one side of his greatness, but this dangerous virtue should not blind us to the artistic character of Reni’s paintings. The essence of his mature genius is a uniquely refined handling, a rarified coloration, an almost rococo tonality found only in the originals that cannot be even minimally invested in the endless copies and variations that retain everything but the quality of Reni’s art.


NOTES AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS


I am deeply grateful to Marilyn A. Lavin for informing me about her discovery of important documents in the Barberini archive related to the affairs of Reni. These papers are in the Vatican Library (Armadio 42, *Cardinal Francesco Barberini, Mastro di Casa Bartolomeo Paserini—1627-1631*, fol. 38a, December 1627: "Alle due facchini che han' portato da Bologna a Roma sopra le spalle il Quadro della Concezione di Guido Reni como per sua fedez'one di Guido Reni come per sua fedez'one di Guido Reni como per sua fede f'one de la con l' [...] e ciò di parola del [signo] Filomar[ino]." Armadio 86, *Cardinal Francesco Barberini, Libro Mastro A*, 1623-1629, fol. CLXXXIX, 31 December 1627: "v. 14 per portatura d'un quadro di Guido Reni fatto portare da facchini da Bologna, come per le liste . . . ").

W. Buchanan in *Memoirs of Painting . . .*, I (London, 1824), refers to an Assumption by Reni that is apparently the Metropolitan's Immacolata. The Immacolata was published by G. Fiocco in *Arte antica e moderna*, I (1958), pp. 388 ff. (with color reproduction), and has been excellently catalogued for the Museum by Federico Zeri, whose manuscript I was graciously allowed to consult together with reports from the Conservation Department. The Witt Library, Courtauld Institute of Art, London, has a photograph of the painting before restoration. I am grateful to Otto Kurz and Denis Mahon for information about the picture, and I was privileged to examine it and discuss its condition and authenticity with Mr. Mahon in the Metropolitan Museum.


For Pulzone, see F. Zeri, *Pittura e controriforma* (Turin, 1957).

For Calvaert, see S. Bergmans, *Denis Calvaert* (Académie Royale de Belgique. Classe des Beaux-Arts, Mémoires, IV, 2), (Brussels, 1934).

JUST AS THIS ISSUE of the *Bulletin* was going to press, the Museum's Board of Trustees and staff received with great sadness the news of the death of Robert Lehman. Mr. Lehman was one of the Museum's most active and interested Trustees. Elected to that post in 1941, he was the Board's Vice-President from 1948 to 1968 and Chairman of the Board from 1967 until his death. Because of his generous contributions, Mr. Lehman was elected a Benefactor in 1949. His many significant gifts include paintings by Cranach, Tintoretto, and Vuillard. As a member of the Purchasing Committee and as Visiting Trustee to the Department of European Paintings, Mr. Lehman was valued as a true connoisseur and advisor. Concerned as well with the administrative aspects of the Museum, Mr. Lehman served on the Finance Committee and the Executive Committee.

In a statement issued at the time of his death, Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., President, and Thomas P. F. Hoving, Director, said that Mr. Lehman was "one of the finest Trustees in the Museum's history, exemplifying enthusiasm and interest in the affairs of this institution and keen sensitivity and zest in what was perhaps his favorite activity in life, the collecting of great works of art."
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Decorative arts, see Western European arts and American Wing
Departmental reports (1968-1969), 53-98
Drucler, James David. A Statue of the Composer Grétry by Jean-Baptiste Stouf, 377-387
Dillon, C. Douglas
  Elected President of the Board of Trustees, T. P. F. Hoving, 189-190
  Second Hundred Years, 369-376
Director’s Choice, T. P. F. Hoving, 202-226
Djumati Enamels: A Twelfth-Century Litany of Saints, M. E. Frazer, 240-251
Documents in Gold, K. R. Brown, 232-239
Donors, list of (1968-1969), 103-112
Drapar, James David. A Statue of the Composer Grétry by Jean-Baptiste Stouf, 377-387
Drawings
European
  Flemish Drawings and Prints of the Seventeenth Century, exhibition, 227-228
  Outstanding Recent Accessions, 398-399
Far Eastern
  Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 155
Egyptian art
  Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 149
ENAMELS

Byzantine

Djumati Enamels: A Twelfth-Century Litany of Saints, M. E. Frazer, 240-251

European

Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 156

MEDIEVAL

Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 154

Director’s Choice, T. P. F. Hoving, 210-211

ENVIRONMENT IS AN ART, exhibition, E. Kaufmann, jr., 321-330

ETTINGHAUSEN, Richard. Islamic Carpets: The Joseph V. McMullan Collection, exhibition, 401-403

EXHIBITIONS

Art of the Medieval Blacksmith, J. M. Hoffeld, 161-173

Chartres, The Year 1200: The Metropolitan on Location, H. Stahl, 293-299

Flemish Drawings and Prints of the Seventeenth Century, 227-228

How to Look at Art, traveling exhibition, J. Norman, 191-201

Islamic Carpets: The Joseph V. McMullan Collection, 401-432

List of (1968-1969), 99-101

Nineteenth-Century America: Craftsmanship, Past and Present, M. Johnson, 365-368


“Valuables and Ornamental Items”: The Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, 147-160

Year 1200, note, F. Deuchler, 229-231

EYE Opener: How to Look at Art, traveling exhibition, J. Norman, 191-201

FABULOUS FAKES, 390-393

FAR EASTERN art

Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 155

Director’s Choice, T. P. F. Hoving, 214-215

FINANCIAL statements for the year ended June 30, 1969, 124-128

FLEMISH Drawings and Prints of the Seventeenth Century, exhibition, 227-228

FOOTNOTES to the Painted Page: The Iconography of an Altarpiece by Botticini, H. Friedmann, 1-17

FORSYTH, William H. Madonnas of the Rhone-Meuse Valleys, 252-261

FRAZER, Margaret English. The Djumati Enamels: A Twelfth-Century Litany of Saints, 240-251

FREScoes

GREEK and Roman

Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 149

Director’s Choice, T. P. F. Hoving, 202-207

GRÉTÉRY, André-Ernst-Modeste. A Statue of the Composer by Jean-Baptiste Stouf, J. D. Draper, 377-387

GUIDO Reni’s Painting of the Immaculate Conception. H. Hibbard, 18-32

HAYWARD, Jane. Medieval Stained Glass from St. Leonhard in Lavanttal at The Cloisters, 291-292

HERRICK, Daniel K. Report of the Treasurer for the year ended June 30, 1969, 122-123

HIBBARD, Howard. Guido Reni’s Painting of the Immaculate Conception, 18-32

HOFFELD, Jeffrey M. The Art of the Medieval Blacksmith, exhibition, 161-173

HÔTEL de Varengeville Room and the Room from the Palais Paar: A Magnificent Donation, J. Parker, 129-146

HOUGHTON, Arthur A., Jr.

Elected Chairman of the Board of Trustees, T. P. F. Hoving, 189-190


HOVING, Thomas P. F.

Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., and C. Douglas Dillon elected Chairman and President of the Board of Trustees, 189-190

Director’s Choice, 202-226

Islamic Carpets: The Joseph V. McMullan Collection, exhibition note, 401


“Valuables and Ornamental Items”: The Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition note, 147-148

How to Look at Art, traveling exhibition, J. Norman, 191-201

HUSBAND, Timothy. A Beautiful Madonna in the Cloisters Collection, 278-290

INDEX to Bulletins of 1905-1942 Published, 400

ISLAMIC art

Islamic Carpets: The Joseph V. McMullan Collection, exhibition, 401-432

Outstanding Recent Accessions, 395

ISLAMIC Carpets: The Joseph V. McMullan Collection, exhibition, 401-432

IVOAbES

EGYPTIAN

Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 149

Medieval

Sir Gawayne and the Three White Knights, H. Nickel, 174-182

JOHNSON, Marilyn. Craftsmanship, Past and Present, exhibition, 365-368
KAUFMANN, Edgar, jr. Environment Is an Art, exhibition, 321-330
KUEFFNER, Nancy. Leaping the Century Gap, 388-389
LEAPING the Century Gap, N. Kueffner, 388-389
LEHMAN, Robert. obituary, 32
LENDERS, list of (1968-1969), 112
LOANS, institutions and organizations receiving (1968-1969), 113

McMULLAN Collection, Islamic Carpets: The Joseph V., exhibition, 401-432
MADONNAS of the Rhone-Meuse Valleys, W. H. Forsyth, 252-261
MANUSCRIPTS
Medieval
  Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 148
  MARVIN, “Valuables and Ornamental Items”: The Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley, exhibition, 147-160
MEDIEVAL art
  Art of the Medieval Blacksmith, exhibition, J. M. Hoffeld, 161-173
  Beautiful Madonna in the Cloisters Collection, T. Husband, 278-290
  Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 148, 152-154
  Director’s Choice, T. P. F. Hoving, 208-213
  Dijumati Enamels: A Twelfth Century Litany of Saints, M. E. Frazer, 240-251
  Documents in Gold, K. R. Brown, 232-239
  Madonnas of the Rhone-Meuse Valleys, W. H. Forsyth, 252-261
  Medieval Stained Glass from St. Leonhard in Lavanttal at The Cloisters, J. Hayward, 291-292
  Needlework by Nuns: A Medieval Religious Embroidery, B. Young, 262-277
  Sir Gawayne and the Three White Knights, H. Nickel, 174-182
  Year 1200, exhibition note, F. Deuchler, 229-231
MEDIEVAL Stained Glass from St. Leonhard in Lavanttal at The Cloisters, J. Hayward, 291-292
MEMBERSHIP by classes (1968-1969), 102
METALWORK
Ancient Near Eastern
  Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 150-151
  Outstanding Recent Accessions, 394-395
Byzantine
  Documents in Gold, K. R. Brown, 232-239
Medieval
  Art of the Medieval Blacksmith, exhibition, J. M. Hoffeld, 161-173
  Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 152
  Director’s Choice, T. P. F. Hoving, 208-209

METROPOLITAN Museum of Art
Architecture
  Renovation of the Great Hall, 362-364
  Temples of the Arts: Museum Architecture in Nineteenth-Century America, J. Cantor, 331-354
Centennial celebration
  Centennial Tours. J. Schwarz, 304-307
  Leaping the Century Gap, N. Kueffner, 388-389
  Nineteenth-Century America, exhibition, 365-368
  Rise of an American Architecture, exhibition, 321-330
  Second Hundred Years, C. D. Dillon, 369-376
  Year 1200, exhibition, 229-231, 293-303
Reproductions workshop
  Fabulous Fakes, 390-393
Traveling exhibitions
  How to Look at Art, J. Norman, 191-201

NEAR Eastern art, see Ancient Near Eastern art and Islamic art
Needlework by Nuns: A Medieval Religious Embroidery, B. Young, 262-277
Nicholas of Verdun. The Year 1200, exhibition note, F. Deuchler, 229-231
Nickel, Helmut
  Armorers’ Shop, 183-188
  Sir Gawayne and the Three White Knights, 174-182
Nineteenth-Century America, exhibition. Craftsmanship, Past and Present, M. Johnson, 365-368
Norman, Jane. How to Look at Art, traveling exhibition, 191-201

OUTSTANDING Recent Accessions, 394-399

PAINTINGS
American
  Outstanding Recent Accessions, 399
European
  Director’s Choice, T. P. F. Hoving, 220-226
  Footnotes to the Painted Page: The Iconography of an Altarpiece by Botticini, H. Friedmann, 1-17
  Guido Reni’s Painting of the Immaculate Conception, H. Hibbard, 18-32
  PALAIS Paar, The Hôtel de Varengeville Room and the Room from the, A Magnificent Donation, J. Parker, 129-146
  PARKER, James. The Hôtel de Varengeville Room and the Room from the Palais Paar: A Magnificent Donation, 129-146
  Primitive art. Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 158-159
PRINTS
European
  Flemish Drawings and Prints of the Seventeenth Century exhibition, 227-228
  Outstanding Recent Accessions, 398-399
RENÉ, Guido. Painting of the Immaculate Conception, H. Hibbard, 18-32

RENOSOFTATION of the Great Hall, 362-364


ROSENFELD, Arthur. Architects and Museums, 355-361

RUGS

Islamic

Islamic Carpets: The Joseph V. McMullan Collection, exhibition, 401-432

SCHWARTZ, Jane. The Centennial Tours, 304-307

Sculpture

American

Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 160

European

Statue of the Composer Grétry by Jean-Baptiste Stouf, J. D. Draper, 377-387

Far Eastern

Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 155

Director’s Choice, T. P. F. Hoving, 214-215

Greek and Roman

Director’s Choice, T. P. F. Hoving, 202-203, 206-207

Medieval

Beautiful Madonna in the Cloisters Collection, T. Husband, 278-290

Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 153

Director's Choice, T. P. F. Hoving, 212-213

Madonnas of the Rhone-Meuse Valleys, W. H. Forsyth, 252-261

Primitive

Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 158-159

Second Hundred Years, C. D. Dillon, 369-376

Sir Gawayne and the Three White Knights, H. Nickel, 174-182

Staff, list of (1968-1969), 116-121

STAHLE, Harvey. Chartres, The Year 1200: The Metropolitan on Location, exhibition, 293-299

Stained glass

Medieval

Medieval Stained Glass from St. Leonhard in Lavanttal at The Cloisters, J. Hayward, 291-292

Statue of the Composer Grétry by Jean-Baptiste Stouf, J. D. Draper, 377-387

Stouf, A Statue of the Composer Grétry by Jean-Baptiste, J. D. Draper, 377-387

TEMPLES of the Arts: Museum Architecture in Nineteenth-Century America, J. Cantor, 331-354

Textiles

Medieval

Needlework by Nuns: A Medieval Religious Embroidery, B. Young, 262-277


TREASURER’S report for the year ended June 30, 1969, D. K. Herrick, 122-123

TRUSTEES

Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., and C. Douglas Dillon elected Chairman and President of the Board of Trustees, T. P. F. Hoving, 189-190

Lehman, Robert. obituary, 32

List of (1968-1969), 114

Visiting Committees (1968-1969), 115

“VALUES and Ornamental Items”: The Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 147-160

Visiting Committees (1968-1969), 115

WESTERN European arts

Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Alastair Bradley Martin, exhibition, 156-157

Director’s Choice, T. P. F. Hoving, 216-219

Hôtel de Varengeville Room and the Room from the Palais Paar: A Magnificent Donation, J. Parker, 129-146

Statue of the Composer Grétry by Jean-Baptiste Stouf, J. D. Draper, 377-387

WILKINSON, W. D. Works of Art: Use Extreme Care, 300-303

Woodwork

European

Director’s Choice, T. P. F. Hoving, 216-217

Hôtel de Varengeville Room and the Room from the Palais Paar: A Magnificent Donation, J. Parker, 129-146

Works of Art: Use Extreme Care, W. D. Wilkinson, 300-303

WRIGHTSMAN rooms: The Hôtel de Varengeville Room and the Room from the Palais Paar: A Magnificent Donation, J. Parker, 129-146

YEAR 1200, exhibition

Chartres, The Year 1200: The Metropolitan on Location, H. Stahl, 293-299

Note, F. Deuchler, 229-231

Works of Art: Use Extreme Care, W. D. Wilkinson, 300-303
