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Preface and Acknowledgments

The quality of the paintings discussed and analyzed in this volume of the catalogue of the Robert Lehman Collection is inverse to their limited number. The forty-two paintings reviewed here in the light of their historical significance are marked also by their diversity; they range in date from the mid-fifteenth to the end of the eighteenth century, and they were created by artists working in France, the Netherlands, Central Europe, Spain, and Great Britain – the oltralpi according to the Italians (whose works are the subject of Volume I of this series). Philip and Robert Lehman were not trying to encapsulate all facets of the art of continental Europe and Great Britain, but instead selected a few remarkable works that would exemplify major aspects of the art of painting during this period.

Five paintings stand out from the fifteenth century. Civic achievement and self-confidence seem fundamental themes in the Goldsmith in His Shop (No. 12), painted by Petrus Christus in 1449. Contemporaneous with Christus’ Goldsmith but representative of totally different cultural sensitivities and ambitions is the Virgin and Child with a Donor Presented by Saint Jerome (No. 6), here analyzed as to its physical makeup and historical origin and convincingly placed in Bavaria or Austria. Although the artist who made it remains unidentified, the painting undoubtedly is one of the major works made in central Europe in the mid-fifteenth century. By placing the sitter before a landscape, a formula that had lasting repercussions in Italian as well as Northern art, Hans Memling conveyed the prestige of the wealthy merchant or banker who was the subject of his Portrait of a Young Man (No. 13), here dated to about 1475–80. The Annunciation (No. 14), one of Memling’s finest works, was painted about half a decade later. Near the end of the century, Jean Hey portrayed the young Margaret of Austria, using Memling’s idea of a landscape backdrop but adding a large dividing wall behind the sitter that lends monumentality to the composition. As a portrait of a future leading political figure in her youth by one of the greatest artists of the time, Margaret of Austria (No. 3) is rightly considered a milestone in the history of French painting, and in the history of portraiture.

Already a portent of the sixteenth century is a second major work from France, although by an artist who was probably trained in the Netherlands. The Virgin and Child of about 1500 (No. 4) is one of the few known paintings by the artist called the Master of Saint Giles. His manner of painting and the shape and sophisticated iconography of the Christ Child, here clarified for the first time, demonstrate that he was among the great artists in western Europe at the turn of the century. Though they are only part of a larger work of art, the wings of a triptych Gerard David painted about 1510 (Nos. 20, 21) represent the best of Bruges painting before the economic and artistic decline of the city later in the century. Hans Holbein’s small and much appreciated later version of his portrait of the great humanist Erasmus of Rotterdam and Venus with Cupid the
Honey Thief of about 1530 and the Nymph of the Spring of about 1550 by Lucas Cranach father and son (Nos. 9–11) are other high points of the sixteenth century.

The pattern repeats itself in the seventeenth-century paintings in the collection, which are few in number but of the highest quality. Opening the century is El Greco's Saint Jerome as Scholar (No. 38), which can be seen as the embodiment of both religious fervor and human dignity. From the close of the century is one of Rembrandt's most impressive late works (No. 31), a sophisticated and sensitive portrayal of his fellow artist Gerard de Lairesse that cannot help but elicit viewers' compassion.

Philip and Robert Lehman set high standards for the acquisition of old master paintings, but they also were attracted by the appeal of the subjects depicted. The eighteenth century is represented here by three portraits as human as they are elegant. All three are products of a special relationship between artist and patron. The Condesa de Altamira and Her Daughter, María Agustina (No. 40) records Goya's connections with the influential Altamira family. George Romney’s Lady Lemon (No. 41) was commissioned by the sitter’s husband, Sir William Lemon of Cornwall. And William Fraser of Reelig (No. 42) was the second in a series of portraits Sir Henry Raeburn painted of Edward Satchwell Fraser and his children.

When the idea for a catalogue of the Robert Lehman Collection was implemented in about 1980, it was fortunate that the most accomplished authorities were willing to undertake the scholarly assessment of the works of art in each volume. The forty-two paintings in this volume have been catalogued by seven authors. Additionally, in accordance with the original plan, the Paintings Conservation Department of The Metropolitan Museum of Art carried out investigations of the condition and technical structure of all the paintings. Due to the complexities of multiple authorship, much time has passed since this volume was originally conceived. Those authors who submitted their sections rapidly needed later to review their texts and update them to accommodate recent developments in art-historical interpretation and, particularly, in technical research. Because of its growing sophistication, the investigation of the material structure and other aspects of works of art not visible to the naked eye has assumed greater significance in recent years, and is increasingly requiring the reexamination of historical issues. I am grateful to the authors who dutifully completed their entries early for their willingness to revise them (one author in fact did so twice) to reflect as much present knowledge as possible.

A special word is needed about the five entries written by Professor Charles Sterling. He was the first author to complete his section of the volume, in 1983. With his concurrence, arrangements were then made for the incorporation of the results of technical investigations carried out by Maryan Ainsworth, Senior Research Fellow in the Paintings Conservation Department. Sterling's death in 1991 prevented him from reviewing most of the results of these investigations. Fortunately, Ainsworth was willing not only to provide her technical findings, as she had for other sections of the book, but also to incorporate them into Sterling's texts and update the entries accordingly. While reviewing the paintings' material structure by various technological processes that included
infrared reflectography and X radiography, she discovered features that provided insights into their subject matter and chronology. In the case of Jean Hey's Margaret of Austria (No. 3), Ainsworth's identification of the sitter's jewelry adds to our understanding of the painting and allows a hypothesis about a lost pendant. In the Virgin and Child by the Master of Saint Giles (No. 4), she recognized the object the Christ Child holds as a dragonfly, symbol of his triumph over the devil. In these and other instances, Ainsworth's additions amplify Sterling's interpretations. I am convinced that Charles Sterling would have appreciated them, and I am grateful to Maryan Ainsworth for having applied her intelligence and her time to a task that in essence was not hers.

As usual, all the texts needed to be edited. Even if from the start a minimum of consistency is sought, when no less than seven authors are involved unacceptable differences are bound to be numerous, and there are other pitfalls authors are not even aware of. Sue Potter, with the help of Jean Wagner, Mary Gladue, and others, edited the volume with her usual conscientious precision mitigated by a forgiving understanding of idiosyncrasies and also a sense of humor.

A project like this is the product not of just one individual (or in this case seven individuals) but of an entire community. On behalf of the Robert Lehman Foundation and Laurence B. Kanter, Curator of the Robert Lehman Collection, I want to thank the authors, the directors and staffs of the Paintings Conservation and Editorial Departments at the Metropolitan, and all those in libraries, museums, and other institutions who have facilitated the publication of this volume. Manus Gallagher, Francesca Valerio, and Monique van Dorp of the Robert Lehman Collection were especially helpful. The project has also been aided greatly by Ph.D. candidates at the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, who contributed in various ways to the cataloguing of these paintings: Carina Frycklund, Maria F. Saffiotti, Mariët Westermann, Mary Brantl, Jeff Schrader, Jan Leja, and especially Nancy Minty, whose work on the entries for the seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish paintings was invaluable. With his perceptive historical and textual emendation of the entries, the late Sydney Freedberg improved this volume as he did the earlier books in the series.

In discussing and illustrating some of the finest works of art Philip and Robert Lehman acquired and made available to others to enjoy and study, this catalogue honors their perspicacity and generosity. It also is fundamental for the advancement of the history of art, as any new interpretation of a work of art must start from a solid knowledge of the object itself and of the scholarship that has gone before. Art history owes a debt of gratitude to the Robert Lehman Foundation and its board, particularly its secretary, Paul C. Guth, for arranging and facilitating this research and its publication in the volumes of the Robert Lehman Collection Scholarly Catalogue Project.

Egbert Haeremamp-Begemann

*John Langeloth Loeb Professor Emeritus of the History of Art,*

*Institute of Fine Arts, New York University*

*Coordinator of the Robert Lehman Collection Scholarly Catalogue Project*
NOTE TO THE READER

Within each of the six sections of the catalogue, the entries are arranged chronologically. The paintings have been measured through the center; height precedes width. "Inscription and "inscribed" refer to comments, notes, words, and numbers presumably written by the artist who made the painting; "annotation" and "annotated" refer to the same when added by another hand. In the provenance sections, names and locations of dealers are enclosed in brackets. References to books and articles have been abbreviated to the author's name and the date of publication; the key to those abbreviations is found on pages 197–225. References to exhibitions and their catalogues have been abbreviated to city and year; the key to those abbreviations is found on pages 226–30.
FRANCE
Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries
Simon Marmion was perhaps the most illustrious painter-illuminator of the North, celebrated even in his own time by contemporary writers living in Valenciennes. Jean Molinet, chronicler of Duke Philip the Good and canon of the church of Notre-Dame la Salle in Valenciennes, composed a lengthy poem which was engraved as an epitaph on Marmion's grave, and the poet and rhetorician Jean Lemaire de Belges hailed him as the “prince d’enluminure.” Although he left no documented work, Marmion's oeuvre has been reconstructed from the correspondence between the archival details of his life and a stylistically cohesive group of miniatures and panel paintings. His major work is the painted portion of the Altarpiece of Saint Bertin (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin; National Gallery, London), which was ordered for the abbey of Saint Bertin at Saint-Omer by Bishop Guillaume Fillastre, one of the most important Burgundian dignitaries, and was dedicated in 1459. (The elaborate gilded silver centerpiece of the altar, which was produced in Valenciennes between 1455 and 1459, was melted down during the French Revolution.)

Marmion was probably born in Amiens about 1425. He was the son of Jean Marmion, the painter in charge of decorative work for the municipality of Amiens from 1426 to 1444. His brother, Mille, was also a painter, and his daughter, Marie, became a successful illuminator. Simon succeeded his father in working for the town of Amiens: he is mentioned in documents there for decorative work he completed between 1449 and 1451, and in 1454 he was paid for a Calvary for the Justice Chambers in the city hall. From 1458 until his death in 1489 his name appears in the archives of Valenciennes. The records also show that he worked for the cathedral of Cambrai and that in 1468 he became a master in the guild of Tournai, where his brother worked for some years. Marmion was employed intermittently by Duke Philip the Good of Burgundy and his son and successor, Charles the Bold, providing decorations for ducal events, illuminations, and at least one panel painting.

Simon Marmion

1. The Lamentation of Christ

1975.1.128

Oil and tempera(?) on oak panel. 51.8 x 32.7 cm. Painted on the reverse: the coat of arms of Charles the Bold and Margaret of York, with their initials, C and M, tied together with love knots in the four corners.

The painting has not been cut down; a barbe is present along all four edges. Tiny losses as well as abrasion are found in several of the faces, in Christ's legs and the right side of his face and chest, and locally throughout the landscape. The green glaze (perhaps a copper resinate) in the trees and in the ground behind the figures has discolored to brown and was partially removed in past cleanings. The blue robe of Nicodemus (at the right) has darkened significantly, resulting in a loss of form in this area. The reverse is beveled. It is well preserved, with minor losses scattered throughout the painting. Dendrochronological analysis of the panel determined that the youngest measured heartwood ring was grown in the year 1442. Using the sapwood statistic for eastern Europe, a felling date of 1455...1457...1461 + x could be derived. Considering a median of fifteen sapwood rings and a storage time of approximately ten years, the painting can be assumed to date from about 1467.1

PROVENANCE: Probably commissioned by Duke Charles the Bold of Burgundy and his wife Margaret of York.2 Acquired by Philip Lehman by 1922.3


The aura of restraint and quiet sorrow of this Lamentation of Christ distinguishes it from the more typical representations of the scene by Flemish artists such as
Rogier van der Weyden, Dieric Bouts, and Hugo van der Goes, where human bereavement is expressed through emphatic gestures of pathos. This Lamentation is essentially a Pietà, the central theme being the Virgin with the body of Christ stretched across her lap. The peaceful face of the dead Christ shows no trace of past suffering. As Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus gently lower his limp body onto the Virgin’s lap, she does not embrace it but instead crosses her hands over her chest in a gesture of pious veneration. She has already renounced her suffering as a mother and has recognized the virtue of salvation through the sacrifice of Christ, conqueror of Death. Next to her, Saint John prays earnestly and in isolation, in an attitude similar to that of Mary Magdalen, who stands at the far left, away from Christ, and, like the women next to her, expresses a quiet and tender sadness.

The subject of the painting is not described in the Gospels, but is instead found in popular, vernacular texts, among them Ludolf of Saxony’s Vita Christi. It was a depiction that was favored by French artists, both panel painters and manuscript illuminators. In the Pietà de Nouans, for example, Jean Fouquet also chose to represent the placement of the body of Christ in the lap of the Virgin by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, and in his painting, too, the Virgin is praying, rather than embracing the body to express her sorrow as a mother. Similar representations appear in Books of Hours from the workshop of Fouquet.

There has been little dissent about the authorship of this painting. Friedländer, Ring, Hoffman, and Châtelet have all accepted it as Simon Marmion’s. It was painted with the same technique as the Saint Bertin Altarpiece (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin, and National Gallery, London), the work most generally accepted as by Marmion. Viewed at close range, the Lamentation, like the altarpiece and many of Marmion’s manuscript illuminations as well, has a finish that appears relatively matte, not glossy (perhaps suggesting the use of tempera as well as oil), and the brushstrokes are disengaged, not blended. This is typical of a manuscript illuminator’s technique; artists trained exclusively in panel painting favored more fully integrated brushwork produced by successive layers of translucent glazes of oil paint.

The lime greens, salmon pinks, and pale red and blue tones of the Lamentation likewise echo the pastel colors of Marmion’s palette for his manuscript illuminations. The transparent gauzeliike material of Mary Magdalen’s dress and the cloth that envelops the body of Christ in the Lamentation are rendered in the same way as the costumes of Saint Omer and the chaplain in the Saint Bertin Altarpiece. And other hallmarks of Marmion’s style – his particular observation and rendering of the fall of light on brocade and his modeling of faces and hands, the highlights expressed boldly in unblended strokes – are as apparent in this painting as they are in the altarpiece.

The Lamentation/Pietà theme is also treated in a drawing attributed to Marmion in the Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, Massachusetts (Fig. 1.2), and in a few carefully considered miniatures by him, among them a single leaf in the Philadelphia Museum of Art and a folio of the La Flora Hours in the Biblioteca Nazionale, Naples. The Fogg drawing, worked up in silverpoint over a preliminary sketch probably in black chalk on ivory grounded paper, was used as a workshop model for Pietà compositions that Marmion executed both on vellum and on panel. It isolates the figural group of the Virgin and Christ, and it shows certain revisions, such as the shift of the left contour of Christ’s body, that indicate that it was a working drawing. Although the poses in the Lehman painting are related only generally to
those in the Fogg sheet, the underdrawing of the painting (see Fig. 1.1) exactly copies the pose of the Virgin in the drawing, showing her with her hands clasped in prayer and her eyes in a lower position below a single, rather than double, wimple. Marmion changed both details in the upper painted layers of the Lehman Lamentation.

The underdrawing of the painting further demonstrates the stages of its invention. In order to emphasize Christ’s listless body, the two figures to the right, Saint John and Nicodemus, were painted farther away from the Christ figure than they were originally drawn. Likewise, the positions of Joseph’s and Mary Magdalen’s heads were adjusted slightly. What little modeling there is in the underdrawing, down the contour of Nicodemus’ back, shows the same type of even parallel hatching that was used for the shading of Christ’s left arm in the Fogg drawing. The underdrawing in the landscape, cityscape, and diminutive scene of Golgotha at the back is very summary indeed, indicating only the general placement of these compositional features.

The Lamentation is the only other painting in Marmion’s oeuvre besides the Saint Bertin Altarpiece, which was completed in 1459, that can be securely dated on the basis of historical factors. The sophisticated reverse of the panel, with its elegant inscription showing the coat of arms and the interlaced initials of Duke Charles the Bold and his last wife, Margaret of York, is certainly contemporary with the Lamentation. The work was thus a commission from the duke of Burgundy, whose marriage to Margaret of York in 1468 provides a terminus

Fig. 1.1 Infrared reflectogram (computer assembly) of detail of No. 1
post quern. The recently determined dendrochronological date of the painting supports this. On 3 May 1473 the Order of the Golden Fleece met with great pomp and circumstance in Valenciennes. Margaret of York accompanied her husband to the festivities, remaining in Valenciennes until the end of August. Marmion was also in attendance, employed to furnish decorations for various events. It was perhaps on that occasion that the duke commissioned the Lamentation from Marmion, an artist whose services he had called upon for the completion of a sumptuous Breviary only a few years before.11

The style of the painting also accords well with a date in the early 1470s, more than ten years after the completion of the Saint Bertin Altarpiece. Marmion's later works, such as the Saint Jerome with a Donor in the Philadelphia Museum of Art, show the influence of Hugo van der Goes, specifically the Death of the Virgin (Groeningemuseum, Bruges), which Marmion may have seen during a possible sojourn in the Netherlands in 1475–78.12 As the Lamentation does not yet reveal Hugo's influence but instead hints of the work of Dieric Bouts, it must predate 1475. The character of Marmion's Lamentation – the intellectual isolation of each actor in the scene and the rigidity of the gestures, as well as certain forms in the organization of landscape and architecture – is particularly close to the upper left wing of the Holy Sacrament altarpiece (Sint Pieterskerk, Louvain) that Bouts painted between 1464 and 1468.13

CS and MWA

NOTES:
2. Hughes (1984, p. 13) does not mention this painting, but in her discussion she refers to the initials C and M as they appear in manuscripts made for Margaret of York as "marks of possession."
3. On a postcard dated 6 September 1922 (Robert Lehman Collection files), Friedländer wrote, "Mr. L's picture the Pietà is not by Dieric Bouts, but by Simon Marmion, as far as I can see."
6. Sterling expressed some reservations about the attribution to Marmion in 1941 and in 1957 in the catalogue of the Paris exhibition, but in 1981 he published the painting as by Marmion and his workshop, and in his original manuscript for this catalogue (1984; Robert Lehman Collection files) he expressed no doubt about Marmion's authorship. Baetjer was cautious in 1977, but in 1980 and 1995 gave the painting to Marmion without question.
10. Courcelle-Ladmirant 1939, ill.
11. Duke Charles had employed Marmion to complete a Breviary begun in 1467 for Charles's father, Philip the Good. On the Breviary, for which Marmion was paid in 1470, see Hindman 1992 and Hindman 1997, no. 8 (a leaf in the Robert Lehman Collection that is probably from the Breviary).
Franco-Flemish Painter

ca. 1475–80

2. Portrait of a Woman

1975.1.129
Oil on oak panel. 57.5 x 41.6 cm.

The oak panel has been thinned and cradled, but retains all of its original edges. It is constructed of two boards glued together vertically with the join 11.2 centimeters from the left edge. There are many scattered losses in the painting, particularly along the left side of the face and on the right shoulder, the top of the veil, and much of the picture to the right of the join. The picture is considerably abraded, especially in the flesh tones, the fur collar, and the white veil, and finishing glazes have been lost. The underdrawing is visible to the naked eye in the area of the face and neck. Dendrochronological analysis of the larger of the two boards indicates that the youngest heartwood ring was grown in 1451. Using the sapwood statistic for eastern Europe, a felling date of 1464...1468...1473+x can be derived for the tree. Assuming a ten-year storage period, the painting could have been produced about 1478 or later.¹

PROVENANCE: Charles Léon Cardon, Brussels, by 1907; [F. Kleinberger Galleries, Paris and New York], 1909 (bought from Cardon); Mary (Mrs. Chauncey J.) Blair, Chicago, 1910 (bought from Kleinberger); [F. Kleinberger Galleries, Paris and New York], 1916 (bought from Mrs. Blair). Acquired by Philip Lehman from Kleinberger in October 1916.²

EXHIBITED: Bruges 1907, no. 191 (as Hugo van der Goes); New York 1914; Buffalo 1915-16; Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1916; New York 1914; Paris 1917, no. 31, pl. 23 (as Burgundian, second half of the fifteenth century); Cincinnati 1959, no. 126, ill. (as Franco-Flemish, second half of the fifteenth century); New York 1989-99, p. 409, ill.

LITERATURE: Hymans 1907, p. 202 (as attributed to Hugo van der Goes); Kervyn de Lettenhove et al. 1908, no. 92, pl. 45 (as French, fifteenth century); Pierron 1908-9, pp. 27-28; Fierens-Gevaert 1908-12, vol. 2, p. 104, pl. 40 (as Hugo van der Goes); Maeterlinck 1913, pl. 40 (as Hugo van der Goes); Destré 1914, p. 161 (as French, ca. 1450); Sage 1915, ill. p. 30; Friedländer 1924-37, vol. 1 (1924), p. 158, pl. 70 (as Petrus Christus?); ca. 1450; Lehman 1928, no. 92; Mayer 1930, p. 118, ill. p. 115 (as French?); mid-fifteenth century; Sterling 1941, p. 58, no. 21 (as school of Burgundy, ca. 1470); P. Wesccher 1941, p. 200 (as Mary of Burgundy); H. Wesccher 1946, ill. p. 1844 (as Mary of Burgundy); Ring 1949, p. 218, no. 153 (as French); Heinrich 1954, p. 222; Delaissé 1959, p. 194 (as Margaret of York); Lehman 1964, p. 17 (as Franco-Flemish, second half of the fifteenth century); Friedländer 1967-76, vol. 1 (1967), p. 89, pl. 94 (as Petrus Christus?); ca. 1450); Szabo 1975, pp. 83-84, pl. 60 (as Margaret of York, shortly before 1477); Baetjer 1980, p. 60, ill. p. 472 (as possibly Margaret of York, 1475-1500); Hughes 1984, ill. p. 55 (as possibly Margaret of York); Baetjer 1995, p. 348, ill. (as possibly Margaret of York; French, 1473-1500).

In the early years of the twentieth century several historians — Hymans, Fierens-Gevaert, and Maeterlinck among them — considered this a portrait by Hugo van der Goes. In 1924, still impressed by the Flemish character of the painting, Friedländer included it, albeit with some hesitation, among the works of Petrus Christus of about 1450. Mayer attributed it to an unknown French master and dated it to the middle of the fifteenth century. In his stylistic analysis of the painting in 1941, Sterling distinguished certain French traits intermingled with the conventions of Flemish portrait tradition (an interpretation that was subsequently accepted by Ring and Szabo). Not taking into account the abraded state of the picture, he enumerated among the French qualities the linear accentuation of the silhouette, the geometrization of volume, and the simplification of the modeling, which would have appeared richer, with increased subtlety in the blending of the tones, if it had been executed by a Flemish artist. Perhaps more typically Flemish are the half-length pose of the sitter and her placement in a trompe l’œil stone window.³

There are no clear indications of the sitter’s identity. It has been suggested that she is Margaret of York, third wife of Duke Charles the Bold of Burgundy, and the portrait does share certain general traits with other known portraits of Margaret.⁴ A likeness of about 1468 that is sometimes attributed to Simon Marmion (Louvre, Paris), for example, has a similar dour expression, large eyes, and long, prominent nose.⁵ In the Louvre portrait and in the Miracles of Christ triptych attributed jointly to the Master of the Legend of Saint Catherine and the Magdalen Master (National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne), Margaret of York wears the same elaborate necklace, which is lacking in the Lehman image.⁶ On the other hand, the depiction of Mary of Burgundy, Margaret’s stepdaughter, in the Melbourne triptych shares with the Lehman portrait similar physiognomical traits and the simpler costume and necklace. If, however, the Lehman portrait is Mary of Burgundy, as was once suggested,⁷ she is not dressed in regal attire, as she is in the portrait by the Master H. A. or A. H. also in the Robert Lehman Collection (No. 8). Without further compelling evidence, the painting can for now be described only as the
likeness of an aristocratic lady. Her elegant costume suggests a date in the late 1470s or 1480s, and the dendro-chronological data for the panel support such a date.9

The painting is considerably abraded and finishing glazes are now missing, revealing more of the underpainting than was originally visible. An infrared photograph (Fig. 2.1) clarifies the precise location and extent of the underpainting, the lines of which crisscross the woman's face.10 The hennin and veil at the right in the preliminary drawing indicate that the painter initially planned to show the sitter facing left instead of right. This suggests that the painting may have been half of a diptych, facing a portrait of the woman's husband. In such double portraits the man and woman usually face each other, with the man on the left.11 If this was the original plan for the Lehman portrait, a decision to create a single portrait rather than a diptych was apparently made early on, for the X radiograph (Fig. 2.2) shows no additional brushwork that would indicate a fully completed portrait facing left. The trompe l'oeil frame that encloses the sitter was added at the second stage of production of the painting. The X radiograph indicates that the earlier version did not include the painted window frame, but instead showed the sitter with her arms joined in front of her, the cuff of her right sleeve barely visible at the lower center edge beneath what is now the window ledge.

CS and MWA

NOTES:
1. Report of Peter Klein, Ordinariat für Holzbiologie, Universität Hamburg, 13 May 1987 (files of the Paintings Conservation Department, Metropolitan Museum).
3. Ring compared the Lehman painting to the illuminations in the so-called Baudricourt Hours (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; Paris 1993–94, no. 74), which are sometimes attributed to Jean Fouquet.
4. Among the Netherlandish paintings that place the sitter before or behind a trompe l’oeil stone window or in which the painting’s frame functions as a window are the Portrait of a Woman attributed to Hans Memling in the Memlingmuseum, Bruges; the Portrait of a Young Woman and the
Jean Hey (also known as the Master of Moulin)  

The so-called Master of Moulin was named after the triptych The Virgin in Glory that was made in about 1498–1500 for Moulin Cathedral, presumably commissioned by Pierre II, duke of Bourbon, who is depicted with his wife, Anne de Beaujeu, and their daughter Suzanne on the wings of the altarpiece. It is now generally agreed that this artist is the Jean Hey whom Jean Lemaire de Belges, poet and historiographer to Margaret of Austria and Louis XII, included among the great modern painters in his poem La plainte du Désiré, published in 1504. According to the annotation on the painting’s reverse, in 1494 Jean Hey produced an Ecce Homo (Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts, Brussels) for Jean Cœuillette, treasurer of the Bourbons. Hey’s earliest works, especially the Nativity of Cardinal Jean II Rolin (Musée Rolin, Autun) painted in about 1480, indicate his origins in the Netherlands and his debt to the art of Hugo van der Goes. In addition to the Margaret of Austria in the Robert Lehman Collection, toward the end of the fifteenth century Hey painted a series of splendid portraits of members of the Bourbon dynasty that show a highly personal style blending Netherlandish and French traits.

Hey was essentially a panel painter, but on occasion he worked as an illuminator. The frontispiece to the Statutes of the Order of Saint-Michael (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris) that Pierre II presented to his brother-in-law, King Charles VIII, in 1493 or 1494 shows the remarkable adaptation of Hey’s style to the miniaturist’s art.
Jean Hey

3. Margaret of Austria

1975.1.130

Oil on oak panel. 32.7 x 23 cm.

The oak panel has been thinned and set into another panel with added spandrels at the top and a strip 3.2 millimeters with added at the bottom. This second panel is cradled. The left and right sides of the painting have been trimmed slightly. The barbe in a semicircular form at the top conforms. The portrait is in good state. Paint losses, scattered locally throughout the picture, are most noticeable under the sitter's right eye and in the cheek, the necklace pendant, the dress at the upper left, the veil, and the stone architectural element above the sitter's head.

PROVENANCE: Don Sebastián Gabriel de Beaujeu, Braganza y Borbón, infante of Spain and Portugal; his son, Prince Pierre de Bourbon et Bourbon, duke of Durecal, Paris; his sale, American Art Association, Chickering Hall, New York, 20–21 April 1889 (Lugt 48153), lot 24 (as Doña Juana La Loca by Hans Holbein the Elder; not sold); his sale, Haro Frères et Broche, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, 3 February 1890 (Lugt 48735), lot 23 (as Jeanne la Folle by Holbein); sold to Prince Manuel de Yturbe, Paris; his granddaughter, Princess Yturbe, Paris; sold to F. Kleinberger Galleries, New York, 1926. Acquired by Philip Lehman from Kleinberger in March 1926.

EXHIBITED: Paris 1904, no. 107; Kansas City 1942–44; Colorado Springs 1951–52, pl. 28; Paris 1957, no. 35, pl. 24 (as presumably Margaret of Austria, by the Master of Moulins [Jean Perréal or Jean Hey]).

LITERATURE: De Maulde La Clavière 1896, p. 370 (as Suzanne de Bourbon by Jean Perréal); Benoît 1901, pp. 327–32, ill. (as Suzanne de Bourbon by the Maître des Portraits de 1488); Bouchot 1904, pp. 289–94 (as Suzanne de Bourbon by the Peintre des Bourbons, called the Master of Moulins); Fry 1904, pp. 368–69, ill. p. 373 (as Master of Moulins); Lafenestre 1904, p. 90, ill. (as Suzanne de Bourbon by the Master of Moulins); Bouchot 1905, pl. 79 (as Suzanne de Bourbon by the Peintre des Bourbons); Lemoins 1905, p. 32; Dimier n.d., p. 108 (as Jeanne La Folle, not by the Master of Moulins); Durrieu 1911, pp. 744–45 (as Suzanne de Bourbon by the Master of Moulins); Hausenstein 1923, pl. 59 (as Suzanne de Bourbon by the Master of Moulins?); Dimier 1925, p. 43 (as Jeanne La Folle by a Flemish master); Art News 24, no. 23 (13 March 1926), pp. 1, 3, ill.; Mayer 1926b, pp. 125–26, ill.; New York Evening Post, 13 March 1926, p. 4; New York Times, 14 March 1926. Lehman 1928, no. 93 (as Suzanne de Bourbon by the Master of Moulins); International Studio, August 1930, p. 60; Pierce 1930, pp. 286, 287, 291, fig. 2 (as Suzanne de Bourbon); Lemoins 1931, p. 94; Hulin de Loo 1932, p. 63 (as Margaret of Austria); Winkler 1932, pp. 246–47; Dupont 1937, p. 60 (as Suzanne de Bourbon by the Master of Moulins); Sterling 1938, pp. 118–19, n. 117bis, fig. 145 (as presumably Margaret of Austria, by the Master of Moulins [Jean Perréal?]); Sterling 1943, p. 21, no. 24, pl. 63 (as presumably Margaret of Austria, by the Master of Moulins [Jean Perréal?]); Louchheim 1947, p. 55, ill. p. 54 (as Suzanne de Bourbon by the Master of Moulins); Goldblatt 1948, p. 3, no. 7, ill. p. 73 (as Suzanne de Bourbon by Jean Clouet the Elder, called Jean Hay); Ring 1949, p. 239, no. 363, pl. 169 (as probably not Suzanne de Bourbon, by the Master of Moulins); Schaeffer 1949, p. 64 (as presumably Margaret of Austria); Heinrich 1954, p. 222, ill. p. 227 (as Suzanne de Bourbon?) by the Master of Moulins); Taylor 1954, ill. p. 142 (as Suzanne de Bourbon by the Master of Moulins); Lassaigne and Argan 1955, p. 189, ill. p. 188 (as more probably Margaret of Austria than Suzanne de Bourbon, by the Master of Moulins); Zerner and Katic 1960 (as a young princess, perhaps Margaret of Austria but certainly not Suzanne de Bourbon, ca. 1490); Huillet d'Istria 1961, pp. 80–81, pl. 6, cover ill. (as Suzanne de Bourbon or Margaret of Austria?); school of the Master of Moulins); Chiarelli, Moriondo, and Mazzini 1963, p. 221; Dupont 1963, pp. 84–85 (as presumably Suzanne de Bourbon, by the Master of Moulins [Jean Prévost?]); Sterling 1963b, pp. 65, 67 n. 10 (as presumably Margaret of Austria, by the Master of Moulins, ca. 1491); Zerner and Katic 1966, ill. (as a young princess, perhaps Margaret of Austria but certainly not Suzanne de Bourbon, ca. 1490); Reynaud 1968, p. 34, n. 5 (as presumably Margaret of Austria, by the Master of Moulins [Jean Hey]); Sterling 1968, p. 30, n. 12 (as presumably Margaret of Austria, by the Master of Moulins [Jean Hey], ca. 1490–91); Lucie-Smith 1971, p. 29, ill. p. 28 (as Master of Moulins); Sterling in Bialostocki 1972b, p. 193 (as Margaret of Austria by Jean Hey); Labande-Mailfert 1975, pp. 92, 106; Szabo 1975, pp. 81–82, pl. 67 (as Margaret of Austria? by the Master of Moulins); Baetjer 1977, pp. 343, 346, 349, n. 13, pl. 3 (as Suzanne de Bourbon or Margaret of Austria, probably by Jean Hey); Baetjer 1980, ill. p. 473 (as presumably Margaret of Austria, by the Master of Moulins); Metropolitan Museum 1987, pp. 134–35, fig. 99; Lorenz and Regond 1990, pp. 36–38 (as Margaret of Austria by Jean Hey); Baetjer 1995, pp. 350–51, ill. (as probably Margaret of Austria, by Jean Hey).

In the dignified bearing and lavish costume of the sitter, as well as the grandeur of the setting, this painting exemplifies the best of the late fifteenth-century tradition of courtly portraiture. The exquisite dress in red and black velvet with ermine cuffs, the elaborate headdress embellished with gold chains, and the magnificent pendant necklace of enamel and precious jewels suggest that the sitter is a princess. At first, following De Maulde La Clavière's suggestion in 1896, she was thought to be Suzanne de Bourbon, but the Lehman portrait is not readily identifiable as the daughter of Pierre II, duke of Bourbon, and Anne de Beaujeu as she is depicted on the right wing of the Virgin in Glory triptych in the cathedral of Moulins.
Details of the sitter’s costume, namely the particular type of headdress (a hood of velvet decorated with gold chains) and the square neckline of the dress, with its off-center closing, are in keeping with the courtly fashion of the last twenty years of the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{15} The initials \textit{C} and \textit{M} in the border decoration of her collar (the inverted letters on the left are presumably a mirror image of the ones on the right) probably signify the short-lived union between Margaret and Charles. The chain of gold shells on her headdress perhaps alludes to the coat of arms of the Bourbon dynasty, a rampant lion encircled by eight scallop shells.\textsuperscript{16} The shell ornament commonly appears in collars worn by contemporary members of the Bourbon family, such as Pierre II in the portrait of him by Jean Hey in the Louvre (Fig. 3.6).

The Lehman portrait belongs to a group of paintings that Sterling assigned in 1968 to the Master of Moulins, now called Jean Hey. It is particularly close in technique and execution to the artist’s portraits of Madeleine of Burgundy (Fig. 3.5) and Pierre II (Fig. 3.6), both in the Louvre. The influence of Hugo van der Goes from Jean Hey’s early training in the Netherlands persists here in the cool palette, precise drawing, and dense, highlighted modeling. The \textit{Madeleine of Burgundy} and the Lehman portrait share the thick, opaque applications of paint for the skin tones; the unblended staccato strokes in the rendering of the fur and a similar treatment of the jewelry, with abbreviated, matte impasto strokes for highlights; and even the manner in which the architectural elements are painted, with nicks suggesting the realistic effects of age. In the landscapes in both the \textit{Pierre II} and the Lehman portrait the trees are painted in a solid green base tone with short, disengaged strokes of lighter green schematically applied for the leaves, and the middle distance is uniformly a distinctive creamy lime green.

The portraits of Madeleine and Pierre II of France were painted about 1492–93, suggesting perhaps the latest date the Lehman portrait could have been made, for Margaret was on her way to the Netherlands by then. Further documentary evidence discovered by Reynaud in 1968 helps to secure a more precise date.\textsuperscript{17} Margaret of Austria and Charles VIII apparently stayed in Moulins in the autumn of 1490 and again between mid-December 1490 and the end of January 1491. At this time Jean Hey was employed by Pierre II. Also in December of 1490, Charles VIII ordered the delivery of “ung tableau de bois pour y pourtraire une yimage de nostre dame.” Reynaud has suggested that this commission for a painting of the Virgin, which is now lost, was probably
given to Jean Hey. It is conceivable that Hey painted the Lehman portrait during the same period.\textsuperscript{18}

As Margaret is represented facing right, saying her rosary, this panel was probably the left half of a diptych, with the object of her veneration placed at the right. Diptychs in which the aristocratic donor (male as well as female) is represented on the left, that is, in the place of honor normally reserved for the holy image, are not uncommon in French art. Other well-known examples of this format are Jean Fouquet's diptych \textit{Étienne Chevalier with Saint Stephen} (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin) and \textit{The Virgin and Child Surrounded by Angels} (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp)\textsuperscript{19} and his \textit{Guillaume Jouvenal des Ursins} (Louvre, Paris), in which Jouvenal prays to an image to the right which is no longer extant.\textsuperscript{20}

Exactly what this hypothetical holy image might have been is difficult to say. That it may have been a Crucifixion, Lamentation, or Resurrection instead of the customary Virgin and Child is suggested by Margaret's somber expression, as well as by certain details of the painting. The elaborate pendant hanging from Margaret's necklace is not simply a fleur-de-lis, as has always been supposed, but an enameled gold pelican pricking its
breast, its blood suggested by the large ruby below. According to popular legend, the pelican pricks its own breast to provide blood to revive its starving young, and by way of the legend it came to symbolize Christ’s sacrifice and resurrection. Symbolic of the Eucharist, the pelican was sometimes recommended to the laity as a subject for meditation during the celebration of the Mass between the consecration of the host and the pax, thus linking physical and spiritual feeding. With its Eucharistic connotations, the pelican has been associated with the most common prayer, the *pater noster*, specifically the words “give us this day our daily bread.”

This connection is perhaps intended here, for in her silent recitation of her devotions Margaret has paused on the large gold filigree *pater noster* bead of her rosary. That Margaret should wear such an obvious display of her faith is entirely consistent with what is known about her religious fervor and devotion as an adult. Contemporary writings extol the virtue and religiosity she expressed in both private and public acts.

The underdrawing of the portrait (see Fig. 3.1) offers an opportunity to consider the drawing style of Jean Hey. Probably made in black chalk (or some equally crumbly-looking drawing medium), the underdrawing
establishes the composition and the modeling of the torso and face of the sitter. Parallel hatching in the neck and head and along the right side of the costume indicates the system of lighting to be followed in the painted layers. Most unexpected is the uninhibited drawing in the landscape, where a large foreground tree seen through the right window opening was planned and there are indications of foreground rocks as well as background mountains. These preliminary ideas were abandoned at the drawing stage, for the X radiograph (Fig. 3.2) shows only the application of strokes for the castle and its surrounding grounds. Here and there contours were adjusted, usually to accommodate a form which was painted larger than it was drawn.

Placing a sitter in an architectural setting with a view of a landscape beyond is a Flemish idea whose dissemination was due mostly to the popularity of portraits by Hans Memling. Hey altered Memling’s formula, however, by posing Margaret before a dividing wall or mullion. This device adds balance and a kind of enforced monumentality to the composition, a notion foreign to Memling’s more subtle contrivances. Jean Hey thus managed to convey Margaret’s regal position and station in life, despite the relatively small size of the panel.
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NOTES:

1. A handwritten note in the margin of the title page of the copy of the sale catalogue in the Watson Library at the Metropolitan Museum states: “The paintings unsold in this collection were returned to Paris and sold at Hôtel Drouot Feb. 3, 1890 / Escribe, Haro + Bloche experts. Amount of sale 111,740 francs.” In the margin of lot 24 is written: “Paris sale, 7,310 f. / ... frères 3000 / Pan cat 629 ‘School of H’ Jeanne la Folle Wood 32 x 25 cm Bust 3/4 ... about 16 x 12 in.”

2. The entry for lot 23 includes the notice “Attribution de l’ancien Catalogue, n 1339.” The Catalogue des Tableaux provenant de la Galerie de S. A. R. Don Sébastien Gabriel de Bourbon, Bragance et Bourbon ... Formant la Collection du Prince Bourbon, Duc de Durcal (p. 17) provides no explanation for the “Ancien Catalogue” cited
in the descriptions of many but not all the lots in this sale. The reference may have been to a (manuscript?) catalogue of Don Sebastián’s collection in the family archives, as the introductory text in the sale catalogue is extracted from material in the archives. According to the catalogue, Don Pedro Alcántara de Borbón y Borbón, first duke of Dúrcal, was born in Madrid on 12 December 1862, son of the infants of Spain and Portugal, Don Sebastián Gabriel de Borbón y Braganza (b. 1811) and Doña María Christina de Borbón y Borbón, sister of King Francisco of Naples. Part of the prince’s collection came down through the family, while “the rest was bought together in Italy by his father, Don Sebastián, who by his relation to the King of Naples” and under the protection of Pope Pius IX, “enjoyed peculiar facilities for obtaining works of art, in the breaking up of noble houses and the dispersal of collections in consequence of the political changes in the kingdom” of Naples. There is no evidence upon which to determine by which avenue the Lehman picture entered the collection of Don Sebastián Gabriel.

3. Benoît 1901, pp. 328, 331 (“il y a tout lieu de penser que jusqu’à l’époque de la vente, en 1890, il n’avait pas quitté la maison de Bourbon depuis son origine”); Paris 1904,

4. Mayer (1926b, p. 125) reported that Mme Yturbe, the “present” duchess of Parcent, had acquired the painting a quarter century ago.

5. According to the 13 March 1926 issue of Art News (pp. 1, 3, ill.), the painting was accompanied by a certificate signed by Max Friedländer, Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum, Berlin, stating that it was a work in “perfect state of preservation by the ‘Master of Moulins.’”


7. To judge from the attention the painting drew from the press upon its arrival in the United States in 1926, its purchase must have been considered a momentous occasion.

8. Hulin de Loo reported that Dimier had recently arrived at the same opinion.

9. Heinrich mentioned that “it is now thought that the sitter in the newly cleaned portrait by the Master of Moulins is more probably Margaret of Austria in view of its date.”


11. On this portrait and other paintings of Margaret of Austria, see L. Campbell 1985, pp. 34–35.

12. Ibid., no. 23, fig. 28; Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 12, no. 33.


16. See Jouglar de Morenas 1938, p. 221.

18. Confirmation of the suggested dating by dendrochronology was not possible because the panel is marouflaged and therefore has no original edges visible for a count of the tree rings.


21. Lorentz and Regond (1990, pp. 37–38) suggested another interpretation: a fleur-de-lis over which is a dove above a heart-shaped ruby. According to Lorentz, the pendant would have been a gift from Charles VIII to his fiancée.

22. See Ferguson 1954, p. 23. As Ferguson points out, the interpretation finds a source in Psalm 102:6, “I am like a pelican of the wilderness,” an allusion to Christ.


24. See Boom 1935.

Master of Saint Giles

The Netherlands and France, active ca. 1500

The Master of Saint Giles was named by Friedländer after two panels of about 1500 in the National Gallery, London, that represent scenes from the legend of the saint. In 1912–13 and 1937 Friedländer listed fourteen other works by the same hand that form the small oeuvre of this apparently emigrant master. Among them are two panels in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., that probably were part of the same altarpiece as the London paintings. Also credited to the Master of Saint Giles are a portrait of Philip the Fair, duke of Burgundy (formerly Oskar Reinhart collection, Winterthur), who was in Paris in 1501; a Presentation in the Temple that is based in part on Bramante’s Prevedari engraving of 1481; and a Betrayal of Christ (Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts, Brussels) presented as a night scene, unusual for the time. The artist’s reference to compositions of Rogier van der Weyden and Dieric Bouts in his several paintings of the Virgin and Child, as well as his particular handling of details of light and costume, suggests that he was trained in the Netherlands. The London and Washington panels, however, depict objects, architecture, and sites that prove he was active in Paris. Whether he was originally Netherlandish or French, this most talented and accomplished artist helped disseminate the Netherlandish style of painting, at the same time creating a personal French idiom.

4. Virgin and Child

1975.1.131

Oil and tempera(?) on paper laid down on oak panel. 26.6 x 18.2 cm.

There is no barbe evident at any edge of the painting. Except for two preserved areas, one with a seal marked “F. Kleinberger Paris New York” and the other with a now illegible inscription, the worm-eaten panel has been thinned to 4 millimeters, half its original thickness. Two strips of wood, each 2 millimeters wide, have been added to the right and left edges of the painting. There are losses to the original paper support in the form of a triangle at the upper left, in a lozenge shape below that, and in smaller areas to the right of the lozenge-shaped area. The entire background has been repainted in viridian green (a pigment developed in the mid-nineteenth century) to cover over these damages. Other retouched damages in the paint layers are found in the Child’s mouth and forehead, in the Virgin’s face, and in the modeling of the drapery along the far right side, as well as in the sleeve at the left. Abrasion to the painting is most marked in the left wing of the dragonfly, which has all but disappeared. The X radiograph (Fig. 4.1) and the infrared reflectogram assembly show a triangular area of thinner ground preparation in the upper right corner (the upper left corner is cut off), suggesting that the composition, like other Virgin and Child compositions attributed to the Master of Saint Giles, originally had an arched top. Dendrochronological analysis of the panel has determined that the youngest heartwood ring was grown in 1458. Considering the sapwood statistic for eastern Europe, a felling date for the tree of 1471...1473...1477 + x can be derived. Assuming a
median of fifteen sapwood rings and a storage time of ten years, it is plausible that the painting was created about 1483 or later.⁴

PROVENANCE: Martin Le Roi, Paris; [E. Kleinberger Galleries, Paris and New York]. Acquired by Philip Lehman from Kleinberger in October 1911.⁵

EXHIBITED: New York 1954; Paris 1957, no. 37; Cincinnati 1959, no. 127, ill.

LITERATURE: Lehman 1928, no. 89; Mayer 1930, p. 116; Friedländer 1937, pp. 222, 230, no. 5, fig. 11; Ring 1949, p. 231, no. 245; Heinrich 1954, p. 222 (as ca. 1490); Lehman [1964], p. 18; Szabo 1975, p. 89, pl. 68; Baetjer 1980, p. 120, ill. p. 473; Sterling 1990, pp. 300–302, no. 31, fig. 267 (color); Baetjer 1995, p. 351, ill.

Since Friedländer first identified the oeuvre of the Master of Saint Giles (or Aegidius in Latin), including the Lehman Virgin and Child, whether he was a Netherlands painter who worked in France or a French painter who trained in the Netherlands has remained an open question.⁴ Though the matter may never be fully resolved, close examination of the style, technique, and execution of the Lehman Virgin and Child provides evidence that the artist's experience in the Netherlands most likely preceded his artistic career in France. Although the painting derives from Virgin and Child motifs found in the late works of Dieric Bouts, in the details of its technique and execution it bears a close resemblance to the eponymous Saint Giles Protecting the Hind and Mass of Saint Giles in the National Gallery, London, and the related Episodes from the Life of a Bishop Saint and Baptism of Saint Clovis in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., which were very likely painted in Paris, all for the same altarpiece, about 1500.⁵

The uncommon but not unprecedented support of the Lehman painting is paper, laid down onto an oak panel that was later thinned and cradled.⁶ It most likely began as a drawing after a workshop model and was subse-
Quantum worked up as a painting. As is the case with the London and Washington paintings and as seems to be typical of this master, the design of the Lehman Virgin and Child was not totally fixed at the outset but continued to evolve during the painting process. Some stages of the complex structure of the paint layers can be reconstructed by studying the X radiograph and the infrared reflectogram assembly (Figs. 4.1, 4.2) together. What little underdrawing can be seen with infrared reflectography is restricted to a summary indication of the contours of the Christ Child’s body and the Virgin’s hands, and there is only minimal parallel hatching, used to define the knuckles of the fingers of the Virgin’s right hand.

The first painted design, visible both in the X radiograph and the infrared reflectogram assembly, shows the Child with his right arm hanging down at his side, his left arm positioned slightly farther to the right, and his left leg pulled up tightly against his body at a sharp angle. The Virgin held a piece of fruit (an apple?) in her right hand. The general pose of the Virgin, with her voluminous mantle over her long, loose hair, and the position of the legs of the Child are derived in part from certain Boutsian compositions, though in reverse, such as the Virgin and Child in the Metropolitan Museum (Fig. 4.3), which is known in numerous other versions.

When the Master of Saint Giles reworked his original plans, he referred to another Boutsian model known today from copies by followers of Bouts in the Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen (Fig. 4.4), in a private collection in Geneva, and formerly on the New York art market. He probably had an exact pattern for the figure of the Christ Child in hand, for the new design, painted directly over the first one (indications of which can be seen in Fig. 4.2), copied the Bouts model exactly. The Master of Saint Giles adjusted the Christ Child’s right and left arms to hold a dragonfly on a string (instead of
the rosary he holds in the Bouts versions), extended his left leg to a more horizontal position, changed the configuration of folds in the drapery below him to precisely match the model, and slightly adjusted the position of the Virgin’s right hand. The Bouts motifs assimilated by the Master of Saint Giles indicate that he had direct knowledge of Bouts’s late Madonna and Child compositions of about 1470–75, suggesting that the Lehman painting was probably executed in the last decades of the fifteenth century. (Although Dieric Bouts died in 1475, his workshop in Louvain continued under the direction of his two sons, Dieric the Younger and Aelbert.) That date is supported by the dendrochronological evaluation, which indicates that the painting was created in 1483 at the earliest.

In technique and execution the Lehman Virgin and Child appears to postdate a Virgin and Child of about 1490 in the Louvre, Paris, that is also attributed to the Master of Saint Giles and is one of a group of four paintings modeled after a prototype by Rogier van der Weyden (the other examples are in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Besançon; the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Dole; and the Karmelientenklooster, Bruges). The paint layers on the Louvre panel are thinner and more transparent than those evident in the Lehman painting. The use of rather opaque-looking paint, more broadly applied, was a technique developed toward the end of the fifteenth century. The execution of the Lehman Virgin and Child compares closely in several details with that of the Washington Baptism of Clovis and the Saint Giles Protecting the Hind and the Mass of Saint Giles in London. These similarities include the somewhat coarse modeling of the flesh tones, where there is a comparable accentuation of folds of flesh and highlighting of the
contours with single strokes of light paint, and the use of disengaged but fluid strokes for the richly textured robes and draperies. The introduction of numerous and complicated changes, even in the upper paint layers, is also characteristic of the master.

Because the Lehman painting and the other Virgin and Child compositions attributed to the Master of Saint Giles rely heavily on earlier Netherlandish prototypes, and we know that the Washington and London paintings were produced about 1500 in Paris, it is quite likely that the artist began his career in the Netherlands before moving on to Paris. The Lehman painting may perhaps be best understood as a transitional work in his oeuvre, as it depends upon Netherlandish compositional motifs but clearly exhibits features of technique and execution that signal the direction of his Parisian phase of production.

One feature of this painting that enhances its meaning, namely the dragonfly held by the Christ Child, has escaped notice until now. The motif of the dragonfly, unusual in Virgin and Child compositions, has been discussed principally apropos the insect in Dürer's 1495–96 engraving The Virgin with the Dragonfly. Heffner has convincingly identified the species in Dürer's print as a dragonfly, which he notes is a symbol of the devil. Teufelspferd (devil's horse) and other words with the root Teufel were common names for the insect in sixteenth-century German. In French, presumably the language of the Master of Saint Giles, it was called a pucelle (hence the emblem of the French manuscript illuminator Jean Pucelle) and a demoiselle, but also an aiguelle du diable, agent du diable, martai-diable, or cheval du diable.

The dragonfly in the Lehman painting is certainly meant as a reference to the devil and to ever present evil. Several contemporary examples illustrate the commonly held belief that evil is as ubiquitous as it is inconspicuous. The devil lurks in the shadows of the barn behind the ox and the ass in Hugo van der Goes' Portinari Altarpiece and among the music-making angels in Grünewald's Isenheim Altarpiece, and the mousetrap in the Merode Triptych by the Master of Flémalle is an allusion to the devil. In the Bouts model (Fig. 4.4) for the Lehman painting the Christ Child holds an apotropaic coral necklace. Here the function of the dragonfly is not simply to ward off evil but to conquer it. The Christ Child has a double hold on the sinister intruder, both by the tail with his left hand and on the end of a tether in his right. Clearly this is symbolic of Christ's triumph over the devil through his incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection. According to the Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine, "the manifestation of Christ's birth [served,] firstly, to confound the demons, for they could no longer overpower us as they had before." This role of the Virgin and Child as protectors from evil is sometimes referred to by certain texts found in paintings of the Virgin and Child.

In the Lehman painting, the protective and redemptive role of the Christ Child is graphically depicted as a visually potent response to the supplicant's fervent prayers.
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NOTES:
1. Ainsworth is indebted to Christopher McGlinchey of the Paintings Conservation Department at the Metropolitan Museum for the analysis of the pigment samples.
4. Friedländer 1912-13; Friedländer 1937. On the Master of Saint Giles, see also Tolley 1996. Predating both of Friedländer's articles are his comments dated 1 May 1911 on the reverse of a photograph in the Robert Lehman Collection files, where he attributed the painting to the Master of the Saint Aegidius Legend and dated it about 1490. In his manuscript draft for this catalogue entry (1984; Robert Lehman Collection files), Sterling also supported the attribution to the Master of Saint Giles, suggesting close parallels with Saint Anne, the Virgin, and the Christ Child, a small altarpiece that was stolen from the church of Saint-Jean in Joigny in 1974 (Sterling 1990, no. 23, ill.), and tracing the evolution of the Madonna in the Lehman painting through the "firm roundness and novel sculptural amplitude" of the Virgin in the Virgin and Child attributed to the Master of Saint Giles in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Besançon (see note 14 below). In his manuscript draft and when he published the Lehman painting in 1990 (p. 302), Sterling proposed a rather late date of 1505-10 for it, citing the influence of the fully rounded figures and monumental frontality of the Virgin and Child by the Flemish painter Michel Sittow (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin; Trzina 1976, pl. 14; Sterling 1990, fig. 268), who was in the service of Philip the Fair in Paris in late 1505 and early 1506 (see Trzina 1976, p. 59). Considering the Master of Saint Giles' reliance on Boutsian models for the Lehman painting, and his presence in Paris about 1500 for the commission of the altarpiece that included the London and Washington panels, the later date seems unlikely.
6. The question of the support was first raised when a new X radiograph of the painting showed a weavelike pattern. Christopher McGlinchey (report of March 1991, Robert Lehman Collection files) determined that the support was
paper by microscopic analysis of a tiny sample taken from
the lower edge of the painting. Paintings on paper laid
donw on panel are a phenomenon that has so far been
rarely noticed or mentioned. An early Franco-Flemish Pro-
file Portrait of a Lady in the National Gallery of Art,
Washington, D.C. (Hand and Wolff 1986, pp. 90–92, ill.),
may have been painted on paper, and the Saint Jerome in
His Study of about 1442 in the Detroit Institute of Arts
that is from the workshop of Jan van Eyck (New York
1994, pp. 68–71, color ill.; Heller and Stodulski 1995,
ill.) was certainly painted on paper. See also L. Campbell
1990, p. 63; Scailliérez 1992; Veroustraete, De Schryver,
Somewhat later examples in the oeuvre of Hans Holbein
the Younger are better known. They include a Portrait of
Benedict von Hertenstein in the Metropolitan Museum; the
Portrait of Derich Born in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich;
a Portrait of Anne of Cleves in the Louvre, Paris; and
the following paintings in the Kunstmuseum, Öffentliche
Kunstsammlung Basel: Adam and Eve (1517), Portrait of
Erasmus (ca. 1523), and Portrait of the Artist's Wife and
Two Children (1528?).
7. It is possible that the design on the paper support was a
tracing made on transparent paper that in turn served as the
underdrawing for the painting as it was worked up
after being attached to the panel. This was suggested in
Ainsworth (1997) 1999. Such a hypothesis would explain the
use of paper (which does not equal canvas or parch-
ment as an intermediary layer on wood) as a primary sup-
port and the contemporary dating of the wood panel used
for the secondary support. On the manufacture and use of
oiled papers for tracing workshop patterns, see Cennini
1960, chap. 26, p. 14, and Le Bègue in Merrifield 1967,
p. 292–94.
8. See Hand and Wolff 1986, especially p. 173, n. 10, and
Bomford and Kirby 1977, especially p. 49.
9. The underdrawing detected here is similar to that found in
the draperies and hands of the acolyte in the Baptism of
Clovis in Washington (Hand and Wolff 1986, p. 175, fig. 9).
10. On the various versions of this, see Bauman in Metro-
12. Other Boutstian models may have been in the artist's mind
as well. The versions in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut,
Frankfurt, and the Museo Correr, Venice (ibid., nos. 15,
15a, pl. 23), show the Virgin and Child in roughly the
same pose (though reversed) before a cloth of honor. If
there was originally a cloth of honor behind the Virgin in
the Lehman painting, it was completely repainted some-
time after the mid-nineteenth century with viridian green,
a pigment produced about 1850.
13. On the late Madonna types, see Bauman in Metropolitan
Museum 1984, p. 53. The connections between the Master
of Saint Giles and Dieric Bouts are further supported by
Held's comments (1952a) on the earlier Virgin and Child
in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Dole, that he added to the
Master of Saint Giles's oeuvre. Held noted an emphasis in
the Dole panel on dramatic lighting effects that differed
from Rogier van der Weyden's more neutral treatment
and signaled the influence of Bouts. In addition, he saw
the pronounced V-shaped neckline and wide forehead of
the Master of Saint Giles's Virgin type as reflecting Bouts-
ian models.
14. On these four versions, which are probably not all by the
same hand and need to be studied further, see Friedländer
1937, pp. 221–31, fig. 12; Ring 1949, p. 231, no. 246;
Held 1952a, especially pp. 107–8, figs. 6, 7, 15; and
Sterling 1990, nos. 18–21, ill. On the type of Rogier com-
position on which these paintings are modeled, see Perier-
d'Ieteren 1982 and Sterling 1990, pp. 241–43, fig. 223.
15. For a summary of the scholarship on this topic, see Strauss
29–34, 73–74. Ainsworth is indebted to David Hefner
for the sources for this information.
18. For more information on this symbolism, see Schapiro
20. For example, in Gerard David's Annunciation (Fig. 21.2)
and Bernaert van Orley's Virgin and Child with Musical
Angels, both in the Metropolitan Museum (New York
1998–99, nos. 79, 89, color ill.), the words on the hem of
the Virgin's dress are from a hymn sung to the Virgin
at Lauds and Matins: "Ave Maria Mater Gratiae, Mater
Misericordiae, tu nos abhiste protege" (Hail Mary,
Mother of Grace, Mother of Mercy, protect us from the
evil one).
Corneille de la Haye, also called Corneille de Lyon

The Hague ca. 1505–Lyons 1575

It has long been known that Corneille de la Haye was a native of The Hague. Since the nineteenth century he has also been called “de Lyon” because of his documented residence in that town from 1533 to 1575, the year of his death. Corneille is documented in 1541 as painter to the dauphin (the future Henry II of France) and in 1551 as peintre et valet de chambre du roi. From a number of sixteenth-century records we know that he was regarded as an accomplished portraitist, and he has been credited with a large number of portraits of aristocratic subjects based on a group of paintings first identified by Roger de Gaignières, the celebrated French collector of the seventeenth century.

The oeuvre of Corneille de Lyon was profoundly affected by the discovery in 1962 of the perfectly preserved Portrait of Pierre Aymeric, which was acquired by the Louvre, Paris, in 1976. On the reverse of this panel the sitter himself specified that it was painted in Lyons, 11 April 1534, “par Corneille de la Haye en Flandres,” painter to Queen Eleanor of Portugal (second wife of Francis I). It immediately became evident that this portrait is by the hand of the artist whom in 1924 Dimier called the Master of the Benson Portraits because two of his very characteristic works belonged to the English amateur Benson. Today we know of nine small portraits securely attributed to this artist. They all represent men, shown either half length or bust length, all except one (formerly in the collection of the marquise de Ganay, present location unknown) shown with hands holding gloves or books. All are painted with green backgrounds, and their general coloration is rather dark. Their execution is loose and fast; the brushstroke is visible, spontaneous, and sure. The paintings display a marked chiaroscuro and an accentuated plasticity, a dynamic structure of form meant to impose on us the vitality of the models, reinforced by the sitters’ ingenuous gazes, which are always directed to the viewer. All of these characteristics agree perfectly with the image we have of the Master of the Benson Portraits as an artist trained in the Netherlands. The hands holding objects, the green background, and the small format can be found in the works of Joos van Cleve and Barthel Bruyn the Elder.

The identification of the Master of the Benson Portraits with Corneille de la Haye presents certain problems, for the former’s dark, plastic, and psychologically aggressive portraits stand in contrast, at least at first glance, to the mass of small, light portraits delicately painted with soft strokes of the brush that traditionally are considered the latter’s work. Corneille de la Haye’s portraits represent royal or aristocratic men and women of calm demeanor and gazes that are turned away from us with discreet expressions. Formerly, before the discovery of the Portrait of Pierre Aymeric, it was common practice to consider the Master of the Benson Portraits as a Netherlandish imitator of Corneille, in whose light portraits was recognized a spirit and style wholly French.

In June 1533, upon the occasion of a visit to Lyons, Corneille’s Dutch compatriot the poet-humanist Johannes Secundus already referred to him as “old friend.” Presumably Corneille could not have been a mere beginner at this point, an assumption readily confirmed by the mastery of the portrait of Aymeric, executed the following year. However, that the Portrait of Pierre Aymeric, painted with such bravado, might have been the work of the young Corneille, about twenty-five to thirty years old, cannot be discounted. Subsequently, Corneille de la Haye – a documented court artist, painter in title to the dauphin in 1541, then to Kings Henry II and Charles IX, portraitist to the Queen Mother Catherine de Médicis, as well as to the aristocracy – could have changed his style to suit his new clientele. We can imagine that in observing their bearing and taste he allowed himself to be “Frenchified.” This was certainly the case for his Flemish contemporary Jean Clouet.

From all the evidence, among the more than one hundred light portraits (most with green backgrounds, some with blue) are both originals and shop replicas. We know from two contemporary accounts that Corneille kept a large number of original works in his shop, just as photographers keep their negatives. It goes without saying that the replicas with which he furnished his royal and aristocratic clients were of excellent quality, frequently executed by himself. From about 1560 on, however, he might have turned his workshop over to his family. His son-in-law, Jean Maignan, was a renowned painter and architect in Lyons; his sons Corneille II and Jacques were both painters; and an account of 1577 affirms that his daughter Clémence “peignait divinement bien.”
Attributed to Corneille de la Haye

5. Portrait of a Man with His Hand on His Chest

1975.1.132

Oil on mahogany panel. 17.7 x 14.7 cm.

The panel has been thinned to 4 millimeters and cradled. There is no barbe evident; all four edges appear to have been somewhat trimmed. The painting is covered with an extremely thick yellow varnish. Though because of this varnish the exact state of the picture is masked, it appears to be in relatively good condition. Some abrasion is evident in the flesh tones, particularly in the hand, which is now unarticulated, the fingers no longer clearly separated. There are numerous tiny losses in the background and in the face, hand, and jacket of the sitter.

PROVENANCE: Léopold Goldschmidt, Paris; Count de Sartiges, Paris; [F. Kleinberger Galleries, Paris and New York]. Acquired by Philip Lehman from Kleinberger in July 1912.²

EXHIBITED: Paris 1892; Cincinnati 1959, no. 129, ill.


In technique the Lehman Portrait of a Man fits into the group of paintings long associated with Corneille de la Haye.² There is little or no apparent underdrawing visible. The painting was instead produced with continuous fine, delicate strokes of thinly applied paints which describe the features and modeling of the face. The expression of life in the gaze and in the mouth is persuasive. Obscured at present by a very thick and significantly yellow varnish, the exact condition of the portrait is unclear. Yet aside from the question of condition, the quality of the painting is very fine, and compares well with the best of the seventeen portraits attributed to Corneille de la Haye and his workshop in the Metropolitan Museum.³ It is especially close in style, technique, and execution to the Portrait of Charles de Cossé, Comte de Brissac (Fig. 5.1).⁴

With the discovery in 1962 of the Portrait of Pierre Aymeric (Louvre, Paris; Fig. 5.2), which is dated 1534 and ascribed to Corneille de la Haye in the sitter's own

Fig. 5.1 Attributed to Corneille de la Haye, Charles de Cossé, Comte de Brissac (1506–1563). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Jules Bache Collection, 1949.49.7.44

Fig. 5.2 Corneille de la Haye, Pierre Aymeric. Musée du Louvre, Paris, RF1976.15. Photograph: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, Paris
Corneille de la Haye

No. 5
hand, it became necessary to reexamine the works attributed to Corneille and to the artist called the Master of the Benson Portraits, who was clearly the author of the Aymeric portrait. Were the dynamic, rather dark portraits formerly ascribed to the Benson Master reconcilable with the light, delicately painted portraits in the style of the one in the Robert Lehman Collection? It may be possible to recognize a close correspondence between the light and dark portraits specifically in the manner of drawing and modeling, in the treatment of the eyes, nostrils, and lips. There seems as well to have been a transition in the artist's conception of portraiture around the years 1540–45. We may also accept a double social aspect in his art, for several of the dark portraits appear to be contemporary (by their costume) with light portraits. The first were of wealthy bourgeois (this was the case for Pierre Aymeric, for whom Roudié reconstructed a biography). The rest were nobility. The bourgeois painted by Corneille, even if they are more approachable and more somberly dressed, still seem to be cultivated and to have been in contact with humanist circles in Lyons. Pierre Aymeric and the man in a portrait in the Brooklyn Museum of Art remove their hands from their coats the way a patrician Roman would take his hand from the folds of his toga. This gesture was used by Jean Clouet, Holbein, and, in Lyons itself, by Jean Pérreal.

The man in the portrait in the Victoria and Albert Museum holds an open book, ostensibly as an attribute of his personal preoccupation.

The Lehman portrait probably dates to about 1540–45, judging from the short beard and the costume, particularly the flat, closed collar and the large, flat beret worn horizontally rather than at an angle. The hand resting on the chest is unique in the abundant series of portraits by Corneille which have come down to us. The gesture seems charged with specific significance. The message may have been intended for the recipient of the portrait. Or, more likely, it may be a gesture of self-identification, appropriate to a portrait of the artist himself. The age of the sitter, too, accords with this suggestion. If he was born about 1505, Corneille would have been between thirty-five and forty years old in 1540–45.

Clearly, the works attributed to Corneille de la Haye of both the first and second, or dark and light, styles need further investigation. A full technical study of a large group of these portraits would enable us not only to better understand the development of the artist's style but also to separate the master's work from that of his workshop.

CS and MWA

NOTES:
1. Kleinberger invoice dated 23 July 1912 (Robert Lehman Collection files). Also from Kleinberger, on 10 March 1913 (invoice in the Robert Lehman Collection files), Philip Lehman purchased Portrait of a Man Wearing a Black Doublet (François d'Andelot de Coligny?) ascribed to Corneille de la Haye that was recently on the New York art market (sale, Sotheby's, 19 May 1995, lot 93).
2. For a résumé of the problem of attributions to Corneille de la Haye, see Sterling 1955, pp. 30–32, nn. 4, 6; Adhémar 1961; and Dubois de Groër 1996.
3. See Baetjer 1995, pp. 475–79. An unfinished portrait attributed to Corneille de la Haye in the Metropolitan Museum, Portrait of a Man in a White Fur Coat (ibid., p. 479, ill.), shows the refined working technique of this group of paintings.
4. Ibid., p. 475, ill.
5. Roudié 1962, pp. 480–85, figs. 1, 2; Béguin 1978; Dubois de Groër 1978. In the last two articles can be found a color reproduction, excellent details, and very useful comparisons with a number of portraits traditionally attributed to Corneille.
7. Dubois de Groër 1996, no. 61, ill.
9. Dubois de Groër 1978, fig. 5.
10. See, for example, the similar costumes in Hans Holbein the Younger's Portrait of a Man and Portrait of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, both datable to the 1540s, or late in his career (Rowlands 1985, pls. 111, 114).
CENTRAL EUROPE
Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries
6. Virgin and Child with a Donor Presented by Saint Jerome

1975.1.133
Oil on poplar panel. 63.5 x 48.3 cm. Inscribed in Mary’s nimbus: "VFQ\ldots R[or P]AOWB\ldots ?"

The poplar panel has been thinned and cradled. It was originally engaged in an arched frame that covered its upper third. The arch of the upper edge of the original painting (and therefore the arch of the frame) was drawn with a compass using a radius of 22.5 centimeters. The point of the compass was located where the Child’s upper right thigh was subsequently painted. The arch is truncated at the left and right by its intersection with the walled grassy bank. The curves of the bank were also drawn by a compass whose radius at the outer edge was about 51 centimeters.¹ The original frame was later removed, and the height of the painted surface was increased by at least 10.4 centimeters and was given a trefoil-like shape. The barbe of the original curved edge was scraped down during this process and the upper portion of the panel regessoed. This order of events is supported by information in the X-ray radiograph (Fig. 6.1): Four very narrow nail holes are evident outside the semicircular delimitation, the arced brushstrokes of a ground preparation conform to the curved shape of the first framing device, and the ground is thinner along the line of demarcation between the upper and lower portions of the panel. After the upper portion of the panel was gilded and the design punched, the lower part was regilded to some extent, and the trees and some of the plants were reworked. At still a later date (perhaps in the nineteenth century, when the painting was put into a modern frame), the panel was trimmed at least slightly and wooden strips were added on all four sides. These strips extend the dimensions of the trimmed panel by 2.9 centimeters at the bottom, 2.2 centimeters at the top, and 6 millimeters on each side.

The painting is in good condition except for scattered losses in the figures (especially in the faces) and in the gold background (particularly in the top portion). A warm glaze on the lettering and in the decorative details of the halos has been partly worn away. Remnants of what appears to be an extremely discolored glaze containing red pigment particles is still visible, particularly in the Virgin’s dress. Abrasion to the painting is most noticeable in the flesh tones, the fur cloak of the donor, the underskirt of the Virgin’s dress, and the coral beads.

PROVENANCE: H. Wendland, Paris, 1913; his sale, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, 26 October 1921 (Lugt 82619), lot 12 (as Swabian, sixteenth century). Acquired by Philip Lehman at the Wendland sale in 1921.²

EXHIBITED: New York 1928, no. 9, pl. 9 (as school of Cologne, fifteenth century); Paris 1957, no. 30, pl. 26 (as Bavaria, ca. 1450); Cincinnati 1959, no. 121 (as Germany).

LITERATURE: Pantheon 1928, p. 615, ill. (as Upper Rhine, late fifteenth century); Freund 1929, p. 285, fig. 5 (as school of Cologne, fifteenth century); C. Kuhn 1936, p. 24, no. 7 (as Lower Rhine, ca. 1500); E. Buchner 1956, pp. 83–84, ill. (as Meister der Münchener Marienaltaren); Isarlo 1957; Sterling 1957, pp. 136–37, fig. 3; Stange 1934–61, vol. 10 (1960), p. 58, fig. 91 (as Meister der [Münchener] Marienaltaren, the better of two artists whose works were grouped under the name Meister der Münchener Domkreuzigung); Szabo 1975, pp. 86–87, fig. 69 (as southern Germany, ca. 1450); Baetjer 1980, p. 69, ill. p. 289 (as Bavaria, ca. 1450); Metropolitan Museum 1987, p. 87, fig. 56; Baetjer 1995, p. 212, ill. (as Bavaria, ca. 1450).

In a garden enclosed by a low wall, an unidentified donor kneels before the Virgin and Child. The Virgin is seated on a cushion-covered bench that, like the wall, is made of brass or gold. Set in arcades along the visible sides of the bench are figures in relief, presumably prophets. Saint Jerome, identified only by the cardinal’s hat and cape, kneels beside the donor and presents him to the infant Jesus and his mother. Although the donor has been admitted to this holy company, his modest size acknowledges their superiority. The Child wears coral amulets around his neck and wrist, and he holds a handful of grapes in reference to the Eucharist. The meaning of the letters that are inscribed in Mary’s nimbus ("VFQ\ldots R[or P]AOWB\ldots ?") remains unexplained.³

No. 6, approximate original painted surface
In German art of the fifteenth century a garden carpeted with stylized but clearly differentiated plants was a familiar setting for the Virgin and a symbol of her purity. The imagery, taken from the Song of Solomon 4:12 ("A garden inclosed is my sister, my spouse"), appealed to the courtly tastes characteristic of the International Gothic style around 1400. The plants in this picture are painted in a manner still closely related to the International Gothic, but the figures, with their voluminous garments falling heavily in crumpled folds, point to the mid-fifteenth century.

An arc just above the three trees is visible in the gold ground. Originally a frame was engaged to the panel along this curve, and defined the upper limit of the painting. Consequently, the frame would have covered the upper third of the panel (see the illustration on page 30). The curve was drawn by compass with a radius of 22.5 centimeters. A compass was also used to define the curved grassy bank behind the figures. At the outermost edge of the bank, the radius of the compass line was about 51 centimeters, which places the center well below the bottom of the panel. Subsequently, the original frame was removed and replaced by another with a trefoil-like shape that exposed an additional surface area at the top of the painting. This area was then prepared with gold ground and the figure of Christ as the Salvator Mundi, flanked by two angels, was tooled into it. To judge by the style of the angels, this modification occurred some years after the main part was completed. In their grace and linearity the angels resemble such figures as seen in the work of Rogier van der Weyden and his successors.

The early reframing and additional figures caused a shift of emphasis in the painting. In its original state the figures were enclosed within a circular format, at the center of which is the infant Jesus. The use of the compass to define the enclosure of the painting and then again the boundary between the garden and the gold background suggests that the original artist wished to emphasize the centrality of the holy figures by presenting them within the circular enclosures of the garden and the geometrically defined format of the picture. When the painting was enlarged, centrality yielded to transcendence,
as the enclosure lifted and the vertical axis now directed attention toward the golden figure of Christ as the triumphant savior of the world.

Other changes were made in the painting as well, but whether they were made at the same time the shape was altered is still open to question. The trees were reworked, perhaps out of necessity due to the reworking of the gold ground. The saint’s beard was painted over a fully completed face and red costume (an unusual method at a time when artists generally used the treasured red pigments sparingly), and his surplice was added on top of the partially completed red gown, raising the height of his left leg. Whether these alterations were made in an effort to change a cardinal into a Saint Jerome, perhaps to accommodate a different site or a different purpose for the painting, is impossible to say.4

Buchner was the first, in 1956, to relate this painting to Bavarian art of the mid-fifteenth century. He attributed it to an artist he called the Master of the Munich Life of the Virgin after an Annunciation and a Nativity (Fig. 6.2) now in the Kunsthaus Zürich that once formed the exterior left wing of the main altarpiece in the Frauenkirche in Munich.5 Buchner’s attribution found ready acceptance by Winkler and Sterling in 19576 and by Stange in 1960.7 A comparison of the Lehman picture with the Nativity, especially, does reveal significant similarities in style and technique. Floral motifs like these and figures of this type, with similar physiognomy and in similar three-quarter profile poses, are also found in many Austrian paintings of the same period, by Conrad Laib of Salzburg,8 for example, or Lienhard Scherhauff of Brixen,9 or the artist known as the Master of the Albrecht Altarpiece.10 Yet in none of these cases, including that of the Munich Master, is there an exact correspondence with the style of the Lehman panel, where the forms are softer and the execution rather finer, comparable to that of the portrait of Kaiser Sigismund in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (Fig. 6.3), which has also been difficult to place.11 Attributions of the Sigismund have wandered from Conrad Laib, to Pisanello, to an anonymous Bohemian master. The physiognomy and brushwork of the Saint Jerome in the Lehman picture
and the sitter in the Vienna painting are especially close. But the Sigismund is probably earlier by a decade or two than this Virgin and Child with a Donor, suggesting that the painter of the Lehman panel belonged to a generation trained in the fine manner of the International style, in this case perhaps as an illuminator.

The soft, heavy folds of the Madonna’s blue gown and the donor’s brown cloak recall the drapery of the Madonna in a sculpture of 1443 (Fig. 6.4) from the high altar of Freising (now Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich) that was commissioned in Vienna from Jakob Kaschauer, who is identified in documents as a painter. Kaschauer had a large workshop, but there are no surviving paintings securely identified as his and few sculptures. That so much Austrian and Bavarian art of the mid-fifteenth century has been lost makes assigning a certain attribution or a specific place of origin to this painting impossible. There can be little uncertainty, however, about its regional and period style, or its exceptional quality.

NOTES:
1. These observations are those of George Bisacca of the Paintings Conservation Department at the Metropolitan Museum.
2. In a letter to Robert Lehman dated 22 June 1955 (Robert Lehman Collection files), Wendland wrote that he had purchased the painting in 1935. The copy of the Wendland sale catalogue in the Robert Lehman Collection file has been annotated in the margin next to lot 12: “5,500 fcs/wel be zugilt.”
3. Colin M. Wells, professor of classical studies at Trinity University, San Antonio, has confirmed the tentative reading of this mysterious inscription (letter to the author, 21 October 1991).
4. It is unusual that underdrawing (probably in black chalk or charcoal) could be located only in the drapery of Saint Jerome directly around the donor figure. In this figure, the folds of the drapery were first suggested by incised lines. This mixed technique for the preliminary design of the figures and certain disparities in the quality of execution of the draperies of the donor figure and those of the Virgin are anomalies in the painting that cannot be readily resolved, for the faces and hands of the figures are clearly all by the same artist. One possible explanation might be that the costume of the donor figure was painted by workshop assistants.
6. Sterling accepted Buchner’s attribution in Paris 1957, no. 30. In a letter of 9 August 1957 to Sterling, Winkler said he agreed with Buchner and had come independently to the same conclusion.
7. In 1960 Stange called the artist “Meister der Müncchen Domkreuzigung,” then said that the works grouped under this name were in fact executed by two artists; he called the better of the two the “Meister der Marienfahnen” and attributed the Lehman painting to him (see Stange 1934–61, vol. 10, p. 58).
8. For example, Saint Hermes and Saint Primus in the Städtisches Museum, Salzburg (Baldass 1946, figs. 27, 28).
9. See especially the Adoration of the Magi in the Österreichische Galerie, Vienna (Baum 1971, no. 31, colorpl. 6).
10. For the Master of the Albrecht Altarpiece, see Röhrig 1981 and also Baum 1977, pp. 39–42, nos. 17–19, colorpl. 3.
12. Halm and Lill 1924, p. 131, no. 188.

Cologne
third quarter of the fifteenth century

7. Adoration of the Magi

1975.1.134

Oil on beech panel. 19 x 17.5 cm, painted surface 18.3 x 17.2 cm. Inscribed in dark paint on the back of the uncradled panel: two lines of indecipherable script above the date 15.5, below which are a single indecipherable word and a flourish. Also on the back of the panel: 192–28, annotated in pencil, and a paper label annotated CT2247/R. Lehman.

The painting is in very good condition. The support is a single piece of wood with vertical grain. It has a pronounced barbe on all sides, indicating that it was painted in an engaged frame. The paint surface is well preserved, with the impasto intact and the colors fresh. There are some small local losses in the Virgin’s robe and some minor cracks along the bottom edge of the panel. Infrared reflectography reveals several adjustments in the contours of the shed and the horizon line at the right, as well as a rather free brush underdrawing preparing all the figures. It is not possible to derive a date for the beech panel through dendrochronological analysis.

PROVENANCE: Not established.


This diminutive panel is a free variation of the central image from Rogier van der Weyden’s Columba Altarpiece (Fig. 7.1), now in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich,
but formerly in the parish church of Saint Columba, Cologne.² The anonymous painter’s debt to Rogier’s grand composition of the Adoration of the Magi is evident in numerous details. These include the central position of the Virgin, the arrangement of the ruins sheltering her, and the poses of Saint Joseph, the magus kneeling at the right, the youthful magus, and the young page holding one of the gifts for the Christ Child.

The three kings were honored as particular patrons of the city of Cologne. Rogier van der Weyden’s triptych, which dates to about 1450–55, exerted a strong influence on Cologne painting in the second half of the fifteenth century.³ It in turn acknowledges another prestigious image of the three kings occupying the central field of an altarpiece devoted to the patrons of Cologne, the triptych known as the Dombild that is now in Cologne Cathedral and is traditionally ascribed to a slightly earlier Cologne painter, Stefan Lochner.⁴ Where the painter of the Lehman panel departed from Rogier’s model – by showing the Virgin crowned and flanked by
kneeling, bearded kings – he made reference to Lochner’s authoritative image.

The Lehman Adoration of the Magi has in the past been attributed to an anonymous Westphalian master, but in view of its clear references to painting in Cologne it is reasonable to seek its origins in that Rhenish city. Indeed, the long faces and brittle, angular poses of the figures show affinities to the work of the generation of painters active in Cologne after midcentury. More particularly, the large eyes, prominent noses, and metallic curls of the figures in the Lehman panel approach the works attributed to the Master of the Vision of Saint John, whose oeuvre has been assembled around a votive panel in the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne (Fig. 7.2). The eponymous Vision of Saint John the Evangelist in Cologne and depictions of episodes from the story of the True Cross also ascribed to this painter, one pair of scenes in the Westfälisches Landesmuseum, Münster, and another pair formerly on loan to the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt, provide the closest parallels to the Lehman Adoration of the Magi.5

NOTES:
3. See Schulz 1971, pp. 70–72, n. 46.
5. An oak support, rather than beech, would be more usual for a painting produced in the Lower Rhine or in the Netherlands; see Marette 1961, pp. 52–53.
Master H. A. or A. H.

Tyrol(?), 1528

8. Mary of Burgundy

1975.1.137

Oil on conifer panel, 44.8 x 31 cm, painted surface 43.9 x 30.5 cm. Verso: Virgin of the Immaculate Conception. Inscribed on the verso at the lower edge of the panel, in light olive paint: H A (or possibly A H) 1528.

The panel was examined in 1986 in the Paintings Conservation Department at the Metropolitan Museum. It has not been cut down or thinned. Infrared reflectography showed no underdrawing. The X radiograph (Fig. 8.1), however, revealed a painting of a Virgin of the Immaculate Conception in an oval and a rectangular painted frame beneath the black paint on the reverse of the panel; the black paint has since been partly removed. The monogram and date were inscribed beneath that paint layer. The painting on the recto has suffered heat damage as well as significant paint loss. The areas around the front of the chest and neck and the front of the face and the forehead are pitted and abraded. These areas, the profile, and the background have all been heavily retouched. The painting of the Virgin on the verso shows numerous losses, but the monogram and date at the lower end of the panel are well preserved.


EXHIBITED: Colorado Springs 1951–52, p. 29; Paris 1957, no. 39 (as Mary of Burgundy, attributed to Hans Maler); Cincinnati 1959, no. 128, ill. (as Mary of Burgundy[?], northern France).

LITERATURE: Lehman 1928, no. 94; Mayer 1930, pp. 115, 118, ill. (as northern France, early sixteenth century); Ring 1949, no. 154 (as wrongly attributed to the French school); R. Berger 1963, pp. 144–45, pl. 152 (as attributed to Hans Maler); Innsbruck 1969, under no. 33 (as a variant of the Portrait of Mary of Burgundy in Graz); Robert Wyss in Bern 1969, under no. 216; Szabo 1975, p. 85, fig. 70; Baetjer 1986, p. 112, ill. p. 299 (as Hans Maler zu Schwaz, active ca. 1500–1529); Bonsanti 1983, p. 21, fig. 12a; Baetjer 1995, p. 223, ill. (as Hans Maler zu Schwaz, active 1500–1529).

This is one of five similar profile portraits on panel representing Mary, duchess of Burgundy (1458–1482), the first wife of Kaiser Maximilian I, whom she married in 1477. One of the four others is in the Steiermärkisches Landesmuseum Joanneum, Graz (Fig. 8.2);2 one is in a private collection in Kreuzlingen (Fig. 8.3);3 and two are in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, one exhibited in the Vienna Schatzkammer and the other at Schloss Ambras (Figs. 8.4, 8.5).4 None of the four duplicates any one of the others, although the costumes and jewelry vary only slightly from version to version.

The portraits in Graz and Kreuzlingen were painted on oak panels, probably in the Netherlands or perhaps in France, and are most likely to predate the others. Yet all the extant versions presuppose a lost prototype. The prototype may have been a painting, but a painted portrait in profile would have been extremely rare in the Netherlands or France in the late fifteenth century. Mary of Burgundy is shown in profile on two portrait medals by Giovanni Candida that were made about the time of her marriage, or 1477–79, and portray her on one side and Maximilian on the other.5 Either of these medals could have provided a workable model for a painting of Mary in profile, except that in the medals her head is uncovered and in the paintings she wears a hennin.6

The panel in Graz has customarily been cited as the earliest of the group, the closest to the missing prototype and the model for the later surviving versions (the panel in Kreuzlingen did not become known through the literature until 1969), but to judge by the inscription in its upper right corner, which distinguishes Mary as Maximilian’s first wife, it cannot have been painted before 1493, when he took Bianca Maria Sforza as his second wife (assuming, of course, that the inscription is contemporary).7 The version in Kreuzlingen does not have an inscription to provide a terminus post quem, nor is there external evidence to clarify its place among the portraits in the group apart from its oak support, which points to a more likely origin in the Netherlands than in southern Germany or the Tyrol.8

Mary wears a tall Burgundian hennin characteristic of the 1470s. The heavy band of material over her forehead is pinned to the base of the conical headdress by a distinctive agraffe. Three necklaces, the most conspicuous of which is made of gold in the form of interlocking rings above a row of pendants, stand out against her pale skin. Her dress has a square-cut bodice and laced-on sleeves. The face in the Lehman portrait is fuller, especially under the chin, but the line of the forehead and
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nose, the dark eyes, and the pursed lips correspond generally to the features in the other versions. As Maximilian himself described his young wife, she had a “snow white complexion, brown hair, a small nose, small head and face, mixed brown and gray eyes, pretty and bright. . . . The mouth is rather high, yet clear and red.”

Like the versions in Graz and Kreuzlingen (Figs. 8.2, 8.3), the Lehman portrait shows Mary silhouetted against a plain dark background, but here she faces to the left. The Graz portrait also includes the hands, which are not present in either the Lehman or the Kreuzlingen version. The two panels belonging to the Kunsthistorisches Museum portray Mary in half-length with the background divided by a brocade behind the figure and a masonry wall extending halfway up the picture. The quadrant above the wall was intended for a landscape view, as in the version at Schloss Ambras (Fig. 8.4), where Mary appears facing to the right and holding a scroll of paper in her right hand. In the Schatzkammer version (Fig. 8.5), where Mary faces to the left, the area above the wall is blank. The compositional scheme of placing the figure in profile against a brocade, while leaving an opposite corner of the picture open for a view into the landscape, occurs in several portraits of Maximilian by Bernhard Strigel, to whom Friedländer suggested attributing the Lehman picture.

The authorship of the two Vienna versions remains altogether hypothetical. There are documents establishing that several portraits of Mary of Burgundy existed in Innsbruck or neighboring Schwaz in the Tyrol. On three occasions in 1500 (29 June, 3 July, and 8 July) Maximilian ordered the authorities in Innsbruck to send to him in Augsburg the portraits that were in the possession of the painter in Schwaz. Among the portraits was one of his first wife. Assuming the authorities did comply, a reflection of that portrait may appear in two drawings for an altarpiece by Hans Holbein the Elder in Augsburg. The drawings, now at the Städelisches Kunstinstitut in Frankfurt, include among other figures a portrait of Mary in profile, dressed as she is in the
Lehman painting and the other portraits in the group. Another document from Innsbruck, dated 6 August 1510, records the payment of fifteen gulden to a Hans, Maler von Schwaz, for two panels portraying Mary of Burgundy. In an article published in 1906–7, Glück suggested that this was the same artist as the “Hans Maler, maler zu Schwaz,” who wrote a letter, perhaps sometime between 1523 and 1526, to Anna of Hungary, wife of Ferdinand I, complaining that he had received insufficient payment for ten portraits he had painted for her. Glück further supposed that the portrait in the Schatzkammer in Vienna might be one of those ten. Only the year before, in 1905, Glück had published the inscription found on the back of a portrait of Anton Fugger, dated 1524, in the collection of Graf Thun-Hohenstein in Vienna — “HANS MALER VON VLM MALER ZVO SCHWATZ” — that established the authorship of a stylistically cohesive group of portraits ranging in date from 1517 to 1529. Glück reasoned that the profile portrait of Mary of Burgundy in the Schatzkammer differed from the paintings in that group because it had been based on an earlier prototype.

Determining the author of this version is difficult partly because it is inferior in quality to the versions in Vienna. Furthermore, there are reasons to doubt that Hans from Ulm, whose surname was Maler, is identical with the Hans, Maler von Schwaz, who was paid for two portraits of Mary in 1510. Stange has argued that the Hans Maler who is securely identified with the group of portraits mostly in three-quarter profile that date from 1517 to 1529 belonged to the generation of artists born about 1480 or 1490 and could not reasonably be considered to be the painter of the portraits Maximilian sent for in 1509, or in all probability even the “Hans Maler von Schwaz” who was paid in 1510. Stange also pointed out that given the prevalence of the name, it is not surprising that more than one artist called Hans should have been working in Schwaz.
during the early sixteenth century. There was considerable artistic activity in Schwaz at the time, as it was the business center for Tyrolean silver mines run by the Fugger of Augsburg. Moreover, there is no sure evidence that any of the surviving portraits of Mary were painted by an artist named Hans. Consequently, Egg has proposed that yet another artist who was working in Schwaz around 1500, Niclas Reiser, was the painter of the two portraits of Mary in Vienna.\footnote{This suggestion, tempered by a question mark, heads the entries for both pictures in the 1976 catalogue of portraits in the Kunsthistorisches Museum. The evidence for that attribution is also purely circumstantial.}

Recent examination of the Lehman painting in the Paintings Conservation Department at the Metropolitan Museum sheds a new light on the question of attribution. Though infrared reflectography revealed no perceptible underdrawing or changes in the painted layers, the X radiograph (Fig. 8.1) revealed a painting of the Virgin (in the pose of a Virgin of the Immaculate Conception), within oval and rectangular painted frames, beneath the black paint on the reverse of the panel, an image which is possibly datable to the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century.\footnote{At the lower edge of the painting and on a paint layer beneath that of the Virgin are the monogram H A, or possibly A H, and the date 1528 in light olive paint. At the time the image of the Virgin was painted, the monogram and date were not disturbed, but were simply painted over in a black pigment.} There is no reason to doubt that the monogram and date pertain to the portrait on the recto. Therefore we may now assign the painting to a Master H. A. (another artist by the name of Hans?) or possibly Master A. H. Either way, a name that fits these initials and the circumstances is still lacking. Although one can no longer maintain an attribution to Hans Maler, the date of 1528 corresponds closely in time with his signed work, and it indicates that a portrait type associated with Tyrolean
works from about 1500 to 1510 still had currency at least two or three decades later. Since the Hapsburgs owed their Netherlandish territories to the marriage between Maximilian and Mary, her portrait continued to have contemporary as well as historical significance even long after Maximilian's death in 1519.

NOTES:
1. According to a letter Germain Seligman wrote to Robert Lehman on 18 May 1955 (Robert Lehman Collection file), his firm acquired the painting at the Villeroy sale and eventually sold it to Kleinberger.
2. Mackowitz 1955, p. 105, fig. 3; Mackowitz 1960, p. 27, fig. 1; Kunsthistorisches Museum 1976, pp. 225–26; Steiermärkisches Landesmuseum Joanneum [1995?], pp. 164–65 (as Netherlandish, late fifteenth century). Another version of this portrait, presumably copied from the Graz panel, is painted on canvas and is preserved in fragmentary condition in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (Bonsanti 1983, fig. 10b).
5. Habich [1922], p. 85, pl. 52, figs. 6, 7; and see also Hill 1920, p. 74, pl. 12, 5, and Hill and Pollard 1967, no. 225.
6. An anonymous medal showing Mary in such a hennin bears the date 1479 but is believed to have been made after 1500 (Vienna 1955, nos. 650, 651, pl. 95). It should also be noted that profile portraits had currency in Italy apart from medals, and this tradition also was transmitted to Maximilian's court after his marriage in 1493 to Bianca Maria Sforza, who herself appears in profile in a drawing by Hans von Kulmbach (Pope-Hennessy [1963] 1966, p. 184, ill.).
7. The inscription reads: “MAR. CAR. BVRG. / DVCIS.FET. HAER. / MAX. I. CAES. INVIT. / L.”
8. Robert Wyss (in Bern 1969, no. 216, fig. 299) published the Kreuzlingen version as “Niederländisch oder französisch(?), um 1470/1475,” and conveyed the owner's opinion that the painting is the earliest of the known portraits of Mary of Burgundy and that it may have served as the basis for the other variants. If the painting were as early as 1470–75, it would not only date within the lifetime of Mary of Burgundy but would also predate her marriage to Maximilian in 1477. This is unlikely, as all the other profile portraits of her, including the medals (see notes 5 and 6 above), were made in commemoration of her marriage to the future Hapsburg Kaiser. Bonsanti discussed the Kreuzlingen portrait at length in his 1983 review of the many portraits or representations of Mary of Burgundy. He believes that this version is the source for the other surviving profile portraits, that it was probably executed about 1490 from a lost miniature painting, and that it was painted by Michael Pacher (active 1462, died 1498). There is no evidence to support his hypothesis, and the attribution to Pacher is unconvincing.
10. See, for example, Otto 1964, figs. 123, 126, 128.
12. Geschäft von Hof 1500, fol. 107, quoted in Schönherr 1884, p. xii, no. 621 (29 June): “König Maximilian verlangt, die Regierung zu Innsbruck solle ihm ‘die gemal von unserm auch unser vordern gemahel und ander ange- sicht,’ welche der Maler in Schwaz in Händen habe, unverzüglich schicken.” See also ibid., nos. 623, 624 (3 and 8 July 1500).
17. Stange 1966, pp. 83–86. Even in the case of the Hans identified by inscription as “Hans Maler von Ulm, Maler zu Schwaz,” Mackowitz (1960, pp. 17–22) proposed, albeit unconvincingly, that the inscription should be understood as “Hans, a painter from Ulm, currently painter in Schwaz” and then sought to identify this Hans with a certain Hans Fuchs who appears repeatedly in the account books of Schwaz between 1510 and 1514.
19. See note 4 above.
20. For similar images of the Virgin of the Immaculate Conception, see Stratton 1994, especially figs. 67, 69, 70.
Lucas Cranach the Elder

The son of a painter called Hans Moller or Maler who was also his teacher, Lucas Cranach I named himself after Cranach, the town where he was born in the diocese of Bamberg. His earliest surviving work appears to be the small, expressive Crucifixion in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, which was painted soon after he arrived in Vienna in about 1501, when he was thirty years old. But he was already a painter of some renown by 1504, when he was called to Wittenberg by Duke Frederick the Wise, elector of Saxony, to succeed Jacopo de' Barbari as court painter. In Wittenberg his fame grew, and by 1507 he had begun to assemble the large workshop that would eventually allow him to produce, sometimes in multiple versions, innumerable portraits, religious and mythological paintings, mural designs, and prints. Among the works he delivered in 1533, for example, were sixty double portraits of Frederick the Wise and John the Steadfast that had been commissioned only the year before by their successor, John Frederick the Magnanimous.

Cranach was active in local politics (he served on the Wittenberg city council from 1519 to 1545), and he had a hand in other commercial ventures (the tax records for 1528 show that he was one of the two wealthiest men in the city). He was a close friend of Martin Luther, and his many portraits of Luther attest that he was also a supporter of his cause.

When John Frederick was defeated and captured by Charles V at Mühlberg in 1547, Cranach lost his position as court painter. He joined John Frederick first in Augsburg, then Innsbruck, and when his patron was freed in 1552 he moved with him to Weimar. He died there a year later, but his distinctive style continued to be synonymous with Saxon art for at least another half century.

Lucas Cranach the Elder and Workshop

9. Venus with Cupid the Honey Thief

1975.1-135

Oil on oak panel. 36.3 x 25.2 cm. Signed with the signet (a snake with bat wings) and the date, 1530, on the tree trunk. Inscribed on the cartellino at the upper left: “DVN PVER ALVEOLO FVRATVR MELLA CVPDVD. / FVRANTI DIGITVM SEDVLA PUNXIT API. / SIC ETIAM NOBIS BREVIS ET MORIVTRA VOLYPTAS / QVAM PETIMVS TRISTI MIXTA DOLORE NOCET.”

On the verso of the panel, a fragment of a label with Cyrillic characters: T5. F. T[ ] 2 / *** ; and, in a round stamp: [ ] KUNST / 24.VII.28.

The oak panel is beveled on all four sides on the back and is approximately 2 millimeters thick at its edges. Though the predominant dimension of the painting is vertical, the wood grain runs horizontally. The panel is not cradled. The painted surface extends to the edge of the panel. There is no barbe evident; the ground preparation instead goes over the right and left edges, which are not cut. The top and bottom edges may have been trimmed slightly. The lines of text at the upper left were placed on ruled, incised lines on a cartellino which (the X radiograph confirms) was enlarged on the right to accommodate the size of the text. The overall condition of the paint surface is very good; it has not been abraded or damaged except in certain local areas. Specifically, Venus' face appears to be largely repainted, and the fingers of her left hand are abraded, showing pentimenti. The area immediately around Cupid's navel has been restored.

PROVENANCE: Z. M. Hackenbroch, Frankfurt, 1928; Mrs. A. E. Goodhart, New York.

EXHIBITED: Paris 1957, no. 9; Cincinnati 1959, no. 120, ill.; New York 1960a, no. 15.


One of at least twenty-two versions in the surviving oeuvre of Lucas Cranach the Elder and his workshop, this picture of Venus and Cupid takes its theme from the Nineteenth Idyll of Theocritus:

A cruel bee once stung the thievish Love-god as he was stealing honey from the hives, and pricked all his finger-tips. And he was hurt, and blew upon his hand, and stamped and danced. And to Aphrodite he
showed the wound, and made complaint that so small a creature as a bee should deal so cruel a wound. And his mother answered laughing, “Art not thou like the bees, that art so small yet dealest wounds so cruel?”

Given minor variations in spelling, the Latin inscription that appears on most versions of the painting, including the earliest of them, is the following:

```
DVM PVER ALVEOLO FVRATVR MELLA CVPIDO
FVRANTI DIGITVM CVSPIDE FIXIT APIS
SIC ETIAM NOBIS BREVIS ET PERIVTRA VOLVPTAS
QVAM PETIMVS TRISTI MIXTA DOLORE NOCET.
```

The inscription that Cranach painted into his picture presents a moralizing interpretation of Cupid’s plight. Although the wording on the Lehman example differs from that found on all but one of the other versions (the Lehman version has SEDVLA PUNXIT for CVSPIDE FIXIT in line two, and MORIVTRA for PERIVTRA in line three), the sense is the same in each:

As Cupid was stealing honey from the hive,
A bee stung the thief on the finger;
And so do we seek transitory and dangerous pleasures
That are mixed with sadness and bring us pain.

The inscription, together with the way Cupid is depicted crying in pain, has led to Cranach’s textual source. After Aldus Manutius published his edition of Theocritus in 1495, the story of Venus and the honey-stealing Cupid underwent numerous retellings in the Renaissance. Most modern commentators on Cranach’s treatment of the subject have followed Bauch’s suggestion of 1894 that it was Philipp Melanchthon who provided the artist with
DOMINE ALVEO IN VISO MELLA CUPIDO 
SERVAT DIGITVM SEDULA PENSIT APIS
SIC ETIAM NOSI BREVIS ET MORTUA VOMPE
QUAM FETIMUS TRISTI MENTIS DOLORI NOCTI
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his specific text. In 1528 Melanchthon published a Latin translation from the original Greek of the Theocritean idyll. Both Hutton and Leeman have pointed out, however, that the usual four lines of Cranach's inscription are quoted in the 1621 Paduan edition of Aciati's Emblemata, where the quatrains, transcribed from a printing in the collection of Aloysius Corradinus (1562-1618) in Padua, is recognized as an adaptation from Ercole Strozzi's rendering of the Nineteenth Idyll.

The first two lines of Cranach's inscription are nearly identical with Strozzi's ("Dum Veneris puer alveolos furatur Hymetti / Furanti digitum cupside fixit apis"), and Strozzi, like Cranach, portrayed Cupid crying over the stings rather than blowing on his hand and jumping up and down, as Theocritus described him. Manutius, whose publications were sought out for the university library at Wittenberg, also published in 1513 the works of his late friend Ercole Strozzi, so it is not difficult to account for Cranach's access to this text. As for the second half of Cranach's quatrains, Hutton notes that the moralizing couplet appears under the name of Georg Sabinus in Antonio Germano's Giardino di sentenze, which was published in Rome in 1630. A philologist and writer of Latin poetry, Sabinus came to Wittenberg in 1523 or 1524. There he studied with and became a close friend of Melanchthon, whose daughter he married in 1536. He would obviously have been well known to Cranach.

Cranach painted this theme in small and large versions. The smaller ones, like the Lehman picture, show the figures in a landscape setting with the pale body of Venus silhouetted against dark green foliage. The landscape extends into the distance at the right, where a castle occupies a rocky prominence. The larger versions are painted on tall, narrow panels, allowing the figure of Venus to be represented nearly lifesize. Except for the version of 1531 in the Galleria Borghese, Rome, which includes a tree with the bee's hive, these tall pictures present the figures by themselves on a narrow strip of pebbly ground with a plain dark backdrop. Cranach made use of this format and setting for his lifesize Venus and Cupid of 1509 in the Hermitage, Saint Petersburg, following the model that Dürer established in 1507 with his panels of Adam and Eve (Prado, Madrid). Many of Cranach's lanky nudes, including the one in the Lehman picture, are related in varying degrees to Dürer's prototypes, though Cranach imbued his figures with a distinctive appearance and character. To judge by a drawing dated 1514 in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Dürer seems also to have been the first artist in Germany to represent the subject of the Theocritean idyll. Yet Cranach's approach to the subject betrays no knowledge of, let alone reliance on Dürer's scene, which is more narrative on the one hand, and shows Venus in a consciously more classicizing manner on the other.

In this and all but a few of the other versions of this theme, Cranach's Venus directs her attention to the beholder rather than to her distraught son. In accoutrements and posture the Lehman figure almost duplicates the unaccompanied Venus dated 1529 in the Louvre, Paris (Fig. 9.1). Standing in nearly identical landscape settings, both figures, by means of stylish hats, jewelry, and revealingly transparent veils, are made to appear more naked than nude, more contemporary than classical. Such a Venus as this and such a Cupid who finds his honey in the suggestive slit of a tree give unmistakable meaning to that part of the inscription about "transitory and dangerous pleasures." It is possible, moreover, that the painful consequences were understood to be physical as well as moral. Noting the dread of syphilis in the sixteenth century and citing a belief that the stings of honeybees indicated who was chaste and who was not, Eberle has suggested that Cranach's picture gave warning not least of venereal disease.

According to its date of 1530 - the signet (a snake with bat wings) and date appear on the tree at the left - the Lehman picture follows by three or four years the earliest known versions of this subject, which are also of the smaller format with landscape settings. The version in the Staatliches Museum in Schwerin bears the date 1527, and one in the National Gallery, London, may date from still a year earlier. The composition and figural style of the Lehman picture are consistent with a date of 1530, but whether it is an original or a replica is a question. Identical to the Lehman version in all but a few details and also dated 1530 is the example that was owned by Count Carl Björnstjerna in Stockholm and was auctioned on 30 November 1979 at Christie's in London (Fig. 9.2). In the ex-Björnstjerna version Venus wears a gossamer shift belted just below her breasts, a very unusual garment in Cranach's work that may be a later addition or may indicate the later execution of that painting.

Clearly one of these two paintings was copied from the other, or both were copied from yet another unknown version. While Venus' body in the Lehman painting shows a degree of refinement that one may associate
with Cranach's hand, other areas, such as the bark of the tree trunk, the stones and greenery in the foreground, and the distant landscape view, are summarily rendered. The leaves surrounding Venus are also executed in a less sophisticated manner than Venus herself. Given this apparent range of quality within a single painting, and the production of more than twenty variants of this theme, workshop assistance is almost a certainty. Further investigation of Cranach's technique and his workshop practices may shed better light on the question.

At this point, one can say that the fine execution of the figure of Venus in the Lehman version suggests Cranach's involvement. Those areas where the execution is least convincing, such as around Venus' eyes, nose, and mouth, contributing to a slightly skewed expression, have been retouched. The original finish is obscured where the fingers are abraded on Venus' left hand, showing *pentimenti*.

On the occasion of the exhibition of pictures and objects from the Robert Lehman collection in Paris that year, this painting was reproduced in the June 1957 issue of *L'oeil*. The same issue of the magazine contained an article on Pablo Picasso at his villa in Cannes. Picasso subsequently produced his own version of Cranach's *Venus with Cupid the Honey Thief*, which he dated 12 June 1957.

NOTES:
1. According to Friedländer and Rosenberg 1932, no. 2046.
2. Gow 1932, p. 147.
8. The locations of the small versions are: a. Staatliches Museum, Schwerin, dated 1527 (Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 246); Basel 1974, no. 571, fig. 321; b. National Gallery, London (Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 246); National Gallery 1965, colorpl. 1; c. Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, dated 1530 (Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 244); d. formerly Björnstrierna collection, Stockholm, dated 1530 (ibid., no. 246-47); *Burlington Magazine* 1957, October 1979, color ill. back cover; sale, Christie's, London, 30 November 1979, lot 71, ill.; e. private collection, New York, dated 1531 (Ederheimer 1936, no. 14; Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 248); f. formerly (1963) Frederick Mont Gallery, New York (Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 247); g. formerly Adam Bronicki collection, Warsaw (Basel 1974, no. 571; Michalkowa 1972, p. 87, no. 4, fig. 2); h. Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nürnberg (Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 398); Lutze and Wiegand 1937, no. 213, fig. 372; i. private collection, Germany, ex coll. Frau von Cranach (Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 398); Basel 1974, no. 569; j. formerly (1926) Dr. C. Benedict Gallery, Berlin (Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 398); k. New-York Historical Society (ibid., no. 400); l. formerly Sir Herbert Cook collection, Richmond, England (ibid., no. 246); m. private collection, Switzerland (1972), formerly Schlossmuseum, Weimar (ibid., no. 246); n. formerly (1929) J. Gouldstikker Gallery, Amsterdam (ibid., no. 246); o. formerly (1932) Dr. Paret collection, Berlin (ibid., no. 246); p. Palais d'Orsay sale, Paris, 23 June 1978 (Beurdeley 1979, p. 22, ill.); this may be one of the seventeen versions of Venus listed by Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 246, none of which is illustrated and not all of which involve Cupid the honey thief.
9. The locations of the larger versions are: a. Galleria Borghese, Rome, dated 1531 (Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 245); b. Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts, Brussels (ibid., no. 246); Fierens-Gevaert 1931, pl. 73; c. Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nürnberg (Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 398); Lutze and Wiegand 1937, no. 1097, fig. 371); d. Gemäldegalerie, Berlin (Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 395); e. Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller, Otterlo (ibid., no. 396); f. Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, Geneva, fragment of upper part of Venus (ibid., no. 246); g. lower half of figure in private collection, Milan (Berenson 1915, ill.).
13. De Jongh (1998) has discussed several paintings by Cranach representing the same subject.
15. See note 8 above, version a. According to Basel 1974, no. 570, this version may be a copy.
16. The date of about 1526 was suggested in Basel 1974, p. 600, under no. 500, and p. 626, under no. 569.
17. In 1928 both Bode and Friedländer (letters of 4 February and 1 September, respectively; Robert Lehman Collection files) expressed their written but unpublished opinion that the picture is a genuine work of Lucas Cranach the Elder, signed by him. Basel 1974, vol. 2, p. 787, pl. 737 (reproducing p. 29 from W. Campbell 1957, with ill.), refers to the Lehman version as "an old copy after lost original."
18. See note 8 above, version d.
19. For remarks on the present state of this question, see Sandner and Ritschel 1994.
20. That Picasso based his *Venus and Cupid the Honey Thief* on the Lehman version as reproduced in *L'oeil* was pointed out in Basel 1974 (vol. 2, pp. 736–37, ill.). For Picasso's painting in gouache, see Zervos 1966, no. 335.
Lucas Cranach the Younger

Wittenberg 1515—Weimar 1586

Lucas Cranach II began his career as his father’s student and assistant and gradually took on more responsibility in the family workshop, especially after the death of his older brother Hans in 1537. He ran the shop on his own after 1550, when Lucas I left Wittenberg to join his patron John Frederick in Augsburg, and after his father died in 1553 he inherited the business. Like his father he served on the Wittenberg town council, in his case for nearly twenty years, and like his father he prospered, remaining one of the wealthiest men in the city.

Lucas the Younger's early work is inseparable from his father's, and there is still considerable debate even about which of them authored certain paintings from the late 1540s and early 1550s. Among the earliest of his authenticated works are two large signed panels depicting Hercules battling an army of dwarfs (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden) that he painted in 1551 for the new elector, Maurice of Saxony. His debt to his father is apparent still in the Portrait of a Nobleman and Portrait of a Noblewoman of 1564 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), but his palette is softer and lighter and the poses of his distinguished sitters are more frozen and their faces less individualized.

In addition to executing commissions for portraits and religious paintings, Lucas the Younger and his workshop continued to produce variants of pictures on classical and religious themes made popular by the elder Cranach. As early as the late 1530s he was also designing woodcuts. His precise, carefully drawn woodcut illustrations appeared in 1539 in Ringer Kunst, by Fabian von Auerswald, and in 1541 in two editions of Luther's translation of the Bible.

Lucas Cranach the Younger

10. Nymph of the Spring

Oil on beech panel. 15.2 x 20.3 cm. Inscribed in a cartellino at the upper right: "Fontis nympha sacri sonnum ne rvpme qvisco."

The beech panel, thinned to 2 millimeters, is laminated to an equal thickness of mahogany and cradled. Though the predominant dimension of the painting is horizontal, the wood grain runs vertically. The painted surface extends to the edge of the panel. No barbe is evident, but because the composition is complete the panel can have been trimmed only slightly on all sides. Except for a few pinprick losses in the foreground landscape elements, the painting is in near perfect condition. The two rodents (rabbits?) in the foreground are later but very old additions.

PROVENANCE: James Simon, Berlin; Rudolf Chillingworth, Lucerne; [A. S. Drey, New York]. Acquired by Robert Lehman from Drey in April 1928.¹

EXHIBITED: New York 1928, no. 27; New York 1939a, no. 58; New York 1939b, no. 59; Paris 1957, no. 10, pl. 27; Cincinnati 1959, no. 119, ill.; New York 1960a, no. 7, ill.

LITERATURE: Friedländer and Rosenberg 1932, no. 324b (as probably Lucas Cranach the Younger); Art Digest 1939, p. 5, ill.; Gue 1939, p. 12; Frankfurter 1939, pp. 9–10, ill.; Jewell 1939; Sweeney 1939, p. 19, ill.; Kurz 1953, p. 176, n. 2; Heinrich 1954, p. 222; Arts 1960, pp. 24–25, ill.; Preston 1960, p. 272; Ruhmer 1963, under no. 33; Lauts 1966, under no. 895; Talbot 1967, p. 80, no. 28, 29 (as a late version of the theme); Szabo 1975, pp. 89–90, fig. 72; Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 403B (as likely to be by Lucas Cranach the Younger); Hollander 1978, ill. p. 97; Baetjer 1980, pp. 36–37, ill. p. 297 (as Lucas Cranach the Elder); Baetjer 1995, p. 221, ill. (as Lucas Cranach the Elder); Schneckburger-Broschek 1997, pp. 92–94, under no. 58, fig. 60.

The subject of this picture evolved from a pseudoclassical epigram that appears in abbreviated form as the inscription at the upper right: "Fontis nympha sacri sonnum ne rvpme qvisco" (Here I rest, nymph of the spring, do not disturb my sleep). The entire epigram reads:

Huius nympha loci, sacri custodia fontis,
Dormio, dum blandae sentio murmur aquae.
Parce meum, quisquis tangis cava marmora,
somnum
Rumpere. Sive bibas sive lavare tace.²
It seems to have been invented by a Roman humanist, Giovanni Antonio Campani, between 1464 and 1470, and it then entered several Renaissance compendia of antique or presumed antique inscriptions. When he included the poem in his compilation of about 1477–84, Michael Fabricius Ferrarinus added the following note: “On the banks of the Danube there is a sculpture of a sleeping nymph on a beautiful fountain. Under the figure is this epigram.” Although the report itself was implausible given the recent origin of the epigram, it became prophetic. On a number of fountains constructed in the sixteenth century this inscription accompanied a recumbent female figure. None of the fountains have survived, but two of them are recorded in sixteenth-century prints: the fountain in the Roman garden of Angelo Colocci in an engraving by J. J. Boissard that was first published in 1598, and a fountain identified as from the Veneto in an etching by Tobias Fendt that was first issued in 1574.

Although this theme seems not to have inspired the design of actual fountains in Germany, it struck a responsive chord in Lucas Cranach the Elder and his public. No fewer than seventeen paintings of the Nymph of the Spring by the master or his circle have survived. The
two earliest versions are in the Museum der bildenden Künste, Leipzig, and at the Jagdschloss Grunewald in Berlin (Fig. 10.1). The Leipzig version is dated 1518; for reasons of style the Berlin painting is likely to pre-date it by two or three years. Cranach's specific source for the inscription is undetermined. A slightly altered version of the full epigram was recorded shortly before 1500 by Conrad Celtis in a manuscript preserved in the Stadtbibliothek, Nürnberg. Dürer treated the same subject in a drawing from 1514 that includes the four-line epigram, but if Cranach knew the drawing, he did not emulate the pose of Dürer's reclining nymph.

In at least twelve of the Cranach versions, including the earliest one in Berlin, the figure is positioned as we see her in the Lehman painting: head supported by right hand, left hand resting on left thigh, and left leg crossed over right. The source for this pose was apparently an illustration from the Hypnerotomachia Poliphili of Francesco Colonna, published in 1499 in Venice. The woodcut shows a sleeping fountain nymph watched by two fauns and a satyr, who is unveiling her. Derived in its turn from a Dionysian sarcophagus, the recumbent nymph in the woodcut inspired Italian painters and designers of fountains, and probably also inspired Cranach. Yet the suggestion that Cranach followed a Giorgionesque model should not be dismissed. The landscape setting and the relative softness of the modeling in the Leipzig and, particularly, Berlin versions of
the Nymph of the Spring go well beyond the limits of the woodcut and call readily to mind the likes of Giorgione’s *Venus* in Dresden.

Cranach’s reclining nude was at first simply the “nymph of the sacred spring” of the inscription, devoid of any further identifying attributes. The bow, quiver, and partridges that associate her with Diana in the Lehman picture and other later variants do not appear in the early Berlin and Leipzig versions. Cranach’s nude was never identified, as were the nymph figures on Roman fountains, with Cleopatra or Ariadne, and there is nothing to indicate that the classical myth of Amymone and the spring that bore her name was ever associated with this Saxon nymph. Nor can the popularity of such representations be accounted for as they were in Rome, “where the sleeping nymph fountain was a symbol of the presence of the Muses who presided over the newly reborn academies of learning and the reborn art of poetry.” There is evidence, however, that this reclining figure was taken for Helen of Troy, Venus’ reward to Paris. When Lucas Cranach’s son Hans died in 1537, he was eulogized by the poet Johann Stigel, who praised “one of the frequently seen pictures of the sleeping Helen which with divine art was painted by you.” In the absence of a single other picture in the Cranach manner, let alone a type “frequently seen,” whose subject could be taken for Helen, it is possible that Stigel, rightly or wrongly, was describing the Nymph of the Spring.

Cranach may have added the bow and quiver and the partridges, which first appear in a drawing from about 1525 formerly in the Kupferstichkabinett, Dresden, to fill a certain iconographic vacuum, or it could be that this nymph underwent a change of meaning in his mind as his figural style became more attenuated and mannered. Calling to mind the downfall of Actaeon, who espied Diana naked, the attributes helped to turn what was left of the Italian *poesia* into an ironic and moralizing image on the theme of carnal desire. The nymph only feigns sleep. Having shed her modish dress, she lies upon it, displaying herself like a contemporary courtesan, an ancestor of Édouard Manet’s *Olympia*. Yet the allusion to Actaeon’s forbidden intrusion and the inscription warn the viewer who might be tempted by such a languorous invitation that he proceeds at his own peril.

The Lehman picture represents one of two principal variants of the composition with the Dianian attributes. The Lehman picture and those of its type postdate the earliest version of the other most frequently represented compositional variant, namely the *Nymph of the Spring*

---

**Fig. 10.1** Lucas Cranach the Elder or his circle, *Nymph of the Spring*, Jagdschloss Grunewald, Berlin. Photograph: Verwaltung der Staatlichen Schlösser und Gärten, Berlin

**Fig. 10.2** Lucas Cranach the Elder, *Nymph of the Spring*. Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid

**Fig. 10.3** Workshop of Lucas Cranach the Younger, *Nymph of the Spring*. Staatliche Museen Kassel, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, GKr19
in the Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza in Madrid (Fig. 10.2). On stylistic grounds the Thyssen-Bornemisza version fits within Cranach’s oeuvre about 1530, or about the same time as the lost painting from Dresden. Cranach experimented with several variations around this time. But apart from the Lehman and Thyssen types these remained singular compositions. The Thyssen painting and the six other corresponding versions are distinguished by the placement of the bow and quiver, which hang from a tree at the right, and the spring, which is located at the left. The pose of the figure continues to follow that found in the Hypnerotomachia Poliphili, except in the version in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., where the nymph is posed without the legs being crossed at all.

In the Lehman picture and those like it the bow and quiver hang from a tree at the left and the spring issues from a rock at the right. The inferior but compositionally nearly identical rendering of the theme in the Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel (Fig. 10.3), has been justifiably relegated to the workshop of Lucas Cranach the Younger. The execution of the Lehman picture is distinctly finer than that of the one in Kassel, in which the nymph’s head has also been enlarged so that it is out of proportion with the rest of the figure. A third example of this variant is in the Staatsliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, where it is catalogued as “a late copy of the composition, perhaps belonging to the seventeenth century.” Finally, a poor replica of the Lehman type, known to me only from an equally poor photograph, was according to a notation on the photograph in the collection of Josef Fieger at Düsseldorf. The nymphs in these four paintings wear rings, bracelets, and necklaces, which is characteristic of only those versions that belong to the end phase in the development of the theme.

The signet on the tree trunk in the Lehman picture is the one used by Cranach and his workshop after 1537, or after the death of Hans Cranach. The wings of the serpent are bird’s wings, not bat’s as before, and they are folded back rather than unfurled. Except for the picture of 1550 in Oslo, none of the versions of the Nymph of the Spring from after 1537 are dated, and the signet provides no more than a terminus post quem. In view of the many replications of this nature and the nature of Cranach’s workshop, where many hands closely emulated the master’s style and produced pictures under his imprimatur, the attribution of some if not most versions of the Nymph of the Spring to Lucas Cranach the Elder must be understood in a rather generic sense.

Where the later versions are concerned, the name of Lucas Cranach the Younger comes to mind. Prior to 1550, when the elder Cranach left Wittenberg to attend his imprisoned patron, Duke John Frederick, the assignment of paintings to the son rather than the father involves considerable speculation. Not all Cranach authorities, for example, are convinced of Lucas the Younger’s authorship of the Fountain of Youth in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin, which is dated 1546 and in which our reclining nude appears yet again by the edge of the pool. The body of works from after 1550, however, not to mention those from after the death of Lucas the Elder in 1553, provides a stylistic basis for attributing the Lehman picture to the son. Comparing Lucas the Elder’s technique, as demonstrated particularly by the rendering of the flesh tones in his Venus and Amor and Judgment of Paris in the Metropolitan Museum, with that of the Lehman Nymph of the Spring indicates different hands at work. The gray undermodeling in the flesh tones in the Lehman picture and the opaque, pasty quality of the white used for the highlights in the nymph’s body mark it as technically later than Lucas the Elder’s two paintings, where the figures are modeled with more transparent glazes used over the ground beneath. Characteristic of the younger Cranach’s style are the light tonalities of the rosy flesh tones, the cool blues of the sky, the light green of the grass, and the pastel hues of the rock formation from which the spring splashes into the pool in the Lehman Nymph. The round, somewhat porcine face of the nymph in the Lehman painting bears a resemblance to the commemorated figures on an epitaph panel dated 1542 in the collection of Georg Schafer at Schweinfurt that has been assigned to Lucas Cranach the Younger. The extremely precise and skillful execution of fine details in the Lehman Nymph, such as the jewelry and the scene on the spit of land in the distance, where a minute train of donkeys, three bearing packs and the fourth a rider, advances on a hilltop beggarlike figure (perhaps the prodigal son?), sets this painting apart from indifferent shopwork.

The painting was carried out with no evident changes in the course of its execution, with the exception of one conspicuous addition, applied by a later hand: the pair of white rodents, presumably rabbits, nibbling grass just beneath the nymph’s outstretched leg. In no other version of this theme do these animals appear. They are painted on top of the turf in a technique distinctly different from that of the rest of the work. By contrast, the partridges were thinly painted in an area left in
reserve for them over a gray underpainting, and their surface lies not above but at the same level as that of the turf. The white paint of the rabbits, while abraded more than that of the original surface, is itself quite old. The origin of this pair may well lie in the tradition of the many variants of Dürer’s famous rabbits that were painted in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.29 The addition of the rabbits was surely intended as a gloss on the moralizing twist Cranach had given this innocent nymph manqué. Since Dürer’s engraving The Fall of Man appeared in 1504, rabbits had frequently appeared in German representations of Adam and Eve, including some by Cranach.30 A pair of rabbits, not just one as in Dürer’s humanistic allusion, aptly served Hans Baldung Grien’s expressive purposes in his woodcut of 1511, where he portrayed the fall of man as the result of primarily carnal instincts.33 To that extent, at any rate, the hand that added two rabbits to the Lehman painting had not missed its point.

The painting can be dated only approximately to about 1550. Dendrochronology could not confirm or refute that date because the small size of the beechwood panel presented too few visible rings for an accurate ring count.32

NOTES:
1. The earlier provenance is given on the Drey invoice dated 9 April 1928 (Robert Lehman Collection files), which also notes that the painting was not included in the public sale of the Chillingworth collection at the Galeries Fischer in Lucerne on 5 September 1922.
2. Kurz (1953, pp. 176-77) quotes Alexander Pope's translation (in a letter of 2 June 1725 published in Pope's Works, ed. W. Elwin, vol. 6 [1871], p. 384): "Nymph of the grot, these sacred springs I love, / And to the murmur of these waters sleep; / Ah, spare my slumbers, gently tread the cave! / And drink in silence, or in silence sleep!"


5. MacDougall 1975, p. 360, fig. 2. MacDougall discusses the authorship of the epigram and its association with Roman fountains.


7. Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 119.


13. See Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, p. 93, under no. 119, and Liebmann 1968, p. 434, who cites other authors who point to an influence from Giorgione.


16. J. Rosenberg 1960, no. 40 (now lost).

17. Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 120.

18. A small roundel (diameter 14.7 cm) in the Kunstsammlungen der Veste Coburg shows the nymph with a stag and a beaver instead of the usual bow and quiver and partridges, and it has no inscription (Basel 1974, fig. 146, as ca. 1525-27 based on comparison with another dated roundel, fig. 145). A version of the theme in vertical format with a natural spring and a single partridge but no inscription or other attributes (ibid., fig. 317, as ca. 1526) was in the collection of the earl of Crawford and Ball caricres in Edinburgh in 1958 (according to the object file for the Nymph of the Spring in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. [see note 19 below]). Another version in vertical format with a reworked but apparently correct date of 1533 is in the Hessisches Landesmuseum, Darmstadt (ibid., fig. 316). And in a version dated 1534 in the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool (Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 259), the nymph leans against a large striped pillow and the fountain is similar to the Renaissance fountain in the Berlin painting, with putti spurtling streams of water into a round basin.

19. The six other versions are in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. (Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 403, color ill., as after 1537; a private collection in Switzerland (ibid., no. 404, as after 1537); a private collection in Paris (ibid., no. 402, as after 1537); the Musée des Beaux-Arts et d'Archeologie, Besançon (Basel 1974, no. 547, as Lucas Cranach the Younger [or the Elder], ca. 1540-50; Thirion 1956, pp. 56-57, color ill.); the Nasjonalgalleriet, Oslo (Nasjonalgalleriet 1961, p. 32, ill.; dated 1550); and the Kunsthalle, Bremen (Zervos 1950, ill. p. 75).


22. Photograph Th. 12265/1, Forothen, Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte, Munich.

23. In 1955 Giesecke assigned all paintings bearing the device of a serpent with folded wings to Lucas Cranach the Younger, thereby eliminating the accepted works of Lucas the Elder after 1537. The weaknesses of this thesis were pointed out by J. Rosenberg (1960, pp. 9-10).

24. For a detail of the nymph, see Hartlaub 1958, fig. 4. The attribution to Lucas the Elder was maintained in Friedländer and Rosenberg 1978, no. 407, and Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz 1978, no. 593.


26. Inasmuch as the gray underpainting blocks the passage of infrared light, it is not possible to detect underdrawing with infrared reflectography in any areas except in some of the contours of the nymph's body. Here the underdrawing is very summary and is followed precisely in the painted layers. For further information on underdrawings in paintings by Lucas Cranach the Elder and his workshop, see Sandner and Ritschel 1994.

27. The high-key palette is especially notable in the portraits and portrait sketches of Lucas Cranach the Younger. See, for example, W. Schade 1980, figs. 218, 219, 223, 234, 235, 239, 246.


32. On the dating of beechwood panels by Cranach and his workshop, see Klein 1986, especially pp. 233-35.
Hans Holbein the Younger

Augsburg 1497/98–London 1543

Hans Holbein the Younger’s Bonifacius Amerbach (Kunstmuseum Basel), painted in 1519, the same year he became a master in the painters’ guild in Basel, was a portent of the reputation he would later earn in England as the foremost portraitist of the Reformation. In 1516, when he was eighteen or nineteen years old, he had already been commissioned to paint portraits of the Basel burgomaster Jakob Meyer and his first wife, Dorothea Kannengiesser (both Kunstmuseum Basel). The next year he seems to have joined his father, Hans Holbein the Elder, in Lucerne, where they worked together on the decoration of a house owned by Jacob von Hertenstein. The two collaborated as well in 1521 on the Oberried Altarpiece for the cathedral in Freiburg im Breisgau, one of several religious commissions Hans the Younger undertook in the early 1520s. During those years he also decorated at least one other house in Basel, produced drawings and designs for woodcuts and stained glass, and continued to paint portraits.

Several of those portraits were of the humanist and scholar Erasmus, and when Holbein traveled to England in 1526 he carried with him introductions to Erasmus’ well-placed friends. It was through Erasmus that he was commissioned to paint portraits of Sir Thomas More and his family. Holbein worked in England for the next two years, returning to Basel in August 1528, before his citizenship lapsed. By the summer of 1532, however, he had returned to England, and except for a brief visit to Basel in 1538 and several other journeys abroad, he was to remain there the rest of his life, working for ever more powerful patrons. Henry VIII named him king’s painter in 1536.

Hans Holbein the Younger

11. Erasmus of Rotterdam

1975.1.138

Oil on linden panel. 18.4 x 14.2 cm, painted surface 17.6 x 14 cm.

The panel was thinned and attached to a cradled auxiliary panel. All the original edges are intact. The painting is in an excellent state with the exception of a small paint loss to the right of the sitter’s nose, a tiny scratch on the chin, and abrasion in the fur collar and hat. A pounced design, visible with infrared reflectography (Fig. 11.1), served as a preparatory underdrawing. The white label painted at the upper left is a later addition made when the painting was in the collection of John, Lord Lumley.

Provenance: John Norris, Windsor (d. 1564); Edward Banister, Windsor; probably Henry Fitzalan, earl of Arundel (d. 1580), Nonsuch Palace, Surrey; his son-in-law, John, Lord Lumley (d. 1609), Nonsuch Palace, Surrey, Lumley Castle, and London; Thomas Howard, earl of Arundel and Surrey (d. 1643); his wife, Alethea Talbot, Countess of Arundel (d. 1643); Charles Howard of Greystoke; the Howards of Greystoke; J. Pierpont Morgan (d. 1913), New York (purchased from the Greystokes); his son, J. P. Morgan (d. 1943), New York and Glen Cove, Long Island. Purchased by Robert Lehman in September 1943 from the estate of J. P. Morgan through M. Knoedler and Co., New York.2

Exhibited: London 1890, no. 1094; lent by J. P. Morgan to the Metropolitan Museum, New York, 1909–17; New York 1941b, no. 9; New York 1943, no. 5; Paris 1957, no. 25, pl. 28; Cincinnati 1959, no. 123, ill.; New Haven 1960, no. 3.

Of the several versions and many replicas of Hans Holbein the Younger’s portraits of Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466 or 1469-1536) that survive, this small panel is one of five whose quality is recognized as autograph. Contrary to the opinions of Schmid and Boveri, who had not seen the original painting, the face is marked by the precision and sensitivity one expects of the master. This is further demonstrated by the X radiograph of the portrait (Fig. 11.2), which shows Holbein’s typical handling: a uniform subsurface layer of short, staccato strokes of lead white over which he pulled the glazes and scumbles he used to produce the lifelike modeling of the face.

Erasmus is positioned and dressed in the same way as in Holbein’s portrait of him of 1523 from Longford Castle, Wiltshire, England, now on loan to the National Gallery, London (Fig. 11.3). The Longford Castle portrait and the profile portraits in the Kunstmuseum, Basel, and the Louvre, Paris, from approximately the same time are the earliest of Holbein’s paintings of Erasmus, and the only ones that survive from before Holbein’s departure for England in 1526. The Lehman portrait shows an older Erasmus – grayer and more deeply lined. These same traits appear in a second version in the Kunstmuseum in Basel (Fig. 11.4), a small roundel, equally authentic, with the sitter also in three-quarter profile but without the hands. There seems to be no doubt that after his return from England in 1528 Holbein made another portrait study of Erasmus, when the famous scholar was in his sixties. Yet it appears that
Holbein still had in his possession the study he had used for the Longford Castle portrait and that he simply duplicated the appearance of the cap and the fur-lined coat, secured by a belt tied in a bow, and then reduced the setting to a plain blue background.

Since it was Holbein's practice as a portrait painter to work from a drawing made from life, he could replicate a likeness at any time so long as he had his original drawing at hand. The Lehman portrait and the Basel roundel were evidently modeled on the same life study.
Holbein very likely produced both of them before he left Basel in 1532; both are painted on linden wood, a support common to German and Swiss paintings, instead of oak, which Holbein used for the portraits he made in England. Holbein may, however, have brought the Lehman portrait back to England with him, as it has an English provenance going back to the time of Henry VIII.

The year Erasmus actually sat for Holbein was not necessarily the year of the execution of this panel. Because of Erasmus’ aged appearance, the usual assumption has been that the sitting must be dated as late as possible. According to such reasoning Holbein would have had to travel to Freiburg to make this likeness, as in April 1529 Erasmus moved from Basel to Freiburg. But Holbein was in Basel for some eight months before Erasmus moved away. He must have called on him soon after returning from England in August 1528, for he was bringing him news from Thomas More and his family as well as a group portrait he had drawn of them. Whether the apparent age of Erasmus alone justifies dating the image to Erasmus’ Freiburg years seems questionable.

The earliest record of this portrait in England was provided by three lines written on the back of the panel in a hand that Colvin, who published it in 1909, dated no later than 1530–50: “Haunce Holbein me fecit / Johanne[s] Noryce me dedit / Edwardus Banyster me possidit [sic]” (Hans Holbein made me, John Norris gave me, Edward Banister owns me). The writing is no longer visible because the original panel has been thinned and attached to a board, which itself is cradled.

John Norris held various offices at the courts of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Mary I. He was chief usher of the Privy Chamber at the time of his death in 1564. Edward Banister, who received the portrait from Norris and apparently wrote the annotation on its back, was also an usher at the court of Henry VIII. The next verifiable owner of the portrait was John, Lord Lumley, who had the illusionistic white label painted at the upper left of the picture, rendered with a shadow along the bottom so that it appears to be a slip of paper or parchment affixed to the panel by sealing wax. The words on the label are now illegible, but Colvin was able to read them as “Erasmus Roterdamus.” Not all the pictures in Lumley’s collection had such labels painted on them, but many of them did. Piper lists twenty-two examples. One of them, Holbein’s Portrait of Christina of Denmark, Duchess of Milan, eventually went to the National Gallery, London, where the label was removed on the grounds that it was “not by Holbein, wrong in concept, wrong in quality.”

Eleven works attributed to Holbein appear in the Lumley inventory of 1590; one, listed under “Pictures of a Smaller Scantlinge,” is identified as “Of Erasmus of Roterdame . . . drawne by Haunce Holbyn.” Five of these Holbeins, including the portrait of Erasmus, reappear in the Arundel inventory of 1654. Lumley had inherited the palace of Nonsuch with its art collection from his father-in-law Henry Fitzalan, earl of Arundel. Lumley’s first wife was Fitzalan’s daughter Jane. At Fitzalan’s death in 1580 the Arundel title had passed through his other daughter, Mary, to his grandson, Philip Howard (1557–1595), and subsequently to Thomas Howard (1585–1646). When Lumley died childless in 1609, Thomas Howard became heir to the possessions of the Fitzalan family. As the Lehman Portrait of Erasmus eventually passed from Lumley to Thomas Howard, it is likely that Lumley had acquired it through the Fitz-
alans. Quite possibly it belonged to Henry Fitzalan, who might have received it directly from Edward Banister. From Charles Howard's collection, the painting came into the hands of the Howards of Greystoke, J. Pierpont Morgan, and finally, Robert Lehman.

While it was owned by Thomas Howard the portrait was engraved by Lucas Vorsterman. Not surprisingly, Vorsterman did not include the Lumley label. That it was a later addition would have been well known at the time.

The popularity of this type of small portrait of Erasmus is partly indicated by four surviving replicas that may be classified as "school of Holbein." Apart from the Lumley label, which is unique to the Lehman version, the compositions vary only in the sitter's hands. In the version formerly in the Rothschild collection, Paris, and the one from the Boveri collection, Zürich, that is now in the Kunstmuseum Basel, the hands are all but concealed by the fur cuffs of the coat. Two other versions, both once in the Saxon Royal Collection in Dresden and now in the United States — one in the Ball College Art Gallery, Eunice, Michigan, the other in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York (Fig. 11.5) — show as much of the hands as the Lehman picture. In the Ball College painting three fingers of the left hand seem to rest between the thumb and forefinger of the right hand, while in the Morgan example the hands duplicate the position of those in the Lehman picture. A frequently cited copy by Georg Pencz at Hampton Court, of which there are in turn five more copies or variations, was probably based on one of the versions formerly in Dresden.

Given the numerous replicas of the portrait of Erasmus, it is not surprising to find that a pounced design served as the preparatory underdrawing of the Lehman painting. Holbein deviated slightly from the rigid design of the pounced cartoon in the folds of flesh in the cheek and in the contour of the nose, deftly handling the modeling of the face in a sympathetic treatment of the aged and tired scholar. That the authentic roundel in the Basel Kunstmuseum shows a freehand underdrawing (barely visible in the face and lower left of the painting) instead of a pounced design may indicate that it preceded the Lehman portrait. The Morgan painting was also prepared by pouncing. A comparative study with infrared reflectography of the underdrawings of all of the versions of the portrait, including the ex-Rothschild replica and the one in Michigan, is needed to clarify not only the function of pouncing but also the extent of workshop participation. Recent research has shown that Holbein's customary working procedure was

Fig. 11.3 Hans Holbein the Younger, Erasmus of Rotterdam. On loan to the National Gallery, London

Fig. 11.4 Hans Holbein the Younger, Erasmus of Rotterdam. Kunstmuseum Basel, 324. Photograph: Öffentliche Kunstsammlung Basel, Martin Bühler
to transfer the essential features of a sitter’s physiognomy from the preparatory drawing on paper by pouncing or tracing them directly onto the grounded panel.\textsuperscript{22}

\textbf{NOTES:}

1. Due to the small size of the panel, it was not possible to get a reliable tree ring count to date the wood. Regarding the dating of other linden panels which Holbein used for his paintings, see Klein 1990.


3. Cust listed this picture among the paintings from the collection of Lord Lumley that were found in the inventory of the countess of Arundel.

4. Brunin 1968 cites thirty-eight examples of portraits of Erasmus made after versions by Holbein. On the Erasmus portraits and other details of the younger Holbein’s life and work, see Foister 1996.


7. Ibid., no. 16, pl. 29.

8. Ibid., no. 15, colorpl. 15.

9. Ibid., no. 33, pl. 66.

10. Although Erasmus praised the group portrait of the More family in letters to Thomas More and to his daughter, Margaret Roper, dated from Freiburg, it seems unlikely that Holbein would not have given the drawing to Erasmus earlier in Basel. For the drawing, see Basel 1960, no. 308, ill.

11. Colvin (1909, p. 67) mentions only an inscription written on the verso, but the Robert Lehman Collection files and Ganz (1949) 1950, p. 238, no. 57, refer to a label or piece of paper on the back, in which case it was probably removed before the panel was cradled. See also note 1 above.

12. The reproduction in Ganz (1949) 1950, fig. 15, shows the inscription in partially legible form.


16. Vorsterman inscribed his name beneath the print, which Colvin reproduced in 1909 (p. 69).

17. Ganz (1949) 1950, no. 56, fig. 14; Rowlands 1985, no. 34a.

18. Rotterdam 1969, no. 475, colorpl. 11; Rowlands 1985, no. 34b. Peter Berkes, conservator, Öffentliche Kunstsammlung Basel, reported in a conversation with Maryan Ainsworth in 1997 that another version of the portrait, showing the hands resting on an open book, is on deposit at the Kunstmuseum Basel. Ainsworth has seen yet another replica, this one dating to the early seventeenth century, in the Dubroff collection, Manlius, New York.

19. Ganz (1949) 1950, nos. 58, 59, figs. 16, 17; Rowlands 1985, nos. 34c, 34d. Some confusion about the two versions in American collections has occurred as a result of the illustrations of them having been switched in the German edition of Ganz’s book (1949, figs. 15, 16). The error was corrected in the English edition, published in 1950.

20. Gmelin 1966, pp. 93–94, no. 39, fig. 34. For the replicas, see ibid., nos. 39a–e.

21. Information about the Basel Erasmus was kindly shared by Peter Berkes (letter to Ainsworth, 23 November 1988).

Petrus Christus

active Bruges 1444–Bruges 1475 or 1476

Petrus Christus was the most important painter working in Bruges after the death of Jan van Eyck in 1441. The first evidence of his activity is his purchase of Bruges citizenship in 1444 in order to practice as a painter. He was then described as a native of Baerle, a village in Brabant near the present Dutch-Belgian border. Several signed and dated paintings document his development from 1446, the year of the Portrait of a Carthusian in the Metropolitan Museum and the Portrait of Edward Grymeston on loan to the National Gallery, London, to 1457, as the date on the Virgin and Child with Saints Francis and Jerome in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt am Main, should be read. There are no documented and datable pictures from 1457 until his death in late 1475 or early 1476. His presence in Bruges is documented by the municipal commissions he received for decorations and his activity in the prestigious Confraternity of the Dry Tree and Confraternity of Our Lady of the Snow.

Christus’ practice of signing and dating his pictures was exceptional among Netherlandish painters of his day, and follows that of Jan van Eyck. Discussion of Christus’ work and its chronology has until recently been predicated on the possibility that he was Jan’s pupil. It is now generally recognized, however, that despite his borrowings from Eyckian compositions and some similarities of technique, he is highly unlikely to have worked with Jan, or to have worked in Bruges before 1444. Some of the apparent inconsistencies in Christus’ oeuvre may be due to the influence of other painters of his day, notably Rogier van der Weyden and Dieric Bouts, and to variations in finish, depending on the scale and perhaps also on the destination of his works. Nevertheless, throughout his career he remained concerned with the expressive possibilities of light and space, and his dated works demonstrate his developing mastery of single point perspective.

Petrus Christus

12. A Goldsmith in His Shop (Saint Eligius?)

1975.1.110
Oil on oak panel. 100.1 x 85.8 cm, painted surface 98 x 85.2 cm. Inscribed in white paint at the bottom: ‘In petru xpī me fecit a 1449’ (Fig. 12.2). The painting is in fair condition. It was restored in the 1870s by Brasseur and had undoubtedly undergone previous restorations. In 1993 the halo on the goldsmith was determined to be a later addition and was removed. The oak panel is composed of three boards aligned vertically with joins 27 and 58 centimeters from the left edge. A barbe is evident at the top, bottom, left, and (less discernibly) right edges, indicating that the picture originally had an engaged frame. The panel has been thinned and cradled. The panel surface is abraded in many areas, particularly in the dark background behind the figures, the hat and white shirt of the young man visiting the goldsmith, the shadowed portions of the flesh tones, and the shadowed side of the woman’s veil. The brocade of the woman’s dress is well preserved. The red of the goldsmith’s robe is fairly well preserved, although there are numerous small retouches in the middle tones and shadows. Losses along the joins have also been retouched. The composition is very fully underdrawn, mostly with brush but also with pen in areas of fine hatching, and incised lines guide the placement of the window shutters. Careful brush contours define most forms, while straight parallel hatching strokes with minimal crosshatching establish generalized volumes (see Fig. 12.2). Christus made a number of adjustments at the paint stage, most notably moving the baskets of the balance and making them and the goldsmith’s hands smaller.

Dendrochronological analysis of all three boards of the panel yielded a date of 1433 for the most recent heartwood ring. Assuming a Baltic-Polish origin for the wood and using the sapwood statistic for eastern Europe, this points to an earliest felling date of 1426...1428...1432 + x.4

PROVENANCE: A. Merli, Bremen; his sale, Frankfurt am Main, 11 September 1815 (Lugt 8762), lot 144 (as Ein Goldarbeiter in seinem Laden, by Jan van Eyck; sold to Silberberg for Siebel for Fl 200); Y. Siebel, Elberfeld, lent by him to the Central-Museum zu Düsseldorf, 1817-23;6 Salomon Oppenheim the younger (d. 1828), Cologne, by 1825;7 by descent to his grandson, Albert, Freiherr von Oppenheim (d. 1912), Cologne; his sale, Rudolf Lepke, Berlin, 19 March 1918 (Lugt 776899), lot 6; Busch, Mainz8 [Y. Perdoux, Paris]. Acquired by Philip Lehman from Perdoux in 1920.9

Fig. 12.1 No. 12 before removal of halo
Petrus Christus’ depiction of a goldsmith’s shop is justly famous as one of the earliest northern European paintings to treat the objects and roles of everyday life as part of its subject. Since 1825, when Waagen began the rediscovery of Christus as an artistic personality by linking this signed and dated painting to the Portrait of a Lady now in the Staattiche Museen zu Berlin, it has been a touchstone for discussions of his career. As the earliest dated painting in which Christus employed figures on a large scale, it has been particularly important in efforts to construct a chronology of his work.

Nevertheless, the picture remains enigmatic in many respects. There are no reliable indications of its original designation and function. Recent technical examination led to the conclusion that the halo singling out the seated man as a holy figure was an addition, and it was removed in 1993 (see Fig. 12.1), thereby opening to question the traditional identification of the main actor as Saint Eligius, bishop of Noyon and Tournai and patron of goldsmiths, smiths, and saddlers.

Petrus Christus’ painting represents a man dressed in bourgeois garments sitting behind a counter weighing a ring in a balance. One wall of his narrow room is composed of shelves displaying the finely wrought objects and raw materials of the goldsmith’s trade. Arranged on the counter are an elaborately entwined girdle, weights and a box to store them in, coins, and a mirror. The mirror reflects the view outside the picture space, including two fashionably dressed strollers and a row of houses, thereby indicating that the counter is a shop front. Although the nature of the goods displayed suggests that the shop is that of a goldsmith, its occupant is not depicted with any of the tools of his craft. He is evidently transacting some business with the richly dressed couple standing in his shop, the woman extending her hand toward the balance while the man encircles her with his arm.

A tradition first published by Brulliot in 1817 and repeated in most of the literature on the painting starting with Crowe and Cavalcaselle in 1857 identifies the subject as Saint Eligius and associates this picture with the incorporation of goldsmiths in Antwerp. Saint Eligius (ca. 588–660) served the Merovingian kings of France as a goldsmith, mintmaster, and courtier before being made bishop of Noyon and Tournai, in which capacity he was important in establishing Christianity in Flanders. In 1863 Weale proposed identifying the subject as the story of Saint Godbera receiving the ring committing her to a monastic life from Saint Eligius, in the presence of King Clothaire. In 1879 Wolttmann pointed out that the seated figure is not depicted as a bishop, that the woman has no halo, and that she and her companion must be interpreted as a couple. He considered the painting to be a portrait of a couple and linked it to Van Eyck’s Arnolfini Portrait (National Gallery, London), doubting that it had been made specifically for the Antwerp goldsmiths’ guild. In 1914 and 1915 Smith amplified Wolttmann’s interpretation, suggesting for the first time that the halo was an addition that transformed a secular subject into a sacred one. In 1924 Friedländer rejected both Weale’s and Wolttmann’s interpretations; he regarded the couple instead as an ideales
Brautpaar (ideal bridal couple), whose association with Saint Eligius could indeed be a subject suitable for a corporation of goldsmiths. Many years later, in 1972, Schabacker described the painting as a "vocational altarpiece" similar to Rogier van der Weyden's *Saint Luke Drawing the Virgin* (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston). He reexamined the putative connection with the Antwerp corporation of goldsmiths, pointing out that this body was not formally enfranchised until 1456, and proposed instead that Christus made the picture for an institution in his own city, specifically the Bruges corporation of smiths, which was also under the protection of Saint Eligius and to which the Bruges corporation of goldsmiths was subordinate. That the smiths' chapel on the Smedestraat in Bruges was reconsecrated to Saint Eligius in 1449 provided support for this hypothesis.
In connection with Schabacker's proposal, Saint Eligius' broader importance for Bruges, and indeed for the entire diocese of Tournai, should not be forgotten. Eligius was thought to have been the founder of the collegiate church of Saint Donatian in Bruges as well as of Saint Saviors, of which he was also the secondary patron. In other words, if the picture does represent Saint Eligius and was made for devotional use in a public space in Bruges – or, as is perhaps more likely, was later put to such a use – several Bruges institutions are candidates. While Friedländer's interpretation of the subject and Schabacker's reassertion of its corporate function have generally been accepted, both the tradition that the picture belonged to a corporation of goldsmiths and its characterization as a devotional work representing Saint Eligius deserve closer examination. The earliest mention
of the picture has been considered to be the statement in the entry for Petrus Christus in Brulliot’s *Dictionnaire de monogrammes* of 1817 that the painting had been bought by “Mr. Gérard Siebel, merchant of Elberfeld, without having seen it, according to the custom, as a Jan van Eyck; it was formerly in the house of the corporation of goldsmiths at Antwerp, and represents Saint Eligius seated in a shop richly decorated with precious stones and jewels, weighing rings for an engaged couple in order to sell them to them.”¹⁵ Brulliot’s informant was not the owner himself but Charles Schäffer, or more correctly Karl Friedrich Schäffer, who was a professor at the Düsseldorf Akademie and who was charged with the organization of the Central-Museum zu Düsseldorf, to which Siebel had lent the picture, probably also in 1817. The 1817 inventory of the museum records that Siebel lent it as a Van Eyck, hence it was probably Schäffer who correctly identified the signature and
linked it with the painter Pietro Christa mentioned by Vasari. The owner's persistence in regarding the picture as a work of Van Eyck is one of several indications that it is identical with a picture sold as a “Van Eyck” in Frankfurt am Main on 11 September 1815 as part of the collection of one Merli of Bremen. Because its subject and dimensions correspond precisely with those of the Lehman picture, this putative Van Eyck has haunted the literature on Christus' painting from the time the reference in the Merli auction catalogue was first published by Holst in 1931. According to an annotated copy of the sale catalogue in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt, it sold for 200 gulden. This is precisely the price mentioned by the great collector of early Netherlandish and early German painting Sulpiz Boissée, who was, coincidentally, in Frankfurt at the time of the auction and noted in his diary entry for 12 September 1815: “Picture auction . . . the so-called Eyck sold for Fl 200, the Dürer for Fl 100 to Silberberg for a [citizen of] Elberfeld?” Boissée, at least, already saw reason to doubt the ascription of the monogrammed and dated work to Van Eyck, and his comment, whose connection with this picture has previously been overlooked, corroborates Brulliot’s statement that Siebel of Elberfeld was the eventual buyer of the mysterious “Eyck.”

That the picture changed hands early in the nineteenth century without mention of its previous ownership by the Antwerp corporation of goldsmiths, or, indeed, of Saint Eligius, is noteworthy. In the Merli catalogue of 1815 the seated figure is described only as “ein Goldarbeiter” (a goldsmith). This is elaborated in the inventory of the Central-Museum, Düsseldorf, to “ein Goldarbeiter oder vielmehr der Patron der Goldschmiede – der heilige Eligius” (a goldsmith or rather the patron of goldsmiths – Saint Eligius). At the same time a “ganz neuer goldener Zierrahmen” (entirely new gold frame) and the picture’s fine state of preservation are mentioned, although Waagen in 1825 and Passavant in 1833 described it as having suffered greatly, and Kugler in 1854 referred to overpainting, particularly in the red robe of Saint Eligius. The picture was probably reframed after Siebel acquired it. He may have intended to offer it for resale, and he may also have had it restored. While it is impossible to know when the goldsmith acquired his halo, it may have been added or strengthened at this time.

The contention that the picture was an occupational altarpiece also needs to be examined in view of the pictorial traditions taking form at the time. Van der Wey-
creations of archaic types, but it is not impossible that their lost Eyckian model contained an element of portraiture that carried over to Christus’ work as well.

_The Money Changer and His Wife_ has been variously interpreted, but it is clearly not a devotional work. It may well have exemplified a standard of professional rectitude linked to a biblical text. In his 1658 account of Massys’s work, Van Fornenbergh recorded that the painting bore an inscription on its frame: “Statura justa et aqua Sint Pondera. Levit. cap. 19. vers. 35” (Let the balance be just and the weights equal). The exhortation, part of a long sequence of regulations for daily life from the Book of Leviticus, would not have been incompatible either with the goals of a craft guild or with a broader moral lesson.

The suggestion that the figures, and particularly the goldsmith, in the Lehman picture are portraits, first put forward in 1879 by Woltmann and repeated most recently by Ainsworth, can unfortunately be neither proved nor disproved, due in part to the generalizing tendency of Christus’ art, which makes even his portrait heads approach a common type. Christus’ picture has also long been associated with marriage imagery. The ring the goldsmith is weighing for the young couple does indeed evoke the ring given by the bridegroom to the bride in the marriage ritual as a sign of the transfer of material goods. While the coins on the counter might be part of a routine financial transaction or refer to the money-changing aspect of a goldsmith’s professional activity, they could also be interpreted as belonging to the marriage ritual, since coins were the arras, or earnest money signifying the transfer of possessions.

The girdle prominently displayed on the counter, although not part of the marriage ritual (the term “marriage girdle” used in the literature on the painting is probably a misnomer), was a common gift from bridegroom to bride, and its elaborately looped form here recalls a love knot. These objects need not refer to marriage, but their juxtaposition with the couple’s pose, the man encircling the woman with his arm in a gesture found in early portraits commemorating marriages, does suggest that the picture makes some reference to this important social transaction.

How Christus chose to present the figures and the setting provides important clues to interpreting the painting’s various associations. As is customary for him, the narrative interaction between the couple and the goldsmith is muted, expressed chiefly by the direction of the eyes and the position of the hands. Though the goldsmith has been placed slightly to the right of center, his

---

Fig. 12.3 Quentin Massys, _The Money Changer and His Wife_. Musée du Louvre, Paris, inv. 1444. Photograph: Réunion des Musées Nationaux, Paris

portraitlike particularity in the treatment of the head and may also evoke a holy personage.
and through the careful observation of the progressive foreshortening of the shelves as viewed from a point roughly level with the sitter's shoulders. By contrast, the widened angle of vision in the Lehman picture flattens the shelves, the counter, and the back wall, effectively isolating the costly objects as specimens and putting the viewer in the position of the shopkeeper's client. These distortions accentuate the stiffness of the figures so frequently commented on in the literature on the painting, while giving the few objects arrayed on the broad counter a greater importance.

The half-length format, with its references to portraiture, the emphasis on the professional probity of the goldsmith – who conducts his business, as corporate regulations dictated, in plain view of the public – and the secular quality of the reflected street scene, in which the viewer is also implicated, all suggest that this picture did not function as an altarpiece. Rather, it seems to express the highest goals of the goldsmith's craft, perhaps in part through reference to the social contract of betrothal and marriage. The picture may have been made for an individual craftsman or for a corporation of goldsmiths for a use not connected with the celebration of the Eucharist, perhaps as a sign or some other display of professional qualifications. Or it may have been acquired later by such a corporation, since these bodies are known to have formed collections of works of art. Because the identification of the goldsmith as Saint Eligius is by no means clear from the picture itself, the halo may have been added either to attach this association to the picture or to clarify it, perhaps when the picture was used in a new way.

Although much remains ambiguous in this complex web of possible associations, it is evident that Christus, early in his career, was seeking ways to combine various elements that were just emerging as possible subjects for panel painting. A Goldsmith in His Shop is not only a testament to the progressive character of Christus' art but also a remarkable document in the history of secular panel painting.

NOTES:
1. On the restoration in the 1870s, see Dohme 1877–78, p. 4, and Schnease 1866–79, vol. 8, p. 197. According to Kugler (1837, vol. 2, p. 63) and others, the picture had undergone previous restorations.
2. Von Sonnenburg stated in his report of 15 June 1922 in the file for Christus' Portrait of a Carthusian (1949.7.19) in the Department of Paintings Conservation at The Metropolitan Museum of Art that the halo was made with
shell gold on red bole with no apparent preparatory incisions. He considered its crude execution as evidence of its later date. See also Von Sonnenburg in Ainsworth 1995, pp. 183-85.

3. Ainsworth (in New York 1994, no. 6) suggests that Christus may also have used silverpoint in the very carefully underdrawn face of the goldsmith. See also Ainsworth’s analysis of the development of Christus’ underdrawing technique in New York 1994, pp. 25-65.

4. New York 1994, p. 215; Klein 1995, pp. 151, 153. The most recent ring was on the center board; the left and right boards came from the same tree. Since the picture is dated, this information is chiefly useful in providing an indication of the storage time after the probable felling date.

5. Lot 144 is described as “Ein sehr seltenes Bild, ein Goldarbeiter in seinem Laden, welcher seine Waren einem Herrn und seinem bey sich habenden Frauenzimmer zeigt, mit der Jahrzahl und dem Monogram dieses berühmten Künstler J. van Eyck 1441, ein sehr gut erhaltenes Gemälde auf Hb., b. 32 Zoll, h. 37” (A very rare picture of a goldsmith in his shop, who shows his wares to a gentleman and his lady companion, with the date and monogram of this famous artist J. van Eyck 1441, a very well preserved painting on wood, 32 Zoll wide, 37 Zoll high). Von Holst (1931, p. 47) gave the date of the Merle sale incorrectly as 1811, and the error was repeated in all later literature. For the painting’s purchase by Silberberg, see Boisserée (1808-54) 1978-95, vol. 1, p. 265, and see also note 18 below.

6. A manuscript inventory of the works deposited in the Central-Museum zu Düsseldorf (preserved in the Graphische Sammlung, Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf), which was being organized by Karl Friedrich Schäffer, lists this painting under 3 February 1817 as no. 73, by Johann Eyck. It was one of several works lent by “Herr Gerhard Siebel, Kaufmann, zu Elberfeld” and was described as “Ein Goldarbeiter oder vielmehr der Patron der Goldschmiede – der heilige Aelgisis – sitzt in seinem Laden, wo ein junger Herr mit seiner Dame Ringe zu kaufen scheint. Ein vom Erfinder der Oelhfarben sehr merkwürdiges Oehlgemälde. Es enthält das Monogramm des berühmten Künstlers” (A goldworker, or rather, the protector of the goldsmiths – Saint Eligius – sitting in his shop where a young gentleman with his lady appears to be buying rings. A very remarkable painting by the inventor of oil painting. It contains the monogram of this famous artist). The size is given as “31 1/12 x 36 Zoll.” I am most grateful to the late Stefan Germer for guiding me to the inventory and to Hein-Theo Schulze-Altcappenberg, then at the Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf, for providing the reference. Schulze-Altcappenberg (letter to the author, 16 May 1990) suggests that the picture may have been returned to Siebel on 3 June 1823 because another picture lent by him was annotated in the inventory as returned on that date. On Schäffer’s museum, see Kalnein 1971.

7. According to Waagen 1825, p. 448, but see also note 20 below. For the rise of Salomon Oppenheim the younger and a brief history of the banking house under his heirs, see Krüger 1925, pp. 64-72.


11. Weale’s discussion of the picture shows how this tradition was elaborated over time. Weale (1863, p. 236) stated that he had learned from Oppenheim that the painting had long been in the possession of the Antwerp corporation of goldsmiths, one of the last members of which had sold it to “M. de Sybel.” In 1881 (p. 34) and 1903a (p. 51), however, he reported that it was painted for the Antwerp goldsmiths. And by 1909 (p. 98) he had returned to the more cautious statement of his earlier account.


13. Schabacker (1972, pp. 107, 116, no. 32) based this date on the assertion of Gilliots-de-Severen (1890, p. 54). It should be noted that the new chapel of the Bruges Guild of Saint Luke and Saint Eligius, which served Christus’ own corporation of painters and saddlemakers, was apparently built in 1450, not 1452, as is often maintained (see M. Martens 1992a, p. 38, citing a correction in Duclos 1915, p. 590).

14. M. Martens (1992a, pp. 169, 237-39) noted that a Confraternity of Saint Eligius was established in Saint Saviers. For the position of the chapel of Saint Eligius in this church, as well as later altarpieces and reliquaries dedicated to him, see Devliegher 1979-81, pp. 45, 185, 197-98, 230-31, figs. 252, 273, 374, 381.

15. Brulliot 1817-20, vol. 1, cols. 874-75, no. 145: “Mr. Gérard Siebel Négociant d’Elberfeld, sans l’avoir vu, d’après la manière, pour un Jean van Eyck; il était autrefois dans la maison du corps de métier des orfèvres à Anvers, et représente le S. Eloy, assis dans une boutique précieusement ornée de pierreris et bijouteries, occupé à peser des bagues à des fiancés, pour les leurs vendre.” L. Campbell (1975, p. 68) first drew attention to this important early reference to the picture.

16. See note 6 above.

17. See note 5 above.


19. See note 6 above.

20. Kalnein (1971, p. 331) observed that the Siebel pictures may have been available for purchase when they were on loan to Düsseldorf. In a letter of 27 April 1991 Lorne
Campbell of the National Gallery, London, drew my attention to the puzzling auction of twenty-five of Siebel’s pictures at the Hôtel des Ventes, Paris, 17 May 1852. A picture corresponding to the Christus (Un Joailler de 1459 [sic]) was lot 4 in this sale, even though since 1825 it had been described as in the Oppenheim collection. The pictures in the sale correspond almost exactly with the twenty-six works Siebel lent to Düsseldorf. The three, or perhaps four, pictures in the Oppenheim collection with provenances from Siebel all appear in this sale. Apart from the Christus Goldsmith, they are the Virgin and Child by the Master of the Embroidered Foliage (lot 1 as Jan van Eyck, 103 x 84 cm); see Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 4, no. 84, pl. 77), which is perhaps identical with the “Dürer” also bought for Siebel at the Merli sale in 1815 (lot 142); a version of The Misers by a follower of Marinus van Reymerswaele (lot 3 [92 x 74 cm]; see L. Campbell 1985, 152 under no. 72); and perhaps a game piece with birds attributed to Hondécoeter (lot 11). It is conceivable that the pictures were only on deposit with the Oppenheim family until after Siebel’s death.

21. For Rogier’s Saint Luke and copies after it, see Eisler 1961, pp. 71–93, pl. 79. The subject may have been treated earlier by Robert Campin (see Rivière 1987 for this and later examples).


23. New York 1994, no. 9, ill. Although they do not survive, Christus’ documented copies of the revered icon of the Virgin in the cathedral of Cambrai, believed to be the portrait painted by Saint Luke, also indicate a familiarity with the associations of this type of imagery (see ibid., pp. 195–97). The development and function of religious narratives in a half-length format toward the end of the fifteenth century is analyzed in Ringbom (1965) 1984.

24. In this case the subject was also made specific by an added halo and inscription, now removed (Davies 1971, figs. 1, 4).

25. Frimmel 1888, p. 54: “el quadretto a meze figure, del patron che fa conto cun el fattor fo de man de Zuan Heic, credo Memelino, Ponentino, fatto nel 1440.” Michiel may have read the name and date from the frame but confused the artist with Memling, whose work was probably more familiar to him.

26. Van Fornenbergh 1658, p. 27. This text is actually Leviticus 19:36. The picture has sometimes been interpreted as a satirical comment. Silver (1984, pp. 136–37, 211–12) suggested that it shows a balance between the active and contemplative pursuits of the money changer and his wife.


28. Ainsworth has shown, for instance, that Christus began his Portrait of Edward Gryms aston (National Gallery, London, on loan from the earl of Verulam, Gorhambury) and his Portrait of a Carthusian (Metropolitan Museum of Art), both of 1446, with a common template (see Ainsworth in New York 1994, pp. 49–53, figs. 62–65, and no. 5, ill.). Abrasion in the shadowed area of the faces adds to the generalized quality of the heads in the Lehman picture.


31. On girdles as gifts to brides and the sale through goldsmiths of fabric belts with jeweled fastenings like the one hanging to the right of the goldsmith’s head, see Lightbown 1992, pp. 396–40. He notes, however, that other jeweled articles had replaced girdles as favored gifts by the end of the fourteenth century. In their detailed discussion of fifteenth-century marriage rituals, Molin and Mutembe (1974, pp. 99–100) note that the laying of the priest’s stole over the joined hands of bride and bridegroom marked the participation of the church in the couple’s mutual gifts.

32. See Glück 1933, pp. 190–91.


34. Upton (1990, pp. 32–34) comes closest to this interpretation. Archival research into the Bruges and Antwerp guilds of goldsmiths or associated enterprises like the Dominican Pand connected with the Antwerp goldsmiths might suggest a more specific use.

35. For a 1538 listing of the paintings and objects belonging to the Antwerp corporation of goldsmiths, see Schlugleit 1969, pp. 97–98. Van Eyck’s portrait of his wife was a prized possession of the Bruges corporation of painters at the time of its dissolution at the end of the eighteenth century (see Janssens de Bisthoven, Baes-Dondeyne, and De Vos 1983, pp. 181–82).
A native of Seligenstadt near Frankfurt, Memling is first mentioned in the records of Bruges, where he acquired citizenship in 1465. Because the style of his surviving work shows little or no trace of his German origins, it can be assumed that he was trained in the Netherlands, including a possible sojourn in the workshop of Rogier van der Weyden. Van der Weyden died in 1464, the year before Memling established himself in Bruges. Whatever Memling's formal training may have been, his work was strongly influenced by Van der Weyden's compositions and figural types.

Two works inscribed with Memling's name on their original frames and dated 1479 are the basis for attributions to him: The Mystic Marriage of Saint Catherine and the Floreins triptych (both Saint John's Hospital, Bruges). Other paintings can readily be attributed to Memling on the basis of style, and a number of these are also dated or datable. They include the Portrait of Gilles Joye (Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, Williams- town), dated 1472; the Last Judgment triptych (Muzeum Pomorskie, Gdańsk), probably commissioned in 1466–68 and shipped from Flanders in 1473; the Reyns triptych and the Portrait of a Woman (both Saint John's Hospital, Bruges), dated 1480 on their frames; the Nieuwen- hove diptych (Saint John's Hospital, Bruges) and the Portrait of Benedetto Portinari (Uffizi, Florence), both dated 1487; and the Crucifixion triptych (Sankt Annen- Museum, Lübeck), dated 1491 on the frame. Memling's paintings do not show a marked stylistic progression. While he is acknowledged to have been the dominant painter in Bruges at the end of the fifteenth century, his work has been considered a lyrical summation of the achievements of his predecessors, and his spatial and narrative innovations have frequently been overlooked.
European Paintings


This portrait shows the complex connection between sitter and surrounding space that is one of the characteristics of Hans Memling’s portraits. The sitter occupies the corner of an open loggia giving onto an extensive landscape. The reserved quality of his pose is mitigated by the play of light on varied surfaces—the velvet tunic, the porphyry columns, and the cool stone wall. Although his gaze is abstracted, his hands, placed at the picture’s edge as though resting on the frame, imply contact with the viewer’s space. As the barbe marking the edge of the picture rather awkwardly cuts off the tips of several of the fingers, they were probably originally painted on the engaged frame, an illusionistic device Memling used to assert the sitter’s physical presence in several other portraits. The placement of the hands also indicates that this is an independent portrait and not part of a devotional ensemble. The lost original frame or the back of the panel, now planed down and cradled, may once have carried an inscription or arms pointing to the unknown sitter’s identity.

Waagen first recognized the Portrait of a Young Man as the work of Memling in 1857, and his attribution has been accepted by all later scholars. Perhaps because of the difficulty of establishing a chronology for Memling’s portraits of unidentified sitters, there was until recently no attempt to date the picture apart from Sterling’s suggestion of a date of about 1470 to 1475 on the basis of style and costume. Campbell’s observation in 1983 that the landscape seen through columns was copied in a Virgin and Child in the Louvre, Paris (Fig. 13.1), by a follower of Verrocchio frequently identified as the young Domenico Ghirlandaio (1449–1494) tended to confirm this relatively early date (and also supported the suggestion put forth by Conway in 1921 and Lehman in 1928 that the sitter was Italian). Recent dendrochronological analysis of the Lehman portrait has complicated the issue, however, since it appears, on first examination, to indicate a date in the mid-1480s based on the pattern of usage of oak panels. Accordingly, in his 1994 monograph on Memling De Vos dated the portrait to 1480 or later, while regarding the Louvre Virgin and Child as a late fifteenth-century pastiche that repeated an earlier Madonna type.

Campbell was undoubtedly correct in claiming the Lehman portrait as the point of departure for the Louvre Virgin and Child. The distant valley and the rows of trees defining the recession of the landscape are the same in both pictures, and the pattern of light and shade at the edge of the loggia and the texture of the stone wall in the Louvre picture are indebted to Memling as well. The portrait must therefore have reached Florence very shortly after it was painted and almost certainly represents an Italian sitter. That the portrait should
depict a member of the Florentine community resident in Bruges or a visiting Italian merchant is entirely in keeping with Memling's work for such important Florentine patrons as Jacopo Tani and Tommaso Portinari. Although nothing is known of the provenance of the picture before it was first recorded in the Wemyss collection in the middle of the nineteenth century, the Italianate form of the foreshortened halo added above the sitter's head and removed in 1912 tends to support an Italian provenance. Memling's portrait thus takes on particular importance as one of the few surviving links in the chain of complex reciprocal influences between painting in Florence and Flanders in the late fifteenth century. The strategies employed by Flemish painters to integrate figure and setting evidently appealed to Florentine painters, but these compositional strategies may in turn have been spurred by Italian explorations of related spatial problems, in which the figure was set behind a parapet or in a loggia giving onto a landscape.

The Louvre Virgin and Child does not provide a clear terminus post quem for the importation of Memling's portrait into Italy because it belongs to a group of portable devotional panels whose attributions within the broad designation of Verrocchio followers have been much debated. These works, including the Virgin and Child with Two Angels in the National Gallery, London, and the Ruskin Madonna in the National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh, employ related figure types and show similar spatial concerns, albeit with variations in execution. Nevertheless, the Louvre Virgin and Child should not be dated later than the 1470s, and quite apart from its reflection in Florentine painting, the stylistic evidence of the Lehman portrait itself argues against a date as late as the mid-1480s. A comparison of the somewhat uneasy way the sitter fills the space between the picture's edge and the corner of the room with the more confident treatment of space in such later portraits as those of Martin van Nieuwenhove and Benedetto Portinari, both dated 1487, suggests a relatively early date for the Lehman portrait. The texture of the lips and brows, the modeling of the nose, and the observation of the light, here entering from the window, are more specific than in many of Memling's later portraits. In trying to reconcile these factors with the results of dendrochronology—a method that appears to provide one of the few relatively fixed points in the study of early Netherlandish painting—it is helpful to remember that dendrochronological dating rests in part on a range of statistical averages. The Lehman portrait should be viewed as part of an emerging group of panels for which the combination of art historical and dendrochronological factors suggests that their dates should be estimated by using the minimum elapsed time between the youngest measured growth ring on the panel and the probable date of its use rather than by applying the statistical formula for the mean elapsed time. Such an interpretation would yield a date for this painting from the mid-1470s onward. In the absence of further information about the sitter or the date of the portrait's availability in Florence, it seems most prudent to date the picture to about 1475-80.

NOTES:
1. A photograph without the arrow and halo in the Friedländer archives of the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, is annotated: "With R. Langton Douglas / compliments" and "VII, 1912 Lord Wemyss / Gosford Castle / Pfeil fort bei / Reinigung / or..." See also a letter of 11 August 1912 from Friedländer to Langton Douglas, a letter from Friedländer to Philip Lehman of 21 January 1916 (both Robert Lehman Collection files), and L. Campbell 1983, p. 676. In his 1916 letter to Lehman, Friedländer noted that the hand was slightly damaged in this cleaning. Traces of the halo are still visible on the wall above the sitter's head and are quite marked in a mid-treatment photograph taken in 1933 (and now in the Robert Lehman Collection files), as is the arrow that was formerly inserted in the sitter's folded hands.
2. Robert Lehman Collection files. Also according to the file, the painting received an unspecified treatment from Steven Pichetto in 1934.
3. Ainsworth suggests that a brush underdrawing may have been used in the costume.
4. Report of Peter Klein, Ordinariat für Holzbioleologie, Universität Hamburg, 4 September 1987 (Paintings Conservation Department files, Metropolitan Museum), and Klein 1994. See additional comments in text.
6. This device is evident in the Portrait of a Woman in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. (ibid., no. 85, pl. 119), and other examples. See also Hand and Wolff 1986, pp. 188-93.
7. Manchester 1857, no. 398, cites Cavalcaselle's attribution of the portrait to Antonello da Messina.
8. See Paris 1957, no. 41.
9. Campbell's point of departure for the attribution and date of the Louvre Virgin was Oberhuber (1978, pp. 72–73), who gave the picture to Verrocchio himself, dated it no later than 1468 or 1469, and noted the general influence of Memling on the setting. Oberhuber's attribution and date were affirmed by Cadogan (1983, pp. 368–71), although the Louvre painting has more generally been attributed to the young Ghirlandaio (see Berenson 1933, p. 256; Berenson 1963, vol. 1, p. 76; Bréjon de Lavergnée and Thiébaut 1981, p. 178; and Thiébaut 1996, p. 50, among others). The dependence on Memling's portrait indicates that Oberhuber's date is too early, as Campbell has already pointed out. A distinctly harder repetition of this Madonna type with a background of balustrade and landscape is known only from a photograph (Wengraf 1984, fig. 27).


11. The painting is not listed in the handwritten catalogue of the Wemys pictures at Amissfield House (1771, reprinted in Society of Antiquaries of Scotland 1792). It is possible that it was acquired by Lord Elcho, later the tenth earl of Wemyss, who bought a number of pictures in Italy in the mid-nineteenth century (see Colin Thompson in Edinburgh 1957, pp. 5–7). I am grateful to Lord Wemyss, Julia Lloyd Williams, and Lorne Campbell for their efforts to trace the picture.


16. For the interpretation of similar situations, particularly in relation to Van Eyck's Rolin Madonna, see Klein 1995, especially p. 163. Klein considers that in the absence of traces of the youngest sapwood rings usually trimmed off when a panel was dressed, one must allow for at least nine years' growth of such sapwood rings, plus some minimum storage time, beyond the year of the last measured heartwood ring (in this case 1461). An additional case is Memling's Saint Veronica in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., and the accompanying Saint John the Baptist in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, where the date of 1458 for the youngest growth ring is similarly at variance with the stylistic and contextual evidence for dating the panel if the mean elapsed time is used as a guide (Hand and Wolff 1986, pp. 193–201, 260; Eikemeier in Munich 1995, p. 24).

17. L. Campbell (1983 and 1990) has also suggested that the Lehman portrait provided the basis for the presumed portrait of Perugino in the Uffizi, Florence, that has been variously attributed to Lorenzo di Credi and Perugino himself (Berti et al. 1979, p. 343, no. 1907, ill.).

Hans Memling

14. The Annunciation

1975.1.113

Oil on panel, transferred to canvas. 76.5 x 54.6 cm.

The picture is in good condition despite its transfer from panel to canvas. It was restored shortly after 1830, at which point the original engaged frame was apparently discarded.1 Paul Buésco restored the picture in Brussels after the closing of the 1902 Bruges exhibition,2 and it was restored again and transferred to canvas while in the possession of Philip Lehman.3 The original panel was composed of two boards with a vertical grain joined approximately 28 centimeters from the left edge. A late nineteenth-century photograph of the picture shows it unframed with barbe and edges of unpainted wood on all four sides.4 This photograph and examination of the present edges indicate that the painted surface was slightly extended following the transfer, in particular at the left. The dimensions of the original painted surface are 76.2 by 53.6 centimeters.

The paint surface is somewhat abraded throughout. Local losses, particularly in Gabriel's brocade cope, below the Virgin's extended arm, and in the vase, have been inpainted. These correspond to areas of flaking and lifting paint clearly visible in early photographs. Infrared reflectography reveals that the figures have been extensively underdrawn and the furnishings of the room more broadly sketched in a dry medium. Numerous small adjustments were made during the painting process: the Virgin's sleeves, which were underdrawn with narrow openings, were given dangling hems and her raised hand was made smaller, and Gabriel's staff acquired a more upright position, between his body and his raised hand (see Fig. 14.1). The objects on the cupboard and the vase of flowers were not underdrawn. Radiating incised lines indicate the position of the dove, which was not underdrawn. The rafters and window at the left, as well as the floor tiles, are also incised, but without any clear relation to the projection of the overall spatial construction of the room.5

PROVENANCE: Prince Michael Radziwill (d. 1831); his son, Prince Anton Radziwill (d. 1833), Berlin, by 1832;6 his son, Prince Wilhelm Radziwill (d. 1870), Berlin; by descent to Prince George Radziwill, Berlin (d. 1904); his widow, Marie Branicka, Princess Radziwill, Berlin, until 1920. Acquired by Philip Lehman from Marie Branicka Radziwill through Duveen Brothers in October 1920.
The Lehman Annunciation is one of the finest examples of Hans Memling’s ability to take a pictorial convention inherited from his predecessors and infuse it with a heightened sense of emotion and narrative complexity. Gabriel salutes the Virgin in the narrow confines of her chamber, which is dominated by the vivid red hangings of the bed. The angel’s trailing robes, overlapped by the picture’s frame, convey the movement of his arrival. Movement is implied too in the serpentine pose of the Virgin, who turns from her prayer book, half rising and half swooning as she accepts Gabriel’s message. She is attended by two angels who both support her and present her to the viewer, an elaboration of the narrative which has no precedent in surviving early Netherlandish panel painting.

The perspective of the room might suggest that this Annunciation was the left wing of a larger ensemble, as the diagonal lines of the floor tiles converge slightly to the right of center. The precedent of earlier treatments of the Annunciation, particularly Rogier van der Weyden’s
Columba Altarpiece in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich (Fig. 14.2), would argue for this placement, most likely as part of a triptych. Nevertheless, the possibility that the panel was an independent devotional work cannot be excluded. References to it while it was still in the Radziwill collection make no mention of a larger ensemble. Furthermore, it was evidently dated on the original frame, which was discarded in the early nineteenth century, and Memling did not usually date the wings of works with multiple panels. The reverse of the panel, now transferred to canvas, might have provided information on the painting’s placement, but unfortunately no description of the back has survived.

The date on the lost original frame is usually given as 1482, although Sulpiz Boisserée, who saw the picture in the collection of Prince Anton Radziwill in Berlin in 1832, recorded it as 1480. In any case, a date in the early 1480s can be accepted as reliable, and is not inconsistent with the picture’s style. The play of shadows and the rhythmic arrangement of the figures call to mind Memling’s Mystic Marriage of Saint Catherine of 1479 in the Saint John’s Hospital, Bruges. De Vos saw similarly elongated proportions in the Lehman Annunciation and in the Greverade Altarpiece in the Sankt Annen-Museum, Liébeck (dated 1491), and hypothesized that an abraded 1489 on the Lehman panel’s frame might have been misread by early nineteenth-century critics. However, given the difficulty of assigning dates to Memling’s works on purely stylistic grounds, this connection does not seem strong enough to contradict the early reports of Boisserée, Waagen, and Parthey.

Since its first publication by Waagen in 1847 this Annunciation has been widely regarded as one of Memling’s finest and most original works. The chief dissenting opinion, that of Weale, is remarkable for the narrow view of Memling’s personality that it reflects. Weale denied Memling’s authorship because the very inventiveness of the two angels supporting the Virgin contradicted his notion of the artist as an imitative painter. Virtually all other scholars have concurred with Friedländer that it is “die schönste Erfindung Memlings” (Memling’s most beautiful invention). Indeed, the invention, with its subtle elaboration of a traditional composition, is entirely characteristic of Memling, as is the execution of the underdrawing and paint layers.

In his 1832 diary notation Boisserée compared this picture to the Annunciation in Rogier van der Weyden’s Columba Altarpiece (Fig. 14.2), then in his own collection, and several later critics have repeated the comparison. General similarities of composition include the narrow space of the room, the window open on the left, and the way the rich red hangings of the bed frame the head of the Virgin. Memling’s debt to the figural conventions established by Rogier is perhaps even greater, especially in the serpentine poses of Gabriel and the Virgin. In both works this sinuous repetition serves to emphasize the dialogue between the two figures, becoming almost exaggerated in the graceful curve of Memling’s Virgin and the countercurves of the attendant angels.

Some of the furnishings of the bedchamber may function as symbolic references to the Virgin’s purity, and their frequent repetition in other Netherlandish Annunciations, including the work of Rogier and his followers, underscores this reading. The glass vessel placed near the open window and irradiated with light recurs in the

Fig. 14.2 Rogier van der Weyden, The Annunciation (left wing of Columba Altarpiece). Alte Pinakothek, Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Munich, WAF 1190
Loëvre Annunciation attributed to Rogier, in the Clugny Annunciation in the Metropolitan Museum, which is a late product of his workshop, and in the fragmentary Annunciation in the Burrell collection, Glasgow, by another late follower. As Meiss first demonstrated in relation to the works of Jan van Eyck, such a vessel is probably a reference to the metaphor, common in Marian hymns, comparing the Incarnation and the virgin birth to light that passes through glass, leaving it unbroken. The knotted bed curtain prominently placed between Gabriel and the Virgin here, in the Columbia Altarpiece, and in many other Annunciations set in the Virgin’s bedcham-
ber has been less convincingly interpreted as a symbol of the Incarnation by analogy to contemporary understanding of the process of fetal formation. The lilies in the vase at the right are a common symbol of the Virgin’s purity, while the single iris probably refers to her sorrow at the coming Passion of Christ. The wheels and cherubim embroidered on the border of Gabriel’s cope belong to Ezekiel’s vision of the glory of the Lord (in Ezekiel 10) and hence are appropriate for the Incarnation.

While Memling’s use of symbolic elements in the Annunciation is firmly based in the tradition of Netherlandish panel painting, the gesture of the angels supporting the Virgin is exceptional. McFarlane called this figural group a particularly eloquent representation of the moment of the Incarnation. Purtle regarded Memling’s narrative treatment as an homage to Van Eyck’s Annunciation in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., which she interpreted as indebted, in part, to the liturgical drama enacted in the context of the missa aurea celebrated during Advent. Her argument is based on the use of texts within the picture, the implied movement of the figures, and the expansis manibus gesture of the Virgin in the Washington picture, but only the implication of movement is present in the Lehman picture. Moreover, it is doubtful that Memling had access to Van Eyck’s picture, which may then have been in Dijon. Blum saw the attendant angels as presenting the Virgin as a Eucharistic offering, with the moment of conception being analogous to the mystery of transubstantiation. For her, their presence as courtiers was a reference to the Virgin’s queenly state and, by implication, her role as the bride of Christ, an association that is surely correct.

Memling’s highly original treatment probably conveyed its meaning by evoking various pictorial associations. Angel attendants are included with some frequency in Annunciation scenes in early fifteenth-century French manuscript illuminations and in German, particularly Rhenish, panel paintings. The angels in these works hold a cloth of honor or censers but only rarely approach the Virgin more directly, playfully surrounding her throne-like seat. They do not touch or support her body as they do here. Angels peer around the Virgin’s chair, for example, in the Annunciation miniatures in several luxurious Books of Hours from the workshop of the Bedford Master, in the Grandes Heures de Rohan, and in an altarpiece wing in the Museum Catharijneconvent, Utrecht, that is usually attributed to a Middle Rhenish painter. Parisian manuscript illumination is frequently cited as a precedent for early Netherlandish

Fig. 14.3 Rogier van der Weyden, Seven Sacraments Altarpiece (right panel). Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp. Photograph © A.C.L., Brussels
painters, but it is perhaps more likely that Memling was aware of this tradition for the treatment of the Annunciation through Rhenish examples, given his own Middle Rhenish origins.27

As Blum has pointed out, representations of the Assumption and the Coronation in which angels carry the Virgin’s train or support her provide a further precedent for Memling’s group. Through these courtly attendants Memling proclaimed the honor due the Virgin, just as he used formal devices, in particular the frontal positioning of her head and shoulders and the red hangings framing her head, to signal her special status.

Blum correctly stressed the theological link between the Virgin as Queen of Heaven and as bride of Christ. Bridal associations may also be implicit in the actions of Memling’s angels; their role is comparable to that of the young pages attending the bride in Netherlandish representations of weddings. Although depictions of the marriage rite in early Netherlandish painting vary widely,28 in a number of key works by the Master of Flémalle and Rogier van der Weyden and his circle pages stand on either side of the bride, or the Virgin Mary, supporting her arms. Chief among these are Rogier’s Seven Sacraments altarpiece in the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp (Fig. 14.3),29 and the Marriage of the Virgin by the Master of Flémalle in the Prado, Madrid.30 Two angels perform this function in a miniature of the Marriage of the Virgin from the Bruges workshop of Memling’s contemporary Willem Vrelant (Fig. 14.4).

In the sacrament of marriage the couple’s exchange of words of consent was the action that united them, so the Virgin’s consent at the Annunciation, “Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy word,” made her the bride of God.31 Whereas Jan van Eyck and Rogier van der Weyden inscribed the words of the exchange between Gabriel and Mary across the space of their pictures, Memling has here maintained the integrity of the pictorial space, suggesting the Virgin’s consent through the associations of her pose, at once submissive and active. He heightens the intensity of his narrative through the unsettling combination of the pale, iridescent figures of Mary and the angels with the natural light that flows in part from the viewer’s space, casting shadows over the sill of the frame. Such a vivid symbolic reenactment using the framework of pictorial tradition is one of Memling’s chief contributions to Netherlandish painting at the end of the fifteenth century.32

Fig. 14.4 Workshop of Willem Vrelant, The Marriage of the Virgin. Hours of Isabel la Católica, fol. 41v. Biblioteca del Palacio Real, Madrid, Arm. Inf. 61 Ms. Photograph: El Patrimonio Nacional, Madrid

NOTES:
1. Waagen (1847, p. 187) reported that Anton Radziwill had had the picture restored and the original gray-painted frame removed, although the section inscribed with the date was inserted into the new gold frame. According to Waagen, Radziwill found it “auf einem seiner Güter, von einem Pfeife durchbohrt. Bei der dadurch nötig gewordenen Restauration hat es, besonders in den Fleischtheilen, durch Waschen an Kraft und durch neue, zusammenge- laufenen Lasuren an Klarheit eingebüsst. Der Mantel Maria ist dabei nicht glücklich übermalt geworden” (on one of his estates, pierced through by an arrow. In the resulting necessary restoration, it suffered, especially in the flesh tones, losing strength from cleaning and losing clarity through new unifying glazes. The Virgin’s cloak was overpainted in an unfortunate manner at this time).
3. It is described in Lehman 1928 as on oak panel.
5. See Ainsworth 1994b, p. 87.
6. Prince Anton Radziwill settled in Berlin after marrying Princess Luise of Prussia. That the picture descended through the Radziwill family is evident from the account of Boisserée ([1808–54] 1978–95, vol. 2, p. 654), who saw the picture in Berlin on 27 April 1832 and noted that it came from the estate of the prince’s father (see also Firmenich-Richartz 1916, pp. 514–19). Waagen (1847, p. 187) noted that “eine Kardinalsarum dem alten Rahmen hat den Fürsten Anton auf die Vermuthung geführt, dass dies Bild vom Fürsten Radzivil, welcher die bekannte Reisebeschreibung herausgegeben, in den Niederlanden gekauft und einem Bruder von ihm, der Kardinal war, geschenkt worden seyn möchte” (the coat of arms of a cardinal on the old frame led Prince Anton to conjecture that this picture may have been bought in the Netherlands by the Prince Radziwill who wrote the well-known travel book and may have been given by him to his brother, who was a cardinal). Prince Anton Radziwill must have been referring to his ancestor Mikolaj Krzysztof Radziwill (1549–1616), who wrote an account of a pilgrimage to the Holy Land and whose brother Jerzy (1556–1606) was made a cardinal in 1584. Another Radziwill, Wojciech, or Albert, was bishop of Vilna from 1508 and died in 1519. For the genealogy and offices of the Radziwill family, see Dworaczek 1959, tables 161, 164; Backus 1957, pp. 149–50; and Radziwill 1971. Waagen’s tantalizing aside, overlooked in subsequent literature, raises the possibility that the Radziwill arms were at some point combined with a cardinal’s insignia on the frame.


9. See note 1 above. Memling usually dated these works on the frame of the central panel; an exception is the Moreel triptych in the Groeningemuseum, Bruges (De Vos 1994, pp. 238–44, no. 63, ill.).

10. See Boisserée (1808–54) 1978–95, vol. 2, p. 654, and Waagen 1847, p. 187. Waagen again gave the date as 1482 in 1860 (vol. 1, p. 100) and 1862 (vol. 1, p. 119). By 1899 the date was no longer legible; see Kaemmerer 1899, p. 31.

11. Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 6a, no. 11, pl. 42.


13. Weale 1901, p. 76, and particularly Weale 1903a, p. 35. His rejection of the picture was repeated by Voll (1906, p. 214, and 1909, p. 174) and Huismann (1923).

14. Friedländer 1924–37, vol. 6, p. 35.


17. Meiss 1945, especially p. 179, n. 27. Purtle (1982, pp. 33–34, 121–23) suggested additional alchemical associations, as well as a connection to purification rituals in preparation for marriage. Madigan noted in 1986 that Richard of Saint-Victor used such a vessel as a metaphor for a state of contemplation. The nearly coiled taper also recurs in the Annunciations in Glasgow and New York, though its symbolic associations have not been adequately explained; see Minott 1969, p. 270. Blum (1992) summarized the possible symbolic associations of the objects in Memling’s picture.


21. Purtle (1982, pp. 46–50, especially p. 49, n. 32, fig. 26) thinks that Memling “unashamedly parallels Jan’s figures, but his obvious purpose is to record the Virgin in some type of mystical experience.” Lane (1984, p. 75) supports Purtle’s connection of the picture to liturgical drama.

22. For the provenance of the Washington Annunciation, see Hand and Wolff 1986, pp. 76, 82, n. 5.

23. Blum 1992, pp. 52–53. De Vos (1994, p. 304) emphasizes the Eucharistic implications of the manner in which the Virgin is presented, likening her pose to that of the Man of Sorrows supported by angels.

24. See Meiss 1972, figs. 18–20, and frontispiece (Books of Hours in the Gulbenkian Collection, Lisbon, fol. 21v; the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna [MS 1853], fol. 25; the British Library, London [Add. MS 18850], fol. 32; and the Beinecke Library, New Haven [the De Levis Hours, MS 400], fol. 23).


27. Apart from the Annunciation in Utrecht, examples include the tympanum of the main portal of the Marienkirche, Würzburg, of about 1425 (Schiller 1966–80, vol. 1, fig. 105), the Annunciation from Johann Koebercke’s Marienfeld altarpiece, completed in 1457 and now in the Art Institute of Chicago (Stange 1934–61, vol. 6, pl. 18), and the Annunciation of about 1460–75 by the Master of the Life of the Virgin in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich (ibid., vol. 5, fig. 52).

28. Marriage ritual and the conventions for representing it have been much discussed in relation to Van Eyck’s Arnolfini Portrait; for a summary, see Bedaux 1990, pp. 21–67.


30. Ibid., no. 51, pl. 74. In the Prado painting the second page is barely visible in profile between the Virgin and the priest. Also relevant here is the marriage vignette in the so-called Cambrai altarpiece in the Prado and the marriage scene from a related Rogierian sacrament series preserved in drawings and embroideries (ibid., no. 47, pls. 66, 67, 1318f, l).

31. This point is made by Purtle (1982, p. 5). See Bedaux 1990, especially pp. 55–57, on the importance of consent as the sign that made a marriage.

32. On Memling’s narrative treatment of compositions derived from Van der Weyden in particular, see Philippon 1982.
Follower of Hans Memling

15. Virgin and Child

1975.I.111

Oil on oak panel. 38.3 x 28.3 cm, painted surface 31.5 x 20.2 cm.

The painting is in good condition. The oak panel has a vertical grain. There are traces of a barbe on all four sides, suggesting that the painting originally had an engaged frame. Presumably when the engaged frame was removed, the unpainted margins surrounding the image (4 cm at the top and sides and 2.8 cm at the bottom) were filled with a gesso layer that extends around the sides of the panel. This gesso layer was then gilded and decorated with a band of punched stars between plain borders; this decorative margin is now hidden by the frame. The back of the panel is painted brown in a simulated marble pattern. There are several holes along the top and side edges of the panel’s back. The paint surface is in good condition, although numerous minute losses along the fine crackle pattern have been inpainted, particularly in the trees, the face and veil of the Virgin, and the face and body of the Child. Infrared reflectography shows that the Child’s left hand was originally painted level with the Virgin’s right hand. The design is underdrawn in a dry medium, possibly black chalk, and there are slight adjustments between the drawing and the paint layer throughout, with the Virgin’s hands and the Child’s legs shifted downward at the paint stage. Dendrochronological analysis points to the year 1462 for the youngest heartwood ring of the panel, yielding a probable felling date of 1475–1477–1481 ± x for the tree. Assuming a storage time of ten years, the mean probable date of use of the panel would be 1487.

PROVENANCE: Thomas George Baring, first earl of Northbrook (d. 1904); by 1899; his son, Francis George Baring, second earl of Northbrook (d. 1929); Leonard Gow, Camis Eskan, Dumbartonshire; his sale, Christie’s, London, 28 May 1937, lot 82.

EXHIBITED: London 1899–1900, no. 62; Bruges 1902, no. 140.


While it was in the Northbrook collection this small Virgin and Child was attributed to Dieric Bouts. By 1900, however, Friedländer had already characterized it as the work of a rather coarse follower of Memling, and subsequent discussion of the picture has been limited to efforts to link it to other works by followers of Memling. In 1902 Hulin de Loo attributed it to the same hand as a Virgin and Child formerly in the Sommier and Friedsam collections and now in The Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Friedländer concurred in 1903. In 1961 Eisler, following a suggestion Conway had made in 1921, associated the painting with a Virgin and Child in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, which he designated as school of Memling. In 1964 Arndt, noting the derivation of the Madonna in Boston from Rogier van der Weyden, characterized it as a copy of a very early Memling and related the Lehmann painting to Memling’s mature works, perhaps as a copy. De Vos recently reaffirmed the link to the Virgin and Child.
No. 15
from the Sommier collection in the Metropolitan Museum, giving these and a number of other repetitions of this Memling Madonna type to a hand he named the Master of the Bache Virgin, after another Virgin and Child in the Metropolitan Museum.  

The painter of the Lehman panel was an artist of only mediocre abilities, as is evident in the stiff inclination of the Virgin’s head, her unconvincing grasp on the Christ Child, and the confusion of the draperies on which he reclines. Both the painting technique and the way elements derived from Memling are recombined suggest that the picture was painted by a late follower. The paint application is opaque, and forms are modeled with broad areas of gray tone rather than the transparent layers of pigment Memling used to achieve his more luminous surfaces.  

This less transparent treatment is especially evident in the flesh tones and in the Virgin’s veil, where no attempt was made to create the optical effect of the jeweled robe showing through gossamer fabric. Instead, the jewels and the blue of the underlying robe are superimposed on the brown gray surface of the veil.  

The arrangement of the half-length Virgin and Child in the Lehman picture is clearly indebted to Memling’s example. The Virgin’s pose and facial type, the enframing arch, the landscape, and the parapet are particularly close to Memling’s Virgin and Child in the Museu Nacional de Arte Antigua, Lisbon. Nevertheless, some aspects of the composition suggest a misunderstanding of Memling’s conventions and hence the absence of his direct supervision. The Virgin holds the Child above the carpet-covered parapet, rather than using the ledge to present him to the viewer. Her veil is tucked into the border of her robe in a manner that belongs to depictions of the nursing Christ Child, derived ultimately from Rogier van der Weyden’s Saint Luke Drawing the Virgin (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston). Here it has lost the function of modesty inherent in that type. These deviations from Memling’s model suggest that the Lehman Virgin and Child reflects not the continued production of Memling’s workshop, but rather the replication of established half-length devotional types in the last years of the fifteenth and the first years of the sixteenth century. The Virgin and Child formerly in the Sommier collection, the Bache Madonna, and the Boston panel with which the Lehman picture has frequently been linked should all be regarded as parallel late adaptations of Memling’s work.

MW

NOTES:
1. According to London 1899–1900, no. 62. The painting is not listed in the 1885 and 1889 catalogues of the Northbrook collection (Gower 1885 and Weale and Richter 1889).
2. The painting was still exhibited in Bruges in 1902 as by Bouts, and that attribution was maintained in the 1937 Gow sale.
Master of the Saint Ursula Legend

Bruges, active ca. 1470-ca. 1500

The work of this Bruges painter and contemporary of Memling was first isolated in 1903 by Friedländer, who named him after the wings recounting the legend of Saint Ursula in the Groeningemuseum, Bruges. His paintings, chiefly portraits and small devotional panels, along with a few larger altarpieces, are identifiable by their rather stiff, doll-like figures rendered more expressive through prominent beady eyes and cool, blue gray modeling in the flesh tones. The towers of Bruges appear in the background of many of his pictures. A devotional diptych of 1486 in the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp, is the master's only dated work, but the dates of several other paintings can be inferred from the stage of construction of the tower of the Onze-Lieve-Vrouwekerk (Church of Our Lady). Drawing on the compositional formulas of Rogier van der Weyden and Hans Memling and making reference to aspects of the more expressive style of Hugo van der Goes, the Master of the Saint Ursula Legend was able to attract such prominent patrons as members of the Portinari and Van Nieuwenhove families, as well as monastic communities in Bruges, for his essentially conservative productions.

Master of the Saint Ursula Legend

16. Anna van Nieuwenhove Presented by Saint Anne

1975.1.114

Oil on panel. 59.9 x 45 cm with engaged frame, painted surface 49.8 x 34.3 cm. Inscribed in paint at the bottom of the panel: "De nieuwenhove coëxux domicella Johan- nis et michaelis / Obir de blasere nata Johanne Anna sub .m.c.quater / x.octo sed excipe Jotam octobris,quita,pace quiescat Amen." On the frame at the left, the arms of the Van Nieuwenhove family: azure, on an escallop argent an armlet, and issuing from the chief three pellets or; at the right, the Van Nieuwenhove arms impaled with the arms of the De Blasere family: argent, a chevron gules, between three horns sable and or.¹

The painting is in good condition and retains its original engaged frame. The support is composed of two boards with a vertical grain joined 13.6 centimeters from the right edge. The rim around the sides of the frame is a later addition and shows no trace of any hinge or other mechanism for attachment to another panel. The X radiograph (Fig. 16.1), however, shows traces of nails or fills at the right edge 13.3 centimeters from the top and 14.6 centimeters from the bottom, indicating that the picture was hinged to form a diptych or triptych. There are no indications of hinges on the right side. The back of the panel has a beveled molding like that on the front and is painted with a reddish brown marbled design. Much of the gluing and ground have been lost from the back of the frame. The paint surface is fairly well preserved, though its continuity is somewhat disturbed by a pronounced crackle pattern and some cupping paint accompanied by minute flake loss. These losses have been filled and inpainted. The inpainting is now discolored, as is particularly evident in the face and body of the Christ Child, the faces of the donor and the Virgin, and the lightest area of the sky on the left. The brocade patterns are particularly well preserved. No underdrawing was made visible with infrared reflectography.

PROVENANCE: Probably the Onze-Lieve-Vrouwekerk, Bruges; [Alliance des Arts, Paris], by May 1847;² Quedeville collection, Paris, by 1851;³ Quedeville sale, Malard and François, Paris, 29-31 March 1852 (Lugt 2072a), lot 58 (as Hemmeling); R. Labordette, Amiens;⁴ [F. Kleinberger Galleries, New York and Paris], 1912. Acquired by Philip Lehman from Kleinberger in February 1912.


De viuendo sub coeuro Domicella Johannis et nichaelis
Huit de blasè re nata Jhоване Anna sub M C quatuor
Octo sed recipit Jhovan octobris quinta pace quiescat Amen
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Fig. 16.1 X radiograph of details of No. 16, showing hinges on left side

The donor of this small panel kneels in front of Saint Anne, who is accompanied by a diminutive Virgin and Child as her attribute. That the panel was associated with a holy image is suggested by the saint’s gesture of presentation and by the way the donor’s worshiping gaze is directed out of the picture space; it is corroborated by the traces of hinges on the left edge of the frame that are visible in the X radiograph (Fig. 16.1).

The painting’s function as an epitaph or memorial is established by the inscription at the bottom of the panel, which appears to be original and undisturbed. The inscription has, however, been the source of much confusion because of its unusual word order and the obscure notation of the date. The surnames De Nieuwenhove (for Van Nieuwenhove) and De Blasere occur in the inscription, and the arms of these two families decorate the frame. The arms of the Van Nieuwenhove family are on the left, and they are combined with the De Blasere arms on the right of the frame, indicating that the wife was born a De Blasere. The puzzling phrase “De nieuwenhove co|njunct domicella Johannis et michaelis” has led to the inference that she married twice. In 1915 Mather interpreted the inscription as referring to a woman named Anna who was married first to Jan van Nieuwenhove and later to De Blasere, a reading that Robert Lehman repeated in 1928, and in 1980 Baejter tentatively interpreted it as meaning that a member of the Nieuwenhove family married Jan and then Michiel de Blasere. In 1986 Bauman put forward a more plausible interpretation. He contended that the word “et” in “Johannis et michaelis” was an error and that this phrase should be read as “companion and wife of Jan, son of Michiel van Nieuwenhove” (and not “Jan and Michiel van Nieuwenhove”), supporting his contention with the history of the families. Martens recently provided further information about the families to support Bauman’s interpretation, and he also supplied the most convincing explanation of the donor’s death date, which had previously been widely interpreted as 1480.\(^5\) Martens translated the inscription as “The companion and wife of Jan and [sic] Michiel van Nieuwenhove, born Anna, daughter of Jan de Blasere, died in 1480, minus iota, the 5th of October, may she rest in peace. Amen.” The date is treated as a sum in the inscription: one thousand, four hundreds, eight tens, and, as Martens suggests, subtract one, making it 1479. In fact, Jan van Nieuwenhove, son of Michiel van Nieuwenhove and brother of Memling’s patron Martin van Nieuwenhove, married Anna, the daughter of Jan de Blasere, in 1478. Their daughter Catherine was born on 24 September 1479.\(^6\) As Martens points out, Anna van Nieuwenhove’s death on 5 October 1479 may have been a consequence of childbirth. Jan van Nieuwenhove, who held a number of official positions in Bruges in addition to being a counselor of Archduke Maximilian and watergrave of Flanders, was publicly tortured and then executed by the townspeople of Bruges on 29 February 1488, at the height of their rebellion against Maximilian.\(^7\)

Members of the Van Nieuwenhove family, including Jan van Nieuwenhove and Anna, née de Blasere, were buried in a chapel in the south aisle of the Onze-Lieve-Vrouwekerk in Bruges. The Lehman epitaph was very probably painted for this chapel.\(^8\) It is now evident from X radiography that the panel was originally hinged on the left side, probably to attach it to a sacred image, which would also explain Anna’s kneeling posture and gaze.\(^8\) It seems that the graves of Jan and Anna van Nieuwenhove, together with those of Michiel van Nieuwenhove, his father, and Martin, his brother, and their wives, were marked by a floor slab of Tournai stone at the entrance to this chapel, and the Lehman
epitaph may have hung on the wall nearby. The earliest references to the placement of the graves of the Van Nieuwenhove family are somewhat contradictory, and it is possible that the Lehman panel, with its obscure inscription, may have contributed to the confusion among the several Jans and Michiels buried in the family chapel.

The painting, which had been attributed to Memling in the nineteenth century, was already ascribed to the Master of the Saint Ursula Legend by the time Philip Lehman acquired it in 1912. Only Marlier has expressed reservations about the attribution, which Mather first published in 1915. The ovoid faces and beady eyes of the figures and the cool gray shadows in the flesh tones link the painting to the Ursula Master. Also characteristic of him is the treatment of drapery, especially in the way the full robes of Saint Anne are gathered into rather flat, angular folds that maintain their position in defiance of the laws of gravity. The painting lacks the forcefulness of the painter's best productions, however, due in part to the panel's conventional and utilitarian function and in part to its condition, particularly the disruption of the paint surface caused by prominent craquelure and old inpainting. Another small devotional panel by the Ursula Master in the Hamburger Kunsthalle is very similar to the Lehman epitaph in its rather summary treatment of figures and landscape.

The painting can be dated between 5 October 1479, the death date of Anna van Nieuwenhove, and 1482, before the construction of the octagonal extension of the Bruges bell tower (the tower appears, without the extension, in the center of the city view at the left). The panel is thus a relatively early work by the Master of the Saint Ursula Legend, who was active in Bruges between about 1470 and about 1500. Indeed, Anna van Nieuwenhove, with her smooth face and slender silhouette, resembles Saint Ursula as she is depicted on the panels in the Groeningemuseum in Bruges, which are also presumed to be early works.

NOTES:
2. See Kunstblatt 1847, p. 60.
3. According to Lacroix 1851.
5. It was read as 1488 by Friedländer in 1928 and Bautier in 1956 and as 1489 by Hull in 1981. Hull considered Anna de Blaseire to have been Jan van Nieuwenhove's widow.
7. Most modern sources, including Gaillard (ibid., p. 93), give the date as 29 November 1488, but see the narrative in Molinet (1474) 1935, vol. 1, pp. 597–609. It should be noted that Van Nieuwenhove was executed for his court connections and not, as Harbison (1995, p. 30) has said, as punishment for his role in the rebellion.
8. The report in Kunstblatt 1847, p. 60, that the picture might have belonged to an altar in Bruges appears to be a statement of probability based on its attribution to Memling, although it does not contradict what can be deduced concerning the original placement of the picture. I am grateful to Lorne Campbell of the National Gallery, London, for bringing this reference to my attention.
9. Finding no evidence of hinges, Bauman concluded in 1986 that the panel hung near an altarpiece, while Martens (1992a and 1992b) suggested it hung near what he presumed, on the basis of early descriptions, was an inscribed and decorated foundation stone on the south wall of the chapel.
12. On the construction of the tower, see Verhaegen 1959, pp. 79–81, and Ganshof 1962. Harbison 1995, pp. 25–30, and see also Marten's response in Ainsworth 1995, pp. 44–47) discusses the possible political associations of representations of the Bruges towers. He interprets the inclusion of the city view as reflecting Van Nieuwenhove's role as a partisan of the city in its struggle with Maximilian, whereas it was the citizens of Bruges who tortured and executed him (see note 7 above).
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Dieric Bouts

Haarlem, probably 1415–Louvain 1475

One of the most influential Netherlandish painters of the second half of the fifteenth century, Dieric Bouts was a native of Haarlem in Holland, where he was probably born about 1415. Where he was trained is unknown, but the testimony of Van Mander and other early historians suggests that he was active in Haarlem before setting in the university town of Louvain in Brabant. He is documented in Louvain from 1457, but he may have lived and worked there before that date. Bouts is exceptional among early Netherlandish painters in that some of his most important surviving paintings are documented. The Altarpiece of the Holy Sacrament still in the collegiate church of Saint Peter in Louvain is datable to 1464–68 based on the contract and receipt. The city council of Louvain commissioned two ensembles dealing with themes of judgment in 1468: The Justice of Emperor Otto III now in the Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels (one panel was completed in 1473, and the other was left unfinished at Bouts’s death), and The Last Judgment, a triptych whose wings are probably the two panels preserved in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lille. Among the works attributed to him on the basis of style, the Portrait of a Man in the National Gallery, London, is dated 1462. After Bouts’s death in Louvain in 1475, his workshop style was maintained by his sons, Dieric the Younger and Aelbert.

Rogier van der Weyden’s influence is pervasive in Bouts’s mature paintings. Though the figure types and lighting in his early works show some connection with Petrus Christus and the mature works of both painters reveal an interest in one-point perspective, the nature of their contact is unclear. Bouts’s treatment of landscape as a setting for his figures was especially refined and innovative.

Follower of Dieric Bouts

17. Saint Christopher and the Infant Christ

1975.1115

Oil on oak panel. 38.7 x 24.7 cm, painted surface 37 x 24.5 cm.

The painting is in fair condition. It was cleaned in 1947 by Caesar Diorio, New York, and was superficially cleaned in 1978 after entering the Metropolitan Museum. The uncradled panel is composed of a single board with a vertical grain. Exposed edges on all four sides, together with the slight barbe most evident at the top and bottom edges, suggest that the painting was originally in an engaged frame. The paint surface is somewhat abraded in the dark areas, especially the saint’s raised arm and the cloak below it. These areas have been retouched. Other details, notably the hair, the bare tree emerging from the rocks at the left, the ducks, and the boat, are also abraded. Only minimal underdrawing was made visible with infrared reflectography, and that was confined to a few contour strokes in the figure of Saint Christopher and some hatching strokes in his left thigh. Dendrochronological analysis indicates the year 1454 for the youngest heartwood ring on the panel, yielding a probable felling date of 1467...1469...1473 + x for the tree. Assuming a storage time of ten years, the mean probable date of use for the panel would be 1479.1

PROVENANCE: Private collection, Munich; [Karl Schäfer, Munich], 1927.2 Acquired by Robert Lehman by 1942.

EXHIBITED: Northampton, Massachusetts, 1942–43; Cincinnati 1959, no. 113b; New York 1998–99, no. 17, ill.


Saint Christopher, whose name means Christ-bearer, was a third-century martyr said to have been of gigantic size. The story of his life is largely legendary. The Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine recounts that after being converted to Christianity by a hermit, the saint undertook to ferry travelers across a treacherous river.3 One day a child asked for passage across the river, and the saint was astonished to find that the boy was a crushing heavy burden. His passenger was the
Christ Child, who explained that in carrying him the giant had been bearing the weight of the world.

This painting has traditionally been attributed to Aelbert Bouts, the younger son of Dieric Bouts. In his 1938 monograph on Bouts and his workshop, Schöne ascribed it to Aelbert with reservations. He recognized that the figures related not to Aelbert's own version of Saint Christopher in the Galleria Estense in Modena but to the right wing (Fig. 17.1) of the *Adoration of the Magi* triptych in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, known as the “Pearl of Brabant” and usually attributed to Dieric Bouts himself.\(^4\) Schöne, who followed Voll and a few other scholars in removing the jewellike private altar-piece in Munich from Dieric Bouts's oeuvre,\(^5\) found support for his opinion of its authorship in this picture. He took the slightly more upright figure of the saint in the Lehman picture and his larger scale within the picture field as indications that the painting was a copy of a lost Saint Christopher by Bouts that was also repeated in the more precious idiom of the “Pearl of Brabant,” which Schöne attributed to Dieric Bouts the Younger.

Both of Dieric Bouts’s sons were painters.\(^6\) The elder son, Dieric, had reached his majority by 15 January 1473, and he died between 28 December 1490 and 2 May 1491.
No documentary evidence exists to link his name with particular paintings. The younger son, Aelbert, who was still a minor in 1476, prospered as a painter in Louvain until his death in 1549. Considerable circumstantial evidence links him to paintings with Louvain associations – specifically an *Assumption of the Virgin* triptych in the Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts, Brussels,7 and an *Annunciation* in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich8 – and a distinctive body of work has been assembled around these paintings. Through this body of work the elder Bouts’s style and workshop models survived well into the sixteenth century.

Despite its clear dependence on a Boutsian pattern, the Lehman *Saint Christopher* does not share the characteristics of the paintings linked to Aelbert Bouts. Lacking are his delicately muted palette and his softened and elaborated variation on his father’s rendering of draperies and landscape forms. Instead, the elder Bouts’s style has here been reduced to graphic mannerisms evident in the simplified coastline, the broad, flat faces of Saint Christopher and the Christ Child, and the angular folds and stippled modeling of the drapery. In these and other details the picture is strikingly similar to another small devotional work attributed to Aelbert Bouts but likewise not from his hand, the *Virgin and Child* in the Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto (Fig. 17.2),9 which also derives from a Boutsian prototype, in this case a lost enthroned Virgin and Child with attendant angels.10 The Toronto picture may be by the same hand as the Lehman *Saint Christopher*. This painter should be considered a late follower of Dieric Bouts. Dendrochronological analysis of the Lehman panel suggests that it was painted after Bouts’s death, but this does not exclude the possibility that its painter worked in association with one of the master’s sons. The extension of Bouts’s workshop after his death, particularly through the production of small devotional panels, needs further study.11

MW

NOTES:
1. Report of Peter Klein, Ordinariat für Holzbiologie, Universität Hamburg, 10 September 1987 (files of the Paintings Conservation Department, Metropolitan Museum).
2. Both according to Schöne 1938, p. 143, no. 27a.
5. See Schöne 1938, pp. 43–47; Voll 1906, pp. 120–22; and Heidrich 1910, pp. 32–33, 269. The attribution of the Munich triptych is still disputed; for the most recent discussion, see Collier 1986, Eikemeier 1989–90, and Von Sonnenburg 1989–90.
6. For biographies of Bouts’s sons, see Schöne 1938, p. 3.
8. Ibid., no. 44, pl. 60. For a summary of the evidence, see Folie 1963, pp. 249–51.
9. Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 3, p. 68, no. 65, pl. 79 (ex coll. Hosmer-Pillow, Montreal). Friedländer published the Toronto painting as an early work of Aelbert Bouts, but left open the possibility that it was by another imitator of Dieric the Elder.
10. This was recently reaffirmed by Didier Martens (1993, pp. 149–51), who assumed that the lost Bouts prototype was preserved in Bruges and that most of the variants of it were made by Bruges painters. Hence he attributed the Toronto picture, untenably, to the Master of the Saint Ursula Legend.
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Master of Frankfurt

born ca. 1460, active Antwerp ca. 1490–ca. 1525

The Master of Frankfurt was active in Antwerp in the last decade of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century. He takes his name from two altarpieces painted for Frankfurt patrons, the Humbracht triptych in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt am Main, painted about 1504, and the Holy Kinship altarpiece in the Historisches Museum there. That he worked in Antwerp is established by the stylistic connections between these altarpieces and two earlier paintings clearly linked to Antwerp institutions, The Festival of the Archers' Guild (reported to have been dated 1493 on the lost original frame) and Portrait of the Artist and His Wife (dated 1496 and bearing the arms of the Antwerp Guild of Saint Luke), both in the Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp. The inscription on the frame of the double portrait indicates that the artist was thirty-six in 1496, hence he must have been born about 1460.

The Master of Frankfurt's training cannot be deduced from the style of his earliest works. Rather, the attributed works show a willingness to adapt the models of his great fifteenth-century predecessors, among them Hugo van der Goes, Rogier van der Weyden, and the Master of Flémalle. Later he borrowed from the figural types and compositions of more innovative Antwerp painters, particularly Quentin Massys and Joos van Cleve. The Master of Frankfurt was the head of an active workshop, and his practice of recombining compositional types, as well as his vigorous and rather coarse painting style, was well suited to workshop production.

Delen proposed in 1949 that the Master of Frankfurt was the Antwerp painter Hendrik van Wueluwe. Van Wueluwe is documented in Antwerp from 1483, when he is mentioned as a master painter, until his death in 1533, and he held numerous positions in the Guild of Saint Luke. No work by him survives for comparison, however, and his dates and those of his son Jan van Wueluwe, who was accepted as a master painter in Antwerp in 1503, suggest that he was slightly older than the author of the Antwerp Portrait of the Artist and His Wife.

Workshop of the Master of Frankfurt

18. The Adoration of the Christ Child

1975.1.116

Oil on oak panel. 58.7 x 41.3 cm, painted surface 58.1 x 40.1 cm.

The painting is in very good condition. It was cleaned and restored at Ripponella Studio in New York in 1958. The oak panel has a vertical grain and is composed of two boards with a join 16.4 centimeters from the left edge. The margins of exposed wood and the barbe on all four sides indicate that the painting originally had an engaged frame. The panel has been thinned, as is evident from exposed worm tunneling, and then cradled. The paint layer is very well preserved, with minimal losses along the join and along several cracks at the upper edge. These and a few scattered losses in the right half of the picture have been filled and inpainted. The texture of the thickly applied paint remains intact, although the overall effect is somewhat disturbed by a pronounced crackle pattern and pebbly varnish layer. Very little undertinting is revealed with infrared reflectography; drawing is clearly visible only in the cheek of the frontal angel kneeling behind the manger. Other areas of undertinting may be obscured by painted contours that conform closely to an underdrawn design. Dendrochronological analysis indicates the year 1473 for the youngest heartwood ring on either board of the panel, yielding a probable felling date of 1486...1488...1492 + x. Assuming a storage time of ten years, a mean probable date of use of the panel would be 1498.1

PROVENANCE: Possibly a Russian collection; [Bottenwieser Galleries, Berlin and New York]. Acquired by Robert Lehman from Bottenwieser in December 1930.2

EXHIBITED: Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1931; Cincinnati 1959, no. 115, ill.; New York 1998–99, no. 60, ill.

This picture, which was first ascribed to the painter known as the Master of Frankfurt by Friedländer in 1934, displays the naked newborn Christ Child in a boxlike manger within the ruined palace of David. The Virgin and a crowd of angels kneel on the ground to adore the Child, as other angels sing or hover above. Two shepherds approach the window of the enclosure, while the annunciation to the shepherds takes place in the distant landscape.

Although these events are depicted in even daylight, the composition, including the ruined palace and the poses of most of the figures, derives from a model that must have been a night Nativity, to judge from several other paintings that repeat the same pattern. In these paintings, in an allusion to Saint Bridget's visualization of the Nativity, the Christ Child himself is the chief source of illumination, brighter than the candle held by Saint Joseph. When Friedländer published the painting in 1934, shortly after it entered Robert Lehman's collection, he linked it to other versions of the same composition that he regarded as derivations from a lost night Nativity by Jan Joest. Winkler, who like Valentiner maintained Friedländer's attribution to the Master of Frankfurt, traced a larger group of nocturnal Nativity scenes to an earlier lost prototype by Hugo van der Goes. In 1984, in the first detailed study of the heterogeneous works attributed to the Master of Frankfurt, Goddard gave the Lehman painting to a workshop hand he called the Watervliet Painter after the Deposition triptych in the Onze-Lieve-Vrouwekerk, Watervliet (Fig. 18.1), placing in the same group another very closely related Nativity that entered the Metropolitan Museum in 1982 with the Jack and Belle Linsky collection. Bauman, however, rejected Goddard's suggestion that the Linsky and Lehman pictures were by the same hand and attributed the Linsky picture to a follower of Jan Joest. Friedländer was probably correct in suggesting that Jan Joest was the originator of the particular variant of the nocturnal Nativity theme from which the Lehman picture derives. The prototype for this composition is lost, but in the works that seem to reflect it most closely—the ex-Linsky painting and one in the Dunedin Public Art Gallery, New Zealand—the Virgin is also represented with delicate, feline features like those of the Virgin in the panels of Joest's most important work, the high altar for the Nikolaikirche, Kalkar. Several of the angels in those paintings and the Lehman panel have hair like Gabriël's in the Annunciation of the Kalkar altarpiece, frizzy and rising from their heads as though activated by static electricity. In addition, the Cologne

Fig. 18.1 Master of Frankfurt and workshop, The Deposition. Onze-Lieve-Vrouwekerk, Watervliet. Photograph © A.C.L., Brussels
painter Barthel Bruyn (1493–1555), who is presumed to have trained with Joest, produced a variant of this composition in a painting dated 1516 in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt am Main.\textsuperscript{9} That the composition was also in the repertoire of patterns in the Master of Frankfurt’s shop is demonstrated by a \textit{Nativity} in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Valenciennes (Fig. 18.2), in which the poses of the shepherds and many of the angels are repeated but other elements are rearranged in a manner characteristic of the Master of Frankfurt.\textsuperscript{10} The Valenciennes \textit{Nativity} is comparable to the Lehman painting in that the nocturnal effects have been eliminated, but in its figure types and painting style it clearly relates to the two mature works in Frankfurt from which the painter takes his name. The Lehman picture’s connection to the master is more distant. Indeed, it lacks evidence of the master’s personal involvement, his habitual effort, awkward though it may be, to give figures volume and psychological intensity. Nor can the Lehman painting’s connection to the specific group of works Goddard gave to the so-called Watervliet Painter be maintained. The \textit{Nativity} formerly in the Linsky collection, though it repeats the same composition as the Lehman picture, shows only the most tenuous connection to the Master of Frankfurt and is the work of a painter who used different facial types and a more transparent paint application.\textsuperscript{11} The Watervliet \textit{Deposition}, itself a repetition of a frequently copied composition that has been traced to a lost prototype by Rogier van der Weyden, can be associated with the Lehman picture only as a similarly literal repetition of an established pattern appropriated for use in the shop of the Master of Frankfurt. It must be said that the group of works Goddard attributed to the Watervliet Painter lacks coherence in other respects as well.

The Lehman \textit{Adoration of the Christ Child} is probably a late product of the Master of Frankfurt’s workshop. The thick, undifferentiated paint application supports this conclusion.\textsuperscript{12}

\textbf{Notes:}

1. Report of Peter Klein, Ordinariat für Holzbiologie, Universität Hamburg, 5 May 1987 (Paintings Conservation Department files, Metropolitan Museum).
2. According to the Bottenwieser invoice dated 26 December 1930 (Robert Lehman Collection files) and Valentin 1945, p. 212, the picture came from the Hermitage. However, in 1964 (p. 153, fig. 115) Winkler referred to a painting in the museum in Kiev as exactly corresponding to this painting. His illustration suggests that it is identical with the Lehman painting.
3. On Saint Bridget’s revelation, see Cornell 1924, pp. 1–21.
4. Baldass (1920–21, pp. 39–43) had earlier proposed that the nocturnal \textit{Nativity} was an innovation of Hugo van der Goes.
7. Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 9a, no. 4c, pl. 11.
8. Ibid., no. 1, pl. 6; Hilger 1990, pl. 12.
11. Goddard (1984, p. 93) himself admitted that the Linsky picture was “somewhat on the fringe” of the group he assigned to the Watervliet Painter, although in 1985 (p. 409) he cited the repetition of a brocade pattern as linking it to the Master of Frankfurt’s workshop. Goddard used the mechanical reproduction of brocade patterns as a means of defining the parameters of the Master of Frankfurt’s workshop. He found that the Lehman picture was one of a very few instances of a brocade pattern belonging to the stock of workshop patterns being applied on an inconsistent scale.
12. The painting techniques used in the Master of Frankfurt’s workshop have yet to be studied, although Hoeingwald (1982) has noted different layering structures and paint textures in a single painting. These could be explored further as indications of different hands or specializations within the workshop. On the use of a more opaque paint layer structure as a response to demands of the market and workshop production, see Périer-d’Ieteren 1985 and Philippot 1990, p. 244.
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Joos van Cleve
active ca. 1505—Antwerp 1540/41

Joos van der Beke, more commonly known as Joos van Cleve, was active in Antwerp by 1511, when he was accepted as a master in the Guild of Saint Luke. Although his name recurs in Antwerp records until his death between 10 November 1540 and 13 April 1541, no documented or fully signed paintings by him survive. It was only at the end of the nineteenth century that his documented career was linked to a body of work previously grouped around the 1515 Death of the Virgin (Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne). The monogram IVAb (V and A in ligature) and the arms of the Antwerp painters' guild on the Cologne picture provided the link to the documented painter.

The place and date of Joos's birth are unknown, as is his artistic training, although the appellation Van Cleve suggests a family connection to the Lower Rhine. There is evidence that he assisted the peripatetic Jan Joest with the altarpiece painted for the Nikolaikirche in Kalkar between 1505 and 1508. The earliest independent works in Joos's style, including the altar wings Adam and Eve dated 1507 (Louvre, Paris), suggest that he had contact with Bruges and was familiar with painting in the Lower Rhine and Cologne.

In his mature paintings Joos van Cleve achieved effects of great elegance with his extraordinary control in the rendering of stuffs and flesh. His works draw on a range of sources: the authority of fifteenth-century Netherlandish painters, the extravagance of Antwerp mannerism, and the innovations of the artists of the Italian Renaissance, particularly Leonardo da Vinci. Many of Joos's most important commissioned works were painted for destinations outside the Netherlands, in Germany, Poland, and Italy. His allusions to Italian art suggest the possibility of an Italian journey, but his knowledge could also have come from sources available in cosmopolitan Antwerp. That he was at the court of Francis I of France between about 1530 and 1535 is likely, based on the portraits of the monarch and his wife that have been attributed to him, and on the testimony of Guicciardini.

Workshop of Joos van Cleve

19. The Holy Family

Oil on oak panel. 55.4 x 37 cm.

The painting is in poor condition. The panel, composed of a single board with a vertical grain, has been thinned and cradled. The painted surface extends to the edges of the panel. The painting has suffered extensively in the past from flaking paint, particularly in the figure of the Christ Child, the Virgin's left arm and the mantle over her right arm, the glass vessel and the parapet around it, the lemon, and Joseph's left shoulder and the sky above his hat, as well as along the left edge of the painting beside Joseph. These losses have been filled and inpainted, but the surface of the painting is marred by uneven fills and areas of consolidated paint as well as discolored retouches. A thin veil covering the Christ Child's genitals was removed in the relatively recent past. The painting is fully underdrawn. In many areas precise underdrawn contours were exactly followed at the paint stage, especially in the figure of Saint Joseph, the face of the Child, and the headdress of the Virgin. The underdrawn line is freer in the body of the Christ Child and the capital of the column, the profile of which projects more strongly than in the painted design. Dendrochronological analysis indicated the year 1504 for the youngest heartwood ring on the panel, yielding a probable felling date of 1507...1523 + x for the tree using the sapwood statistic for eastern Europe.

Assuming a storage time of ten years, a mean probable date of use for the panel would be 1520. The provenance: Prince Heinrich von Bourbon, Vienna; Bourbon sale, E. Hirscher and Co., Vienna, 2 April 1906 (Lugt 64233), lot 70; [F. Kleinberger Galleries, Paris and New York] (bought from Hirscher, 2 September 1906); [Ehrich Galleries, New York] (bought from Kleinberger, 1908); [F. Kleinberger Galleries, Paris and New York] (bought from Ehrich, 6 July 1911). Acquired by Philip Lehman from Kleinberger in October 1911.


This treatment of the Holy Family, like many of Joos van Cleve's half-length formulations of the Virgin and Child, was frequently repeated with slight variations in the production of his workshop. In this variant the Virgin nurses a particularly self-possessed Christ Child, who stands facing the viewer. A brocade hanging isolates and elevates the figure of the Virgin, while Saint Joseph, absorbed in his devotions, appears to hover in the background, framed within the corner view of a landscape. The Virgin's exposed breast emphasizes the human nature and nurture of Christ and his mother's role as mediator for mankind. The carnation she holds symbolizes the mystery of the Incarnation, while the glass vessel filled with wine represents Christ's sacrifice reenacted in the Eucharist. The sliced citron or lemon has been interpreted as a reference to the weaning of the Christ Child, but it may also foretell the sting of his Passion.

Friedländer characterized the Lehman picture as a "fine old replica." It is generally considered to be one of a group of replicas derived from a painting in the National Gallery, London (Fig. 19.1), that was certainly executed by Joos van Cleve himself. A comparison of the numerous related versions of the Holy Family shows that various recombinations of setting and pose evolved within Joos's workshop. The Lehman picture is not directly dependent on the London Holy Family, which is depicted against a plain background. Rather, it belongs to a subgroup that shares the same arrangement of figures and setting and includes pictures in the Akademie der bildenden Künste, Vienna; at Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina; in the Musée des Vosges, Épinal; and formerly in the collection of Sir Frederick Cook, Richmond. A Holy Family in the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston (Fig. 19.2), and several paintings allied with it are closely related to this group but depart from it in the simpler folds of the Virgin's headdress, which covers her ear; the more planar arrangement of the cloth behind her; and the omission of the landscape behind Saint Joseph. For their setting, including the landscape visible at the left, the paintings in the subgroup to which the Vienna and Lehman pictures belong draw on yet another type of the Holy Family seated in a loggia, the finest example of which is in the Currier Gallery of Art, Manchester, New Hampshire.

None of these pictures are dated, although the dates Friedländer suggested for the London Holy Family (about 1515) and the Currier picture (about 1520) are a fair estimation of the period when the basic compositional types evolved. A systematic study of the underdrawing in these related paintings would undoubtedly clarify what was innovative and what was more mechanical replication in each of them, thereby helping to put them in sequence. In the London painting the Child stands in the same swaying posture as in the paintings of the group that includes the Lehman picture, but the position of his head depends on yet another formulation within the larger group of Holy Family images, one in which the suckling Child, supported by the Virgin, reclines on a cloth. Infrared reflectography of the London picture shows that the Child was underdrawn in this reclining position, hence Joos must have chosen to paint a more commanding standing Christ Child during the course of his work on the panel. This need not mean, however, that all paintings by Joos and his assistants with the standing Christ Child postdate the London picture; the motif of the standing Christ Child may well have already existed in another variant.

When painting frequently replicated compositions like the Holy Family, the Virgin and Child, or the Infant Christ and John the Baptist embracing, Joos or his
assistants must have freely selected elements of pose or setting from a series of related models in the workshop. The underdrawing of the Lehman picture does not show evidence of mechanical transfer, but the very precision with which the underdrawn contours were followed in most areas does suggest that the artist had access to a workshop pattern. Yet even in this workshop production, elements from variant compositions are recombined in a way that makes it different from the other examples. Thus Joseph was given the sidelong glance and closed lips found in the Houston Holy Family (Fig. 19.2) rather than the lowered eyes and slightly parted lips found in the other most closely related paintings.

In its execution the Lehman picture does not come close to Joos van Cleve’s own refinement. The paint is rather thickly and opaquely applied, with modeling in gray on the faces of both Virgin and Child and in blue on the Virgin’s headdress, in a shorthand technique quite distinct from Joos’s translucent effects. This and the dendrochronological evidence suggest that the painting is a late product of the workshop, probably from the late 1520s or the 1530s.

**NOTES:**

1. The veil is still evident in the photographs reproduced in Cincinnati 1959, no. 116, and Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 9a, no. 66g, pl. 8g. The only treatment record in the curatorial file dates to 1978, when Rustin S. Levinson griege-cleaned the painting, consolidated flaking paint, and corrected some discolored retouches. The Kleinberger stock cards (see note 3 below) indicate that the picture was restored by De Brozik in 1908.


3. The dates of sale are given on the Kleinberger stock cards preserved in the European Paintings Department at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. That Kleinberger purchased the picture from Hirschler on 2 September 1906 suggests that the picture was bought in at the Bourbon sale. I am most grateful to Mary Sprowin de Jesús of the European Paintings Department for making this information available. See also Bruges 1907, no. 233.


6. See Hand 1989, p. 9, and Davies 1968, p. 102, who cites a tradition that the picture’s subject is the weaning of Christ. Segal (in Amsterdam–Braunschweig 1983, pp. 37–38) has noted that the citron, with its rounded shape and bitter taste, was more readily available in early modern Europe than the lemon.


9. Münz 1948, p. 15, no. 21, fig. 8; Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 9a, p. 64, no. 66h, pl. 84. Friedländer considered the picture in Vienna to have the best claim to autograph quality. Renate Trnek of the Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der bildenden Künste has kindly informed me (in a letter of 22 May 1996) that infrared reflectography of the painting revealed no significant underdrawing.


11. Ibid., no. 66i, pl. 85. Judging from the photograph of it in the Witt Archives, London, the painting in Epinal appears to be a copy rather than a product of Joos’s workshop.

12. H. Cook 1913–15, p. 3, no. 465, ill.; Manchester 1965, no. 64 (not in Friedländer). This picture, which according to the Manchester catalogue was later in the collection of Stella Donner, appears to be of higher quality than the other works in the group.

13. Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 9a, no. 66a, pl. 84; allied pictures include ibid., nos. 66c, 66d, pl. 84.

14. Ibid., no. 64, pl. 8c, and see also Hand 1989.

15. Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 9a, pp. 28–29. Although Hand (1989, pp. 13, 17) dated both paintings about five years later, new insights concerning the date of Joos’s Genovese patronage and his susceptibility to Italian influence suggest that the earlier dates are more likely (see Scailliéz in Paris 1991).

Gerard David

Oudewater ca. 1460–Bruges 1523

The last great painter of Bruges, David was probably born shortly before 1460 in Oudewater in the northern Netherlands. He registered as a master in the guild of painters in Bruges in 1484. Where he was trained is unknown, though his early works show the influence of his northern Netherlands roots and of the art of Hugo van der Goes and Dieric Bouts. Three documented paintings are the basis for the reconstruction of David’s oeuvre: the two panels depicting the Justice of Cambyses, one dated 1498, in the Groeningemuseum, Bruges, that can be presumed to be the paintings for the Bruges town hall for which he received final payment in 1498, and the Virgo inter virgines in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rouen, which he gave to the convent of Sion in Bruges in 1509. It has been postulated that David made a trip to Italy in connection with the monumental altarpiece formerly at San Girolamo della Cervara, near Genoa, which is reported to have borne the date 1506 on its frame. (Sections of the altarpiece are preserved in the Palazzo Bianco, Genoa; The Metropolitan Museum of Art; and the Louvre, Paris.)

Working largely within the formal conventions established by fifteenth-century Netherlandish painters, David nonetheless extended their expressive range, both in the tender intimacy of his private devotional paintings and in the substantial presence of the figures in his large altarpieces.

Gerard David

20. Christ Carrying the Cross, with the Crucifixion; The Resurrection, with the Pilgrims of Emmaus (triptych wings)

1975.1.119
Oil on oak panel. Left wing: 87.7 x 29.5 cm, painted surface 86.2 x 27.9 cm; right wing: 87.6 x 30 cm, painted surface 86.3 x 28.2 cm.

Both paintings are in very good condition. Each has been sawn through the thickness of the panel, thereby separating the reverse (see No. 21) from the front. Both panels are composed of single boards with a vertical grain and are now cradled. Edges of exposed wood and a barbe on all four sides of the panels indicate that they once had engaged frames and have not been significantly trimmed. The paint surface of the Christ Carrying the Cross is generally well preserved, with slight abrasion throughout and some small, scattered areas of paint loss and retouch in the lower portion of Christ’s robe, in Simon of Cyrene’s sleeves, below the dog, and on the left crossbeam of the cross near the end. The face of Christ is somewhat worn, and his left eye has been strengthened. The paint surface of the Resurrection is very well preserved. A split through the upper two-thirds of the panel about 9 centimeters from the left edge has been filled and inpainted. There is some abrasion in the face and cloak of the reclining soldier and in the face of the sleeping soldier. The face of Christ is better preserved than in the Christ Carrying the Cross, though there is some strengthening in the eyes.

Infrared reflectography (Fig. 20.1) reveals that the Christ Carrying the Cross is fully underdrawn in a dry medium, with the figure of Christ especially carefully studied. Corrections, also in a dry medium, include the delineation of a diagonal fold across Christ’s thigh, the repositioning of his right foot lower and farther forward, and the adjustment of the contour of his left leg so that it too is farther forward and of the hem of his robe so that less of it trails along the ground. Taken together, these adjustments make the figure of Christ more upright. Brush and wash were used to model the eyes and mouth of the tormentor with the rope. The distant Crucifixion was underdrawn quite freely, with the crosses closer together and Christ’s cross higher and more steeply inclined than in the paint stage. The main figures of the Resurrection are underdrawn in brush over a preliminary drawing in a dry medium (see Fig. 20.2), which is most readily visible in the figure of Christ. In the cloak of the reclining soldier and Christ’s robe, broader wash strokes were added to clarify the area of deepest shadow and probably also serve as undermodeling. The pilgrims on the road to Emmaus are underdrawn in a dry medium. Dendrochronological analysis indicated the year 1487 for the youngest heartwood ring on either panel, yielding a probable felling date of 1500...1502...1506 + x for the tree. Assuming a storage time of ten years, a mean probable date of use of the panels would be 1512. The analysis confirmed that the Annunciation and the Passion scenes were painted on the same boards.

See No. 21.

NOTES:
1. Weale (1903b, col. 276) described them as already separated and cradled.
2. The contours of Christ’s robe were apparently adjusted after the first paint layer and are also visible as pentimenti.
Figs. 20.1 and 20.2  Infrared reflectograms (computer assemblies) of No. 20
21. The Annunciation (exterior of triptych wings)

1975.1.120

Oil on oak panel. Left wing: 87.7 x 29.5 cm, painted surface 86.4 x 27.9 cm; right wing: 87.6 x 30 cm, painted surface 86.4 x 28.3 cm.

The panel with Gabriel originally formed the reverse of the Christ Carrying the Cross and the panel with the Virgin was the reverse of the Resurrection (see No. 20). Both wings are in good condition. Both have been cradled. As with the fronts of the wings, edges of unpainted wood and a barge on all four sides indicate that the images have not been trimmed. The paint surface shows wear consistent with the wings' use as the exterior of a folding triptych. There is an arched gouge below the book held by the Virgin and another short gouge just below her left shoulder. A vertical split in the panel with the Virgin Annunciate corresponds to the split in the Resurrection, both filled and inpainted. Inpainting here and in scattered areas throughout the grisaillle is now discolored. Examination of the grisaillle with infrared reflectography revealed only minimal underdrawing, possibly due to the opacity of the gray tones.

PROVENANCE: Fourth earl of Ashburnham, Ashburnham Place, England; Henry Willett, Brighton, by 1897; Rodolphe Kann, Paris (d. 1905); [Duvene Brothers, Paris and New York], by 1908. Acquired by Philip Lehman from Duvene in March 1912.


The two Passion scenes (No. 20), with the grisaillle Annunciation panels (No. 21) that decorated their reverses, once constituted the wings of a triptych. By the late nineteenth century the fronts and backs of the wings had been sawn apart and separated from the central panel, of which no documentary record remains. Since their first publication by Weale in 1903, the panels have been universally accepted as the work of Gerard David. Characteristic of David's mature style are the deep, translucent colors and the sensitive integration of figures and space, here constrained by the narrow format of the wings. The grisaillle figures of the Annunciation, with their heavy draperies and crisp, almost metallic hair, are less luminously painted. This may be due not only to their nature as imitations of sculpture but also to the intervention of a workshop hand.

As with many paintings by David for which there are no indications of a commission, the Lehman wings have proved difficult to date. David's dated or datable works fall into a relatively narrow time span, from 1498 to 1509, and are limited to his more monumental and public works. Their usefulness as touchstones for his chronology is diminished by the fact that he frequently repeated his own compositions or figural motifs, making flexible use of them in both intimate and more monumental works. In the case of the Lehman wings, the problem has been compounded by the suggestion, first made by Valentine in 1913 and almost universally accepted since then, that they and a Lamentation in the Philadelphia Museum of Art (Fig. 21.1) once formed a portable altarpiece (see Fig. 21.2).

In 1905, before the association with the Johnson panel had been proposed, Bodenhausen dated the two wings to about 1492, citing the influence of Hans Memling's triptych of 1491 in the Sankt Annen-Museum, Lübeck. Friedländer placed the reconstructed triptych among David's mature works, implying a date of about 1510. Sterling suggested a date of about 1500 because of the wings' similarity in costume and style to the two Justice of Cambyses panels and the Baptism of Christ in the Groeningemuseum, Bruges. De Vos linked the proposed triptych to the Saint Anne altarpiece in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., and the Crucifixion in the Palazzo Bianco, Genoa, but considered them all to be late works of about 1510 to 1523, while Van Miegroet placed it in a group he regarded as not later than 1490.

For many years Robert Lehman was the only author to doubt the connection between the Lehman wings and the Philadelphia Lamentation. He wrote in 1928 that he found the landscapes inharmonious. In 1990 and 1994, however, Ainsworth again raised doubts about the ensemble, citing differences between the X radiographs.
and dating the wings earlier than the Lamentation, which she regarded as a workshop product. Ainsworth’s argument is a powerful one, especially in light of her detailed study of David’s painting technique. However, such a mixture of workshop and autograph parts, and the accompanying variations in technique, is not unprecedented in David’s work. A number of other factors suggest that the Philadelphia and Lehman pictures may indeed have been framed as a triptych (see Fig. 21.2).

Given the triptych’s evident function as a small altarpiece, its center would most likely have been a relatively iconic Passion image focused on the body of Christ, either the Crucifixion, the Lamentation, or the Descent from the Cross. Memling’s Lübeck triptych and a variant in Bruges provide precedents in Bruges panel painting for the juxtaposition of Christ Carrying the Cross and the Resurrection and for the use of subordinate scenes from the Passion narrative set in a landscape background. Both triptychs have the Crucifixion at their center. The inclusion of the Crucifixion as a sub-

ordinate scene in the Lehman Christ Carrying the Cross, however, indicates that the central image of David’s smaller altarpiece must have been an episode between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, hence a more intimate Lamentation or Descent from the Cross. No surviving Deposition can be linked to the wings, and while it is possible that another lost version of the Lamentation formed the center of the triptych, among David’s several surviving treatments of the subject the painting in Philadelphia corresponds most closely in size to the Lehman wings.

As Robert Lehman pointed out, the relationship of figures and landscape in the wings and the center panel is subtly different, as is the quality of the execution. In the wings the figures are placed in front of prominent hillocks which define a narrow stage for the main action. A lofty plateau rising behind the hills becomes the setting for subordinate scenes and blocks any view of a more distant landscape. By contrast, the larger figures in the Lamentation occupy the immediate foreground, with the rounded hillocks at the right establishing a middle distance and a transition to a vast panorama beyond. Thus, although the hillock to the right of the Lamentation group seems to form a plausible extension of the mound behind the risen Christ, it should actually be read as being deeper in space. In addition, the characterization of the faces in the Lamentation is much drier, and the paint handling lacks the luminosity and richness of the wings, although the work is admittedly in a more abraded condition. Ainsworth has pointed out that more lead white was used for modeling the flesh tones in the Lamentation, supporting her observation with a comparison of the X radiographs of the three panels.

On the other hand, the slender cliff added on top of the distant landscape at the extreme left edge of the Lamentation is a strong indication that the panels were framed together. The cliff overlaps a large tree in front of the city gate, confusing the spatial markers within the Lamentation itself; its addition makes sense only as an attempt to link the scene with a view on its left. The juxtaposition of the Lehman wings and the Lamentation is indeed more discontinuous than is usual for David’s ensembles and may seem unlikely given the high quality of the wings. There is no evidence that the wings or the putative center were commissioned, and it could be that David permitted a different standard of unity for uncommissioned works. Furthermore, the central panel of the Saint Anne altarpiece, a large ensemble probably made for export, also seems to be largely the work of an assistant. David may have left the execution of the
established composition of the Lamentation to an assistant and carefully worked out the Passion sequence himself. The wings are exceptional in his surviving oeuvre both in their subject and in their conception as separate narratives, rather than subordinate spaces for flanking saints.

Despite the differences in quality, the dates of the wings and the Lamentation need not be as disparate as Ainsworth suggested. David’s Justice of Cambyses, which bears the date 1498 on the wall in The Arrest of the Corrupt Judge, provides a precedent for the active and expressive figures of the wings, albeit on a larger scale. Yet the more fluid articulation of movement and fall of the drapery in the Lehman wings, as well as the softer modeling of the faces, including the use of a brush underdrawing as undermodeling, would seem to indicate a slightly later origin for them, closer to David’s great Baptism triptych (Groeningemuseum, Bruges), which can be dated between about 1503 and 1508. Furthermore, the pose and drapery of the figure of Gabriel in the Lehman grisaille Annunciation replicate those of the angel in the Annunciation (Fig. 21.3) from David’s altarpiece of the Benedictine monastery of San Girolamo della Cervara, near Genoa (now in the Metropolitan Museum), except for the omission of the swirling mantle. David did not repeat an established formula for the Cervara angel but instead created what was, for him, an extraordinarily cadenced and classicizing figure. Most remarkable for David – in fact unique to these two works – is the fold of drapery loosely gathered around the angel’s waist, a classicizing convention often associated with urgent movement that appears in the work of northern artists open to Italian influence, including Dürer and the Antwerp mannerists. (It is tempting to see the innovation of this classicizing angel as related to the Italian destination of the Cervara altarpiece.) It may therefore be presumed that the Lehman grisaille, in which the drapery is stilled in imitation of sculpture, was not the first use of the angel. It is likely that the Lehman wings postdate the design, if not the execution, of the Cervara Annunciation. The frame of the Cervara polyptych is reliably reported to have been inscribed: “Hoc opus fecit fieri D’lus Vincentius Saulus MCCCCCVI die VII Septembris” (Messer Vincenzo Sauli had this work made 7 September 1506). Whether this date refers to the commission or the completion of the altarpiece is not clear, but the former is more likely.

In view of their dependence on larger works datable to the middle of the first decade, a date of about 1510 is plausible for the Lehman wings. This is in accord with the dendrochronological evidence for the wings and does not contradict the dendrochronological data for the less subtly executed Lamentation that may after all have been the central panel of the portable altarpiece.

Some aspects of the Passion scenes, including the most active figures, can be related to miniatures by the contemporary illuminators usually grouped together as the Ghent-Bruges school, and it is possible that David turned

Fig. 21.2 Center: Gerard David and workshop, The Lamentation. Philadelphia Museum of Art, John G. Johnson Collection, JC no. 328. Left and right: No. 20
Fig. 21.3 Gerard David, The Annunciation. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Bequest of Mary Stillman Harkness, 1950.50.145.9ab

...to the manuscript tradition for narratives outside his usual repertoire. The gestures, headgear, and expressions of the soldiers in the Christ Carrying the Cross are close to those in miniatures by the Master of the Older Prayer Book of Maximilian I, and the soldiers in the Resurrection are repeated in a miniature (Fig. 21.4) in the Grimani Breviary in the Biblioteca Marciana, Venice. The calm, frontal figure of Christ in the Resurrection is close in pose and drapery to the Christ of David's Transfiguration in the Onze-Lieve-Vrouwekerk, Bruges.

6. For the altarpiece in Lübeck, see Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 6b, no. 3, pls. 8–13.
11. The panel measures 87.2 by 64.5 centimeters. Recent technical examination of the panel, involving the removal of modern edging strips, indicated that the painted surface measures 85.5 by 63.7 centimeters. There are unpainted edges at the top and sides but none at the bottom, evidence that the panel has been trimmed somewhat at the bottom. I am grateful to Mark Tucker, conservator at the Philadelphia Museum of Art (letter to the author, 14 August 1997), who has undertaken an investigation of the Lamentation, for this information. According to Bodenhausen (1905, p. 116), Johnson acquired the painting in 1899 from a London dealer. Other paintings of the subject are in the Art Institute of Chicago, the Sammlung Oskar Reinhart, Winterthur, and the church of San Gil, Burgos (Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 6b, nos. 195, 163a, 163b, pls. 202, 173; Van Miegroet 1989, nos. 5, 6a, 6b, pls. 32, 92; for the panel in Burgos, see also Bermejo in Valladolid 1988, no. 84, ill. [as attributed to Isenbrandt]).

NOTES:
1. A photograph of the Annunciation in the Friedländer archives in the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, is annotated Willett / XII.97 / MJF.
2. According to London 1908, nos. 6, 7.
3. Duveen Brothers invoice dated 22 March 1912 (Robert Lehman Collection files).
4. The only doubt of his authorship was expressed in 1975 by Scillia, who divided most of the work attributed to the mature David among a number of hands, assigning the Lehman wings to the artist she called the Master of the Marriage of Cana.
12. Ainsworth (1990b, p. 653, and 1994a) considers the denser application of lead white in the Lamentation and the fact that the paint layer could not be readily penetrated by infrared reflectography in the figures (although free underdrawing was revealed in the landscape) indicative of a later date for the Philadelphia panel. See also her forthcoming monograph on David (Ainsworth 1998). I am most grateful to Maryan Ainsworth for her willingness to discuss her research on David's technique.

13. Oddly enough, the few authors who have commented on this later addition (Worcester—Philadelphia 1939, Paris 1957, and Van Miegroet 1989, p. 278) considered that it disrupts the unity of the wings and so proposed that it was painted in after the triptych was dismembered.

14. This was the consensus at a colloquy held at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., and The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 20–24 May 1991; see also Washington, D.C. 1992.

15. For these panels and documents relating to their date, see Janssens de Bisthoven, Baes-Dondeyne, and De Vos 1983, pp. 102–29, pls. 87, 115. Their scale and complexity and the extent of changes made in the course of the work suggest that David painted them over a period of years.


17. This gathered drapery is worn by angels in the Joachim and the Angel and Annunciation from Dürer's Life of the Virgin series (Bartsch 78, 83; Strauss 1980a, nos. 95, 74, ill.) and by the central figure in his Hercules (Bartsch 73; Panofsky [1943] 1955, pp. 32, 73–74, fig. 108), in which instance drapery and pose derive from a Ferrarese engraving. The connection between these two angels of the Annunciation has been noted only by Conway (1921).

18. Significantly, the pose of the Virgin and some details of the room in the Cervara composition recur in a small Annunciation in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt. Recent dendrochronological examination of the Frankfurt painting showed that it and the Cervara Annunciation were painted on boards from the same tree, implying a connection in date as well (see Sander 1993, pp. 233–43, especially p. 239, fig. 143).

19. Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 6b, no. 173, pls. 186, 188; Van Miegroet 1989, no. 25, pls. 202, 205–6. The inscription was transcribed shortly after 1790 by Giuseppe Spinola, who recorded seeing the polyptych, in its large gilt frame, hanging in the abbey church of San Girolamo della Cervara (Biblioteca Universitaria di Genova, Genoa [MS B.VIII.13, pp. 596–99]; excerpts from Spinola's text were published in Adhémar 1962, pp. 142–43).


21. Dendrochronological analysis provides no evidence to link the three panels. The boards of the Lamentation panel include five sapwood rings, with a youngest heartwood ring datable to 1466, suggesting a felling date of 1479...1481...1485 + x and a mean date of use (assuming ten years' storage time) of 1491 (report of Peter Klein, Ordinariat für Holzbiolegie, Universität Hamburg, 22 May 1987, in the Paintings Conservation Department files, Metropolitan Museum), or, paradoxically, earlier than the mean probable date of use, 1512, suggested by the data for the wings (see No. 20).

22. Compare, for example, the miniatures in the Hours of Isabel la Católica in the Cleveland Museum of Art (MS 63.256, fol. 69) and in a Book of Hours in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich (clm. 28345, fol. 112v); see De Winter 1981, figs. 49, 51.

23. Ongania 1906, fol. 162v. These possible connections do not help date the wings, however, as the illuminators themselves relied on patterns and their reciprocal connections with David have yet to be fully worked out.

Workshop of Gerard David

22. Virgin and Child

Oil on oak panel. 15.6 x 11.4 cm, painted surface 14.6 x 10.5 cm. On the reverse, a Thomas Agnew and Sons paper label with no. 27562 printed on it and £125 added in pen.

The picture is in poor condition. The original arched oak panel has been set into a rectangular secondary support. Both the panel and the secondary support have a vertical grain. The paint surface is abraded, severely so in the upper half, particularly in the face and hair of the Virgin, so that at her right temple the angled strokes with which the ground was applied are now clearly visible. The gray background is new and overlaps the edges of the Virgin’s hair, though some fine single strands are still visible at her shoulder. It is not possible to determine the original color of the background. Small local losses above the ear of the Christ Child and in the Virgin’s cloak have been filled and inpainted. Her cloak, sleeve, and hands are nevertheless fairly well preserved. Infrared reflectography (Fig. 22.1) reveals that the picture is fully under-drawn in black chalk with sketchy, broken contour lines, often in repeated strokes. A fillet around the Virgin’s head, what appears to be a shirt worn by the Christ Child, and bunched drapery in the lower right corner were prepared in the underdrawing but omitted in the paint stage. Because the panel has been set into a secondary support, it was not possible to obtain a dendrochronological analysis of the wood.¹


EXHIBITED: London 1966, no. 45.

This *Virgin and Child* is one of several versions of the same figural grouping produced by Gerard David and his workshop. The gesture of the Christ Child tenderly placing his cheek against the Virgin’s as he encircles her neck with his arm recurs in small panels by David in the Öffentliche Kunstsammung, Kunstmuseum Basel, and the Alte Pinakothek, Munich, both of which form diptychs with images of Christ taking leave of his mother.\(^5\) The same pose of Virgin and Child is also found in a tiny panel in a Spanish private collection.\(^4\) This type derives from one of Dieric Bouts’s most frequently repeated half-length compositions of the Virgin and Child,\(^5\) which may itself depend, as De Vos has suggested, on a larger, lost composition by Rogier van der Weyden.\(^6\) By inclining the Virgin’s head and giving the Child’s features a particularly vulnerable expression, David endowed this established type with a still gentler emotion.

David’s small panels were undoubtedly intended as objects of private devotion, perhaps to be hung within the curtains of a bed as a focus for prayer.\(^7\) While the Lehman panel may have been used as a single devotional image, it is more likely that it was paired with a depiction of a later encounter of Christ and the Virgin, such as Christ’s leave-taking, as in the diptychs in Basel and Munich, or with the image of the Virgin embracing the dead Christ that is known in several versions from David’s workshop. (It is noteworthy that the version of the latter subject in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg, though very slightly larger, is in the same format as the Lehman picture.)\(^8\)

Although the painting was exhibited at Agnew’s in 1966 as by Gerard David and was accessioned by the Metropolitan Museum as his work, it has largely escaped mention in the literature on the artist. Comparing it with the versions of the same composition in Munich and Basel and with other small-scale works by David suggests that it is by a good workshop collaborator. Some of the weakness in the spatial relationship of the two figures can be explained by damage, but even those areas which are relatively well preserved, such as the hands and sleeve of the Virgin, are hesitant, lacking the clarity of form and exquisite finish characteristic of David. The same hesitant quality is evident in the underdrawing, with its broken and repeated contour lines (see Fig. 22.1).

---

**NOTES:**

1. Although it has no direct bearing on the age of the painting, dendrochronological analysis of the secondary support was undertaken. Only eighty-two rings could be measured; they indicated the year 1433 for the youngest heartwood ring, yielding an earliest felling date of 1446…1448…1452 + x for the tree (report of Peter Klein, Ordinariat für Holzbiologie, Universität Hamburg, 8 September 1987, in the files of the Paintings Conservation Department, Metropolitan Museum).

2. The provenance is kindly supplied by Gabriel Naughton of Agnew’s (letter to the author, 20 February 1991).


5. There are versions in the Carrand Collection, Bargello, Florence; the Metropolitan Museum; and the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (Friedländer 1967-76, vol. 3, pp. 60, 76, nos. 9, 9a, add. 115, pls. 17, 115; see also New York 1993-95).


7. For this usage, see Ringbom (1965) 1984, figs. 6, 7.

Master of the Half-_lengths

active ca. 1525–1550

The Master of the Half-Lengths was a prolific painter of the second quarter of the sixteenth century whose output of genre-like female figures, small religious works, and landscapes was probably produced with the aid of workshop assistants. His name derives from his half-length depictions of elegant ladies—all with the same heart-shaped face and gentle demeanor—reading, writing, or making music in interiors. These women are painted in a smoothly simplified style that is also readily recognizable in numerous religious paintings, including many half-length Madonnas. Religious paintings with prominent landscape settings and small figures have also been attributed to him. The repetitious character of his paintings and the lack of indications of their patronage or destination suggest that his production was aimed at the open market and at export.

Benesch’s proposal in 1943 that the Master of the Half- Lengths was identical with a Bruges artist named Jan Verecycke who is mentioned by Van Mander has not found acceptance, and there is still no clear evidence of where he worked. Bruges, Brussels, Mechelen, and Antwerp have all been suggested. Although his figure style shows connections to Bruges and particularly to the work of Adriaen Isenbrandt (d. 1551), he may well have worked in Antwerp, given both his probable reliance on the export trade and his indebtedness to the landscapes of Joachim Patinir (before 1500–1524).

Master of the Half-Lengths

23. Virgin and Child

1975.1.123
Oil on panel. 10.2 x 7.8 cm, painted surface 8.9 x 6.8 cm.
The painting is in fair condition. The panel, which has a vertical grain, has been set into a secondary support and cradled. A barbe at the side and bottom edges of the painted surface suggests that the picture originally had an engaged frame. At the top of the panel a strip of wood approximately
4 millimeters wide has been filled and inpainted. The panel has two vertical splits: one running the full height of the image through its center that has been filled and inpainted, and the other passing to the left of the Virgin's right eye. The face of the Virgin is well preserved, although the highlights on her hair are abraded. Her robe has probably discolored (under magnification it shows pools of blue pigment with particles of red), but it has been retouched with brown, which now overlaps the contour of the Christ Child. The Virgin's blue mantle has also been retouched, and a local loss in the cloth beside the Christ Child's shoulder has been filled and inpainted. Infrared reflectography reveals minimal underdrawing.

PROVENANCE: Not established.

EXHIBITED: Cincinnati 1959, no. 117.


This tiny Virgin and Child is not mentioned in the literature on the Master of the Half-Lengths, but it can be readily integrated into the series of half-length images of the Madonna that are an important part of the production associated with this anonymous master. The smooth outline of the Virgin's face and her long neck and delicately arched brows are all characteristic of his work, as is the rather scrawny, prematurely aged type of the Christ Child. The enamellike finish of the best-preserved part of the picture, the face of the Virgin, is also typical of the master's work or, more accurately, that of his atelier. Given the repetitive nature of the paintings grouped under the name of the Master of the Half-Lengths, it is appropriate to regard them as the products of a workshop rather than of a single artist.

A somewhat larger Virgin and Child by the Master of the Half-Lengths sold with the Achillito Chiesa collection in 1925 follows the same pattern as the Lehman panel. A related Madonna formerly in the Figdor collection, Vienna, set before a landscape of similarly muted, striped layers, was the center of a diminutive triptych with Saint Francis and Saint Jerome depicted on the wings. The figures' poses in these pictures rely on fifteenth-century precedents that derive ultimately from the workshop of Rogier van der Weyden. Whether or not the Lehman picture was also once the center of a triptych, it was undoubtedly intended for private devotional use in a conservative milieu. Díaz Padrón has shown that many small devotional paintings attributable to the Master of the Half-Lengths found their way to Spain and were presumably made as pious export objects.

NOTES:
1. Sale, American Art Association, New York, 27 November 1925, lot 37, ill. The panel measures 39.4 by 29.2 centimeters.
24. Virgin and Child

1975.1.124
Oil on panel. 13 x 10.2 cm.

The painting is in good condition. The cradled panel, presumably oak, is composed of a single board with horizontal grain. The paint surface is in general well preserved, although numerous areas of minute flake loss have been filled and inpainted. There is a somewhat larger area of inpainting to the right of the Virgin’s right elbow. An area of flaking paint across the forehead of the Virgin has been consolidated. No underdrawing was made visible with infrared reflectography.

PROVENANCE: Not established.


In the pose of the Virgin nursing the Christ Child, this intimate picture makes use of a devotional type that was established by the mid-fifteenth century in the work of Rogier van der Weyden and his followers. Common to this type are the pose of the Child, who lies extended on a shroudlike cloth, and his abstracted gaze as he ignores the offered breast, which is partially covered with a veil. Here the landscape setting and the rather ambiguous seated pose of the Virgin suggest the tradition of the Madonna of Humility.
European Paintings

Despite the reliance on fifteenth-century precedents, the Virgin's rather full features and the form of her head-dress suggest an artist working in the second quarter of the sixteenth century who was familiar with the classicizing Madonna types of the Brussels painter Bernaert van Orley (ca. 1488–1541). In its scale, sweetness, and use of traditional forms this picture is closely comparable to the Virgin and Child by the Master of the Half-Lengths (No. 23).

NOTES:

Flanders
second half of the sixteenth century

25. Virgin and Child with Saint Joseph

1975.1.121
Oil on oak panel. 22.3 x 22 cm.
The painting is in very good condition. The oak panel is composed of a single board with a vertical grain and has been thinned and cradled. A split runs from the top to the bottom of the painting approximately 10 centimeters from the left edge. There is a small area of paint loss in the upper right corner and some repaint in the shadowed areas of the Virgin's dress and at the back of the Child's head. No under-drawing was visible with infrared reflectography. Dendro-chronological analysis indicated a youngest heartwood ring from the year 1321. Using the sapwood statistic for eastern Europe yields an earliest felling date for the tree of 1334...1336...1340 + x. This would yield a mean probable date of use of 1346.1


EXHIBITED: Cincinnati 1959, no. 113a.


Friedländer characterized this painting as in the style of Gerard David,3 and it was accessioned by the Metropolitan Museum as a product of his workshop. Nevertheless, its relationship to the paintings of David and his immediate Bruges followers is one more of subject than of style or painting technique. The depiction of the Holy Family at table in an interior is indebted to such intimate and frequently repeated devotional subjects by David as The Virgin with the Milk Soup and his close-up Holy Family, in which Saint Joseph offers soup to the Christ Child.4 Yet the spatial arrangement of the small interior suggests an archaizing paraphrase of the Bruges master's prototypes. Thus the vivid red drapery behind the Virgin recalls a cloth of honor, but without the symmetry and enthroning effect of this device in images of the Virgin and Child from David's time. The generous window opening admits more landscape, more atmospherically rendered, than is usual for a late fifteenth- or early sixteenth-century painting. In its rather stilted re-creation of an earlier Flemish type, this picture is akin to the numerous small devotional works produced by Marcellus Coffermans (active 1549–1570) in the third quarter of the sixteenth century.5 It was probably painted in response to the considerable demand for works of this archaic type.

NOTES:
1. Only 160 growth rings could be measured. This and the early date of the youngest heartwood ring suggest either a reused panel or one cut from the center of the tree, so that a substantial amount of younger wood was trimmed away (report of Peter Klein, Ordinariat für Holzbiologie, Universität Hamburg, 5 November 1987, in the Paintings Conservation Department files, Metropolitan Museum).
2. Based on a letter from Friedländer to Robert Lehman of 13 February 1959 (Robert Lehman Collection files).
3. See note 2 above.
4. For the several versions of the Virgin with the Milk Soup, see Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 6b, no. 206, pls. 208–12, and Van Miegroet 1989, pp. 300–301, no. 33, figs. 232, 233. For versions of David's Holy Family, see Friedländer 1967–76, vol. 6b, no. 218, pl. 222, and Van Miegroet 1989, p. 317, no. 61, ill. (as by a follower of David).
5. For attributions to Coffermans, see Díaz Padrón 1983–84, His Mystic Marriage of Saint Catherine, repeated in several versions, is particularly close in spirit to the Lehman Holy Family (see Borenius] 1923, p. 97, pl. 8, and Laureysens 1963, pp. 157–58, fig. 7).
Flanders
ca. 1550

26. The Lamentation

1975.1.1411

The paint surface has suffered numerous flake losses due to poor adhesion to the metal support. These losses are especially disfiguring in Christ’s head, right shoulder, and right thigh; the robe and hat of Nicodemus; the head of the Virgin; and the arm of Saint John the Evangelist. Christ’s torso and the figure of the Magdalen are relatively well preserved. The image is painted within the projecting molding of the metal plaque.

PROVENANCE: Alphonse Kann, New York; his sale, American Art Association, New York, 6–8 January 1927, lot 474.

This small metal plaque framing a painted scene of the Lamentation was evidently made for private devotion. A hook at the top indicates that the object could be hung, and the text engraved on the back – an excerpt from Psalm 127:4, “Wait on the Lord; be of good courage, and he shall strengthen thine heart: wait, I say, on the Lord” – is suitable for private meditation. It appears likely that the plaque was designed to receive a painted decoration, though a body of similar metal objects has not yet been identified.1

The painting itself is difficult to localize, since it undoubtedly reflects a process of popularization and dissemination of more monumental forms. The profile view of the Magdalen and the way the holy figures support the lifeless body of Christ bear some resemblance to an epitaph probably painted in Brussels about 1530 and attributed to a follower of Bernaert van Orley (ca. 1488–1541) that may itself be an adaptation of an independent depiction of the Lamentation.2 The way the heads of the mourners crowd around the figure of Christ may be indebted to a 1548 engraving by Enea Vico that was influential in both the Netherlands and Spain, although the mourners give vent to more violent emotion in the print.3 In its elongated facial types the Lehman plaque recalls the workshop style of Pieter Coecke van Aelst (1502–1550), while the costumes of the holy women, in particular the caps set back on their heads, point to a date about midcentury. The figures’ restrained sobriety and the muted tones of the landscape suggest that the artist was aware of Spanish conventions.

MW

NOTES:
1. I am grateful to James Draper of the European Sculpture and Decorative Arts Department, Metropolitan Museum, for his consideration of this question.
2. Marlier 1966, p. 75, fig. 15.
Imitator of Antwerp Mannerism

27. Adoration of the Magi

1975.I.122

Oil on oak panel, 23 x 14.2 cm. Inscribed on the interior of the left wing: "MARI / A-MA / TER * / GRACIAE / MATER / MISE / RICOR / DIE **"; on the interior of the right wing: "TV HOS / AB HOS / TE PRO / TEGE / IN HORA / MORTIS / SVSCI / PE **"

The painting is in fair condition. The oak panel is composed of a single board with vertical grain and has been inserted in a frame with hinged wings. The panel was painted out to the edges, but these have been slightly beveled and polished. The back of the panel has also been beveled on all sides. There is a split in the panel at the center of the arch. A larger area of damage visible in the X radiograph at the top of the arch is not evident on the surface. There are paint and ground losses to the right of the black magus and below his left knee. In the light areas the crackle pattern has been drawn in and then darkened with black chalk. The halos are painted in gold and adhere poorly to the paint surface; microscopic examination shows that they were applied on top of the simulated crackle pattern. The paint on the interior of the wings has suffered some flake loss. Analysis of pigment samples indicated the presence of Naples yellow and the likely presence of Prussian blue. No underdrawing was detected with infrared reflectography. The frame appears to date from the years around 1500, and tool marks, construction, and materials, including hand-cut nails and square holes, are all consistent with this period. Dendrochronological analysis of the panel inserted into the frame indicated the year 1494 for the youngest heartwood ring, yielding a probable felling date of 1507...1509...1514+x for the tree. Assuming a storage time of ten years, the mean probable date of use of the panel would be 1519.

PROVENANCE: Not established.


This small panel is framed as the center of a triptych with a prayer to the Virgin inscribed on the interior of its wings. The picture has in the past been ascribed to a Flemish or Dutch painter of the first quarter of the sixteenth century. The figures and architectural setting do make reference to paintings of the Antwerp mannerists, but the way the motifs are recomposed indicates that this painting is of more recent origin, as does the presence of Naples yellow and the probable presence of Prussian blue, pigments whose use is anachronistic for the first half of the sixteenth century.

The Adoration of the Magi was a favorite subject of the group of painters working in Antwerp in the second and third decades of the sixteenth century in the highly decorative style that is referred to as Antwerp mannerism. The Lehman panel incorporates elements from several widely disseminated compositions from this group.

The pose and elaborate costume of the aged kneeling magus, particularly his full sleeve, his tasseled hood, and the jewel clasping his robe, relate to an Adoration of the Magi in the Städelsches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt am Main, that is attributed to the Master of the Groote Adoration, although the pleated folds of the king's collar have been simplified and misunderstood in the Lehman picture. The pose of the black magus standing to the right of the Virgin recurs in several triptychs associated with the Master of 1518 in which a central image of the Holy Family and a kneeling magus is flanked by wings showing two standing kings. The details of costume and

Fig. 27.1 Master of 1518, Adoration of the Magi. Present location unknown. Reproduced from Max J. Friedländer, Die altnierländische Malerei (Paul Cassirer, Berlin, 1934), vol. 11, pl. 23, courtesy of the Art Institute of Chicago
accessories in the Lehman panel are particularly close to the version of this triptych in the Prado, Madrid, that has been attributed to Pieter Coecke van Aelst. The architecture of the ruined palace also derives from the central panel of that triptych, but in moving the black magus into the central scene the painter added another arch that does not connect with any architectural forms on the right. On the left an awkward barrel-vaulted bay was added to the ruined arches of the model, which would appear to have supported a centralized domed or vaulted structure.

Given the frequent sharing of patterns within the Antwerp mannerist group, it is possible that the painter of the Lehman panel copied an untraced Adoration in which these elements had already been combined, along the lines of an Adoration of the Magi given to the Master of 1518 that was formerly on the Paris art market (Fig. 27.1). Because the joinery of the frame and the dendrochronological analysis of the wood support are appropriate for a painting from about 1520, it remains possible that the present paint surface replaces a severely damaged original. However, X radiography and cross-section analysis provide no evidence to support this. It should be pointed out, too, that the prayer inscribed on the wings is commonly found in conjunction with images of the Virgin or the Virgin and Child rather than the Adoration of the Magi. The more likely conclusion, that the painting is a later recombination of Antwerp mannerist motifs, finds confirmation in the essential misunderstanding of the rhythmic interplay of arched setting and kneeling and standing figures that is characteristic of the whole group of possible models. The small panel, which has only 144 measured growth rings, may have been a segment of a larger board that also included more recent growth, or it may have been reused from another work.

NOTES:
2. According to George Bisacca of the Paintings Conservation Department, Metropolitan Museum (letter from Ainsworth to the author, 20 August 1996).
3. Report of Peter Klein, Ordinariat für Holzbiologie, Universität Hamburg, 8 May 1987 (Paintings Conservation Department files, Metropolitan Museum). I am also grateful to Laurence B. Kanter, Curator of the Robert Lehman Collection, for his help with this problem.
4. Naples yellow, which was used for highlights in the Virgin and the robe of the kneeling magus, does not occur in paintings until the seventeenth century (see Feller 1986, pp. 219–54). That the blue in the Virgin's robe is Prussian blue, which was introduced in the early eighteenth century (see Harley 1982, pp. 70–74), could not be confirmed because of the small amount of pigment present, but it appears likely, according to McGlinchey (see note 1 above), because of the "strong tint strength... the presence of small quantities of iron, and the dye-like appearance of the pigment when viewed under the microscope." Moreover, there is no evidence in the Lehman painting of other blue pigments appropriate to the sixteenth century, such as azurite, ultramarine, and smalt.
6. Marlier 1966, fig. 53.
THE NETHERLANDS
Seventeenth Century
Utrecht Caravaggist

28. Two Musicians

1975.1.125
Oil on canvas. 99 x 123.5 cm.

The canvas, which has been relined, is in excellent condition. It shows stretch marks all around, especially at the left and right, but without deleterious effects. The paint surface is also in exceptionally good condition, without losses or abrasion. The red lakes used in the dark shirt of the lute player and in the lower right corner have faded considerably, however.¹


LITERATURE: Nicolson 1958, p. 55, under no. A15(?); Slatkes 1965, no. E40 (as wrongly attributed to Baburen); Nicolson 1979, p. 100 (the flute player as after Baburen); Baetjer 1986, p. 6, ill. p. 401 (as Dirck van Baburen); Utrecht-Braunschweig 1986–87, p. 102, under no. 1; Nicolson 1990, vol. 1, p. 192 (the flute player as after Baburen); Baetjer 1995, p. 305, ill. (as Dirck van Baburen).

The brown-haired young man in a white-plumed black beret at the left in this painting plays the transverse flute, while his companion, his mouth open as if in song, plays the lute, resting the instrument on the table between them. Two large nails are placed in the wall at the top right, a device that defines the wall’s position immediately behind the musicians and pushes the scene toward the viewer.³ The spatial relationship between the two figures is not clearly articulated, nor is their shading and lighting integrated.

The left-hand figure, represented in lost profile, is freely copied after the Flute Player by Hendrick Terbrugghen in the Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel (Fig. 28.1).⁴ The copyist changed the figure, however, by making him hunch over and bringing his arms and hands closer to his body. The slit jerkin and striped sleeves of Terbrugghen’s flute player were also simplified to an uncut vest with black trim that continues onto the sleeve as a

Fig. 28.1 Hendrick Terbrugghen, Flute Player, Turned to the Right. Staatliche Museen Kassel, Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, GK179

Fig. 28.2 Dirck van Baburen, Singing Lute Player. Centraal Museum, Utrecht, 11481
single stripe, and the beret was flattened and its plume given greater prominence. The lute player was probably copied from another painting as well, but no direct prototype for him exists among the numerous Northern Caravaggesque paintings of single lute players, including three probably autograph versions of the subject by Terbruggen and the *Singing Lute Player* by Dirck van Baburen in the Centraal Museum, Utrecht (Fig. 28.2).

Like other painters of his generation, Hendrick Terbruggen (1588–1629) traveled to Italy after completing his training. He left Utrecht in 1604. He may have met Caravaggio, who was in Rome until 1606 and died in Parma in 1610, but he certainly came to know Caravaggio’s paintings and those of his followers during the ten years he spent in Italy, mainly in Rome. Terbruggen returned to Utrecht in 1614, about the time his younger compatriot Dirck van Baburen (ca. 1595–1624) was leaving for his tour of Italy. Recorded at Parma in 1615, Baburen may have gone to Italy as early as 1612. After his stay in Parma he went to Rome, where he gained the patronage of Scipione Borghese and Vincenzo Giustiniani, both of whom had collected significant works by Caravaggio. In 1619–20 Baburen and his collaborator David de Haen lived in the same house in the parish of Sant’Andrea della Fratte, the neighborhood of the Caravaggio follower Bartolomeo Manfredi (ca. 1580–ca. 1620). While Baburen’s *Entombment* of 1617 in San Pietro in Montorio in Rome is directly indebted to Caravaggio’s monumental painting in the Pinacoteca Vaticana, his smaller history and genre paintings depart more directly from the work of Manfredi and other interpreters of Caravaggio’s innovations. Like Terbruggen
and Gerard van Honthorst, who had also recently returned to Utrecht from Rome, Baburen developed a distinctive way of portraying half-length Caravaggesque scenes of card players and musicians, and he transferred the scheme to the traditional Northern theme of the procurers as well.9

Although the Lehman painting's subject is demonstrably indebted to Terbruggen's work, its composition and handling are closer to the style of Baburen. In the flute player's sleeve, for example, the rolling waves of fabric in Terbruggen's original (Fig. 28.1) have been replaced by the brittle folds that are characteristic of Baburen's half-length figures (see Fig. 28.2). And the author seems to have adopted, and even intensified, Baburen's tendency to block out stocky figures in thick strokes of paint and to give his characters little breathing space, both laterally and in depth. Valentiner accepted the painting as an original by Baburen,10 but Nicolson and Slatkes justly rejected the attribution. The painting is most likely by a Dutch follower of the Utrecht Caravaggists who was particularly impressed by Baburen's work.

The possible connotations — whether satirical or moralistic, pastoral or erotic — of the many depictions of musicians painted by Terbruggen and Baburen and their contemporaries and followers have been the subject of debate.11 In their quiet profile poses, the Lehman musicians seem above all to register the sweetness of music, and the painter may have chosen these figures for that reason, regardless of the associations evoked by their original models.

**NOTES:**

1. See note 4 below.
4. Nicolson 1958, no. A15, pl. 20. In 1958 Nicolson listed two copies of Terbruggen's *Flute Player* in Kassel: “A copy, canvas, 70 x 55 cm, was in sale Aachen (Ant. Creutzer), 1–2 April 1938 (106) as after ‘Borghem.’ A crude copy, 96 x 121.9 cm, unlikely to be earlier than eighteenth century, of this figure in the company of a luteplayer only partly sketched in, turned to the left, who rests his lute on a table, 1/4 photo. A. C. Cooper 199547 (whereabouts unknown, but thought to be exported recently from London to Switzerland).” In 1965 Slatkes identified the painting in the Cooper photograph with the one in Robert Lehman's collection (and in 1979 Nicolson followed suit), which he said had been “brought to a more finished state since the A. C. Cooper photograph, nr. 199547, was taken.” More likely, the Lehman painting is not the one shown in the Cooper photograph (which I have not seen; unfortunately, A. C. Cooper and Sons does not own the negative). In Utrecht–Braunschweig 1986–87 (under no. 11) Slatkes seems to be saying (his text is unclear) that the Lehman musician was modeled on the copy sold in Aachen in 1938 (71 x 56 cm, not ill.) rather than on Terbruggen's original.
7. Ibid., no. A3, fig. 1; Nicolson 1990, p. 55, pl. 1036.
10. According to the 1935 Koetsier invoice (see note 2 above).
11. For interpretations of harmony and satire in depictions of musicians, see Meijer 1972–73; for the erotic, see Posner 1971; for the pastoral and erotic, see Kettering 1983 (all with further bibliography). For the theatrical and military associations of music making, see Slatkes in Utrecht–Braunschweig 1986–87, no. 10.
David Teniers the Younger

Antwerp 1610–Brussels 1690

David Teniers II was born in Antwerp in 1610, the son of the painter David Teniers I. By 1626 he was assisting his father, but no paintings documenting their collaboration are known. Teniers first signed and dated his paintings in 1633, having become a master in the Antwerp guild in 1632–33. His early scenes of peasants smoking and playing games are indebted to the innovative genre painting of Adriaen Brouwer, who had returned from Haarlem to Antwerp in 1631. Teniers’s stable interiors of the 1630s also show his familiarity with contemporary Dutch genre painting, such as the work of Rotterdam artists Pieter de Bloot and Herman and Cornelis Saftleven. The genre interiors Teniers filled with more elegant company, on the other hand, update the tradition of Frans Francken II.

In 1637 Teniers married Anna Brueghel, the daughter of Jan Brueghel I and ward of Peter Paul Rubens. Probably as a result of his exposure to the works of both masters, from the late 1630s on he concentrated increasingly on the landscape settings of his genre scenes. Combining the atmospheric fluency of Rubens’s landscapes with the miniature staffage of Jan Brueghel, he created a new type of genre landscape that was well received by his Antwerp audience. Teniers also painted genre landscapes with his brother-in-law Ambrosius Brueghel, none of which have survived, and a series of history paintings with Jan van Kessel, a grandson of Jan Brueghel.

Teniers’s social prestige was considerable. From 1640 he was a member of the Chamber of Rhetoricians “De Violieren,” and by 1643 he had joined the prestigious Guild of Footbowmen, painting a large group portrait of the company in that year. In 1644 he was elected dean of the Guild of Saint Luke, and three years later he began to work for the new governor of the southern Netherlands, Archduke Leopold Wilhelm. As court painter, he moved to the court in Brussels in 1651, and by 1655 at the latest he had gained the important post of Camerdiener (chamberlain). Besides painting pictures for his patron, Teniers acted as curator of the archducal collections of Italian and Netherlandish paintings. In this capacity he traveled to England in 1651 to acquire works from the collections of Charles I and the marquess of Hamilton, painted a dozen representations of the archduke’s gallery, and prepared an engraved catalogue of 243 of his Italian paintings, the Theatrum pictorium of 1660.

When Leopold Wilhelm left Brussels for Vienna in 1656, Teniers became court painter to the new governor, Don Juan of Austria, brother of Philip IV of Spain. Perhaps with his patron’s encouragement, Teniers sought a knighthood from the Spanish monarch in 1657. Although he was not knighted, Teniers did eventually receive the king’s support for an Academy of Fine Arts in Antwerp, which was founded in 1664. Teniers continued to paint until at least 1683.

David Teniers the Younger
(purportedly after Correggio)

29. Old Age in Search of Youth

Oil on panel, over traces of underdrawing in black. 22.8 x 17 cm, including the 4 mm strip at the top. Inscribed under the subject beneath a margin line, about 12 mm from the bottom edge: 3 palme hoog / 2 palme breet (painted over). On the verso, a fabric label that reads: Countess of Stratford / 28 March 1923, with 1205 and 126 (the latter presumably the Metropolitan Museum accession number) added in pen.

The panel and paint surface are in excellent condition. A wood strip measuring 4 by 17 centimeters was added to the top of the panel at an unknown date, after Quirin Boel had made his print. There are minor retouchings along the edges and some overpaint along the top, applied to unify the extension of the painted surface with the painting itself. The margin containing the inscription at the bottom was overpainted at an early date to merge it with the subject itself.1

PROVENANCE: Duke of Marlborough, Blenheim Palace, England; his sale, Christie’s, London, 26 July 1886 (Lugt 45934), lot 89 (to Philpot for £5.5); countess of Stratford; her sale, 28 March 1923.2


LITERATURE: Teniers et al. 1660, pl. 31 (as after Correggio); De Bie 1661, p. 338; Thomas n.d., no. 67; Scharf 1862, p. 150, no. 14 (as after Correggio); Baetjer 1986, p. 182, ill. p. 385; Schütz 1980, p. 27; Baetjer 1995, p. 291, ill.
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During his tenure as keeper of Archduke Leopold Wilhelm’s collection of paintings in Brussels, David Teniers prepared the *Theatrum pictorium*, consisting of 243 engravings representing a selection of his patron’s more than five hundred Italian paintings. The *Theatrum* was the first undertaking of its kind, an illustrated catalogue of old master paintings from one of the most celebrated collections in Europe. These two small panels, Nos. 29 and 30, were among the *modelli* Teniers made in the 1650s after the paintings for the *Theatrum* engravings. One hundred twenty of his copies, including the two Lehman panels, remained united for more than two centuries at Blenheim Palace, until the duke of Marlborough sold them at auction at Christie’s in London on 26 July 1886, but they are now widely dispersed.

Questions remain regarding who took the initiative for this publication, precisely when preparations were begun and finished, and how the project was organized. Teniers had certainly not finished painting the *modelli* in May 1656, when Leopold Wilhelm departed for Vienna with his collection, for the archduke left several paintings in Brussels to be “copied there and engraved in copper.” The twelve engravers involved had, however, initiated their work by 1656, since the only dated engraving bears that date. The dedication page, including a portrait of Leopold Wilhelm, was engraved in 1658, the author’s portrait a year later. The *Theatrum pictorium* was published in Brussels in 1660 with introductions in Latin, French, Spanish, and Dutch. The title page makes clear that Teniers arranged for publication at his own expense.

All of the prints after Teniers’s *modelli* have roughly the same dimensions as the panels. It is not known who set that standard, or what procedure was followed in the translation from model to print. The Lehman copies share a technical curiosity in that the grain of each panel runs horizontally, against the vertical format. (The grain customarily runs in the longest direction on rectangular panels.) The other known *modelli* should be examined to establish whether this trait is common to many of them and if so, how it relates to the artist’s working method. Just as Rubens, whose example presumably affected Teniers, apparently did with some of his smaller oil sketches, Teniers may have painted his models on large panels and then cut them up.

Teniers’s use of full color rather than grisaille in the models for the engravers may indicate that he also intended the small paintings to function as independent copies of some of the most famous Italian paintings then known. In spite of the reduction in size and the frequent elimination of detail, Teniers’s copies provide remarkably convincing records of the original paintings. Nonetheless, he painted the Lehman panels and the others from the series in his own fluid and transparent manner, thus unifying the group under his virtuoso style and making works by painters as different as Antonello da Messina, Raphael, and Palma Vecchio look unexpectedly alike.

The engraver Quirin Boel reproduced this *modello* for the *Theatrum pictorium*, in which it appears in reverse as plate 31 (Fig. 29.1). At the bottom of the engraving the size of the original is noted as “3 [palme] Alta. 2 [palme] Lata.” The engraver took this information from the inscription below a black margin line along the bottom of the *modello*, which reads: “3 palme hoog / 2 palme breet,” in a combination of Dutch and Italian that may be the painter’s own notation of the size of the original. In the *Theatrum pictorium* Teniers attributed the original painting, presumably lost, to Correggio (active 1514–54). In the 1659 inventory of Leopold Wilhelm’s collection the painting was attributed to Palma Vecchio (ca. 1480–1528), but in its subsequent history it was considered a work of Correggio.

![Fig. 29.1 Quirin Boel after David Teniers the Younger after Correggio(?), Old Age in Search of Youth. Reproduced from Teniers et al., Theatrum pictorium, pl. 31, courtesy of the Research Library, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles](image-url)
them, since it was found at the end of the nineteenth century in the Péteri collection in Budapest with the imperial collector's seal on the back. An Old Age in Search of Youth appears reversed in one of Teniers's paintings of the gallery of Leopold Wilhelm (Fig. 29.2; formerly in the De Saumarez collection), which therefore was based on the print in the Theatrum pictorium rather than the original or the Lehman model.

The Lehman model depicts a room framed by drawn curtains in which a woman, nude above the waist, kneels on one knee, apparently having just descended from the low chair behind her. She twists her torso and head to the right to speak to the putto with a bow and arrow flying by through an adjoining arcade that offers a view of a hilly landscape beyond its arches. To the left a dazed man, his eyes half open, lies slumped over a spherical object, a star shining directly above his head. His two lances, one resting in the crook of his neck, the other under his left arm, and the gleaming helmet in front of him identify him as a warrior, possibly even Mars.

The woman's knee rests inside a double circle drawn on the floor. The circle encloses markings resembling astrological signs, and on the ground in and around it are jugs, a book with more signs, a bone with a knot around it, a small brazier, compasses, and a knife. The paraphernalia suggest that through incantation the woman has managed to effect the youthful transformation of her face, neck, shoulders, and upper arms (but not her wrinkled, sagging breasts), presumably in an effort to arouse the oblivious man. In visual and literary witch lore of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, witches were usually charged with the desire and power to induce both lust and sleep. Teniers frequently represented

Fig. 29.4 Frans van Stimpert and Anton Joseph von Prenner, Prodomus, seu praeambulare Lumen reserati portentosae magnificientiae theatri... (Vienna, 1735), pl. 16 (detail)
As Pigler suggested, together these two works may represent opposites in love: the youthful woman is successful, since the warrior seems to be on his way to her, and the older one is barely able to arouse the semi-conscious man, in spite of her rejuvenating sorcery. But because no other such representations are known, certain aspects of the two paintings may elude us.\textsuperscript{21}

\textbf{NOTES:}

1. The author and date of this repaint have not been established. Many other panels from the series, including most of those in the John G. Johnson Collection at the Philadelphia Museum of Art and those at the Courtauld Institute Galleries from the collection of Count Seilern (see note 4 below) have similar margins, which in most cases appear to be overpainted in the same fashion as the margins in the Lehman panels.


3. Teniers et al. 1660. Mares 1887 remains a fundamental source on the project; for recent comprehensive discussions, see Schütz 1980 (with bibliography); Antwerp 1991, pp. 278-97; Madrid 1992, pp. 28-52, 53-111; and sale, Sotheby’s, London, 5 July 1995, p. 66. Most of the archduke’s Italian paintings came from the collection of the marquess of Hamilton. The 1659 inventory of his collection shows 517 Italian paintings and 888 German, Flemish, and Dutch paintings, as well as hundreds of sculptures and drawings (see Gara 1967, pp. 39, 62-63).

4. Schütz 1980, p. 27, n. 29. In volume 5 of his notebooks of 1731-52, George Vertue recorded at Blenheim “in ye Closet about 100 small pictures – copy’d by David Teniers for the Duke Leopold – from his excellent pictures in his Collections and from these small peices [sic], were done the printed book by Teniers [ illegible four-letter word] suppose they were all Engraved again – twould be much better – “ (quoted in Walpole Society 1938, p. 135). Several collections own groups of Teniers’s \textit{modelli}, among them the Courtauld Collection in London (Seilern 1955, nos. 48, 49; Seilern 1969, nos. 304-13; Seilern 1971, nos. 391, 392) and the John G. Johnson Collection at the Philadelphia Museum of Art (inv. 693-97), and seven of the sketches were offered for sale together at Sotheby’s in London on 5 July 1995 (lots 35-41).

5. For a chronology and details about the project, see Antwerp 1991, pp. 278-79.

6. Quoted from the archduke’s 1659 inventory, first published by Adolf Berger in 1883.

7. Writing in 1661 (p. 338), Cornelis de Bie stressed that Teniers himself paid for the project, and that he painted “very industriously” copies of all the more than three hundred \textit{(sic)} Italian paintings to be reproduced in print. He also reported that King Philip IV had a gallery constructed in his court in which, “for the contentment of his eye,” he kept only paintings by David Teniers. See also Antwerp 1991, p. 278.

9. The existence of some copies that were not engraved but evidently belonged to the same series may support this idea. It is more likely, however, that the nature or scope of the project changed and that a smaller number of engravings were made than had originally been planned. This question and the issue of the use of modelli and engravings in Teniers's gallery paintings are discussed in the catalogue of the sale at Sotheby's, London, 5 July 1995, p. 66.

10. This size corresponds approximately to the dimensions of the original listed in the 1669 inventory of Leopold Wilhelm's collections (A. Berger 1883, p. 111, no. 291): “2 Spann 9 finger hoch vnd 2 Span 1 Finger bräidi.” A Spanne is the German equivalent of the Italian palma, or almost 21 centimeters; there are ten fingers in a Spanne.

11. Ibid.

12. In 1720 (no. 293) Storffer listed the original in his manuscript catalogue of miniatures made at the request of Emperor Charles VI after the paintings in the Imperial Stallburg Gallery at Vienna. In 1735 the Correggio attribution was maintained by Stampart and Brenner on plate 16 (engraved after the original rather than after Boel) in their Prodromus, seu praemambulare Lumen ... Caroli VI / Prodromus oder vor Licht ... Carl des Sechsten, a prospectus of series of prints to come, which in fact provides an overview of the imperial collections in Vienna (see Zimmerman 1888, with reproductions of all the plates). In 1817 (pl. 65, engraved after Boel) Landon included the painting in his monograph on Correggio, but he may not have seen the original. Frimmel (1904, p. 120, as in the Péteri collection, ex-Ignaz Pfeffer, Budapest) remembered the original, which he saw in the 1890s as a work from the circle of Annibale Carracci. Its subsequent history is not known, and it is not possible to confirm or reject the attribution.

13. Pigler (1936, vol. 2, p. 520; 1974, vol. 2, pp. 542, 552) suggested Joseph Heintz the Younger for this panel and a pendant representing “Liebeszauber” on the strength of Boschini's rather vague allusions to Heintz's bizarre witch paintings (Boschini 1660, pp. 52-53, 534-36, 604, where he is named “Giosef Enzo”). Garas (1968, pp. 188, 220, no. 291, fig. 254) suggested Dosso Dossi, presumably because of the subject's connection with such paintings as Dossi's Circe (Melissa) at the Villa Borghese in Rome or his Stregoneria at the Uffizi in Florence. The lost original as it is reproduced in Teniers's painting of the gallery of Leopold Wilhelm is discussed in Speth-Holterhoff 1957 (p. 154, as unlikely to be by Correggio) and Brussels 1965 (under no. 278) and mentioned in Madrid 1992 (p. 70, under no. 1 [no. 33]). In 1967 (p. 74, 38th case, p. 80, no. 232) Garas noted the original's appearance before 1643 and in 1649 in the inventories of the collection of the marquess of Hamilton, from whom Leopold Wilhelm acquired many of his Italian paintings (see note 3 above).

14. In the manuscript catalogue of the collection from the early 1880s the painting is listed as Venetian school.


17. Davidson (1987, pp. 48-57) gives an overview of Teniers's paintings that thematicize witchcraft, although her statements of his intentions must be read with circumspection. In a painting of a magical laboratory in the Städelisches Kunstinstitut und Städtische Galerie, Frankfurt am Main (1971; Städelisches Kunstinstitut 1924, p. 220), putti are doing the honors.


20. They are not included together in Teniers's paintings of the gallery of Leopold Wilhelm, however. The Woman with a Mirror (The Toilet of Venus) is not present in the gallery painting formerly in the De Saumarez collection (Fig. 29.2; see note 15 above), but it does appear, in the same format as the Philadelphia copy, in the paintings of the gallery of Leopold Wilhelm in the Prado and the Museo Lázaro Galdiano in Madrid and in Vienna (Madrid 1992, nos. 1-33, 3-19; Ferino Pagden et al. 1991, p. 120, no. 9008, pl. 476). To judge by the painted reproductions of the Woman with a Mirror (The Toilet of Venus), its composition matched that of the Lehman painting in reverse, which confirms the supposition that they were pendants.

David Teniers the Younger
(purportedly after Padovanino)

30. Adam and Eve in Paradise

1975.1.127

Oil on panel, over traces of underdrawing in black. 22.3 x
16.5 cm, including the 4-mm strip at the top. On the verso,
a fabric label that reads: Countess of Strafford / 28 March
1923, with I206 and I27 (the latter presumably the Met-
ropolitan Museum accession number) added in pen.
The panel and paint surface are in good condition, except
for minor retouchings along the edges and two small, rather
cruelly repaired losses: a hole in the second tree from the
left, just below the point where the branch grows off to the
right; and a horizontal loss in the foliage to the right of Eve’s
left hip. A 4-millimeter wood strip was added to the top of
the panel at an unknown date, after Quirin Boel had made
his print. A drawn margin (without an inscription) approxi-
mately 6 millimeters wide along the bottom was overpainted
at an unknown date.¹

PROVENANCE: Duke of Marlborough, Blenheim Palace,
England; his sale, Christie’s, London, 26 July 1886 (Lugt
45934), lot 90 (to Philpot for £8.18.6); countess of
Strafford; her sale, 28 March 1923.²


LITERATURE: Teniers et al. 1660, pl. 36 (as after “Paduanino”);
Thomas n.d., no. 41; Scharf 1862, p. 150, no. 13; Baetjer
1980, p. 182, ill. p. 385; Schütz 1980, p. 27; Baetjer 1995,
p. 291, ill.

Fig. 30.1 Quirin Boel after David
Teniers the Younger after Padova-
nino(?), Adam and Eve in Paradise.
Reproduced from Teniers et al.,
Theatrum pictorium, pl. 36, cour-
tesy of the Research Library, Getty
Research Institute, Los Angeles

Fig. 30.2 David Teniers the Younger,
The Gallery of Leopold Wilhelm. Schloss
Schleissheim, Bayerische Staatsgemälde-
sammlungen, Munich, inv. 1840
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Like the other Lehman modello (No. 29), this panel was copied by the engraver Quirin Boel for Teniers's Theatrum pictorium (Fig. 30.1). It depicts Adam and Eve seated beneath two trees. Adam embraces Eve, who leans toward him as he reaches for the apple she holds in front of her. Both figures are shown nude, prior to the moment of the Fall, and they both look apprehensive as the snake coils down the tree toward them, already setting fate in motion. Paradise is indicated by a few leafy trees, rocks, and hillsides beyond to the right. In the bottom left corner a leopard twists its head up to look at a rabbit.

The engraving appeared in the Theatrum pictorium as plate 36, with an attribution of the original to Padovanino (1588–1648) and dimensions of six by four palme. Both the authorship and the dimensions are contradicted by the 1659 inventory of Leopold Wilhelm's collection, in which the painter is considered unknown and the size is given as "hoch 4 Span / 3 Finger vnd 5 Span braidt." The horizontal format of the original painting seems confirmed by the representation of it in Teniers's painted Gallery of Leopold Wilhelm at Schloss Schleissheim (Fig. 30.2) and is further substantiated by the reproduction, as a work by Padovanino, in Anton von Preller's Theatrum artis pictoriae of 1729 (Fig. 30.3). The horizontal format extends the subject to the right and even increases the height slightly by enlarging the landscape. The original painting attributed to Padovanino is lost, so whether Teniers changed the format of the painting listed in the inventory or copied another version cannot be established. The absence of measurements on the modello is atypical. Although Teniers is known to have manipulated relative sizes of paintings both in his gallery paintings and in his Theatrum pictorium, so far as we know this would have been the only instance in which he changed a horizontal format to a vertical one.

The provenance of Padovanino's painting is known from its presence in the collection of the artist Niccolò Rienzi in Venice in the 1630s to its last appearance in the inventory of the imperial collections in 1772. It has never been attributed to painters other than Padovanino, and given the existence of rather similar figure landscapes by him, Teniers's attribution may have been correct.
Rembrandt van Rijn
Leyden 1606–Amsterdam 1669

Born in 1606 the son of a mill owner, Rembrandt received a Latin school education in his hometown of Leyden. After briefly attending Leyden University, he was apprenticed to the local painter Jacob van Swanenburgh from about 1621 to 1624. He then went to Amsterdam for half a year, to join the studio of the successful history painter Pieter Lastman. Back in Leyden about 1625 he established himself as an independent artist, at first painting history scenes in the multicolored and elaborate narrative manner of Lastman. Through the second half of the decade, in collaborative competition with the young Jan Lievens, he gradually simplified his compositions and muted his palette to a range of finely nuanced browns, greens, grays, yellows, and whites. In 1629 Constantijn Huygens, secretary and cultural adviser to the Stadtholder Frederick Hendrik, visited the two artists and wrote enthusiastically about Rembrandt’s powers of characterization. In 1633, on Huygens’s recommendation, the Stadtholder commissioned Rembrandt to paint a series of large Passion scenes (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), a task he completed only in 1639.

Rembrandt moved to Amsterdam around the end of 1631, living at first in the house of the picture dealer Hendrick van Uylenburgh, whose niece Saskia he married in 1634. In part through Van Uylenburgh’s contacts, Rembrandt quickly became Amsterdam’s leading portraitist. The success of his first group portrait, the Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Tulp of 1632 (Mauritshuis, The Hague), established his reputation in that particular genre. Throughout the 1630s he also painted large history scenes in spectacular chiaroscuro settings, choosing to depict the dramatic climax of each story. In 1642, the year of his wife’s death, Rembrandt completed The Night Watch (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), a prestigious commission depicting the militia company of Fans Banning Cocq. In this monumental painting he fused his approaches to portraiture and history painting, unifying the group around a central command.

Rembrandt painted less in the 1640s, devoting more time to drawings and etchings. In these graphic works he portrayed the landscape around Amsterdam with unprecedented candor. His landscape paintings of the same period, wild and mysteriously lit panoramas indebted to Hercules Segers, represent imagined rather than recognizable countryside. By 1650 he had begun to structure more stable, tectonic compositions in all media and genres, at the same time handling brush, pencil, and needle with ever greater freedom.

Even though Rembrandt continued to obtain significant commissions in the 1650s, his finances declined. In 1656 he was forced to declare bankruptcy and liquidate his estate. The inventories of his property show that he had a sizable collection of prints, drawings, antiquities, and curiosities. In 1660 his common-law wife, Hendrickje Stoffels, and his son Titus set up an art dealership to manage his financial affairs.

Although Rembrandt’s atmospheric chiaroscuro and increasingly broad handling gradually lost favor with patrons and collectors throughout the Netherlands, his works continued to be sought after. He continued to receive significant commissions from merchants, manufacturers, and regents, both Dutch and foreign. Nonetheless, some evidence suggests that Rembrandt’s work was subject to criticism during the last decade of his life. The assured, at times almost arrogant look of his self-portraits from that period, the last in a continuous and unprecedented series he had begun in Leyden in the 1620s, may register his response to such critiques.
Rembrandt van Rijn

31. Portrait of Gerard de Lairesse

1975.1.140

Oil on canvas. 112.7 x 87.6 cm. Signature, probably not autograph, at the lower left: Rembrandt (the loop of the R clipped by the edge of the canvas; not followed by an f).

The general condition of the painting is the good. The two pieces of canvas, both original, are joined by a horizontal seam about 44 centimeters from the bottom. An X radiograph (Fig. 31.1) shows that they were sewn together loosely, the 25.4 centimeters at the right having lost the stitching thread by the time the painting was relined.4

William Suhr cleaned the painting before it came to the Museum and photographs taken by him during the treatment (see Figs. 31.4–31.6) give some indication of the condition of the painting. The surface has suffered somewhat from abrasion in the dark areas, most noticeably in the brim of the hat and the background surrounding it and in the portions of the cloak below the seam. Abrasion in the paint swath that defines the right side of the nose has increased the prominence of this detail (see Fig. 31.2).4 As usual, the darkest areas of paint have darkened over time, obscuring some details of the costume and background. Past relinings have caused some flattening of the paint in pastose areas. Losses along the seam, in the background, and in the hat and cloak have been filled and retouched in various restorations.5

In 1978 lifting paint in the area of the seam was reattached.

PROVENANCE: Sale, Amsterdam, 16 June 1802, lot 144 (to Lafontaine for Fl 94); Lafontaine; his sale, Christie’s, London, 13 June 1807, lot 18 (for £25 4s.); probably Lord Young, Edinburgh and Silverknoe, Middlothian; his sale, Christie’s, London, 29 February 1908 (Lugt 66211), lot 66 (to Lewis and Simmons for £215 5s.);6 [Lewis and Simmons, London]; Leopold Koppel, Berlin, by 1909 and still in 1935; [M. Knoedler and Co., New York], by 1944. Acquired by Robert Lehman from Knoedler in May 1945.5


LITERATURE: Probably Art Prices Current 1 (1907–8), p. 95;6 Bode 1908, pp. 180–81, ill. (as dated 1663, noting that others have read the date as 1659); Friedländer 1908–9, pp. 423–24, ill. p. 423 (as close to Rembrandt’s Syndicus, so about 1660); Von Hadeln 1909, p. 299 (as very close in date to the Syndicus); Rosenberg and Valentiner 1909, pp. 503, 565, 579 (as 1663[?]); Voss 1909, p. 287; Bode 1910, p. 8, ill. p. 9 (as a portrait of a scholar; close in conception and execution to the Syndicus); Schmidt-Degener 1913a, ill. opposite p. 118; Schmidt-Degener 1913b, ill. opposite p. 98 (as Gerard de Lairesse, 1665); Hofstede de Groot (1915) 1926, no. 658 (as 1665, but citing Schmidt-Degener’s date of 1669); De Gelder 1921, p. 178, no. 179 (as by Rembrandt and not by Bartholomeus van der Helst);7 Graves 1918–21, vol. 2 (1921), p. 384;8 Bredius 1935, p. 14, no. 321, ill. (as 1665); Timmers 1942, pp. 7–8, no. 4 (as possibly not De Lairesse); Davis 1944, p. 17, ill.; Barnouw 1945, p. 11, ill. (as ca. 1663); Breuning 1945, p. 31, ill. p. 5; W. Martin 1947, no. 94, ill.; Schmidt-Degener 1950, pp. 103–13, pl. 28 (reprint of Schmidt-Degener 1913b); Rousseau 1952, p. 84, ill. p. 87; Slive 1953, p. 160, n. 4, fig. 37; Heinrich 1954, p. 222, ill. p. 230; Comstock 1956, pp. 73, 74, ill.; Isarlo 1957; Sterling 1957, pp. 137–38, fig. 4; Roger Marx 1960, pp. 53, 64, 243, 314, 337, pl. 138; Panofsky 1961, p. 20, n. 43, fig. 8; Van Hall 1963, pp. 178, 179, no. 7 (as De Lairesse); Lehman 1964, p. 13; White 1964a, p. 119, ill. p. 120; White 1964b, p. 118, ill. p. 120; Brion 1965, p. 42, fig. 43; K. Bauch 1966, p. 23, no. 441, pl. 441; Rosenberg, Slive, and Ter Kuile 1966, p. 208; Gerson 1968, pp. 129–30, 446, pl. 407; Wallace et al. 1968, p. 165; Arpino and Lecaldano 1969, no. 437, ill.; Gerson and Bredius 1969, no. 321, ill. p. 247; Haak 1969, p. 310, figs. 338, 338a; Hannam 1969, p. 392, ill. p. 395; Kitsch 1969, pp. 27, 89, pl. 43; Foucart and Lecaldano 1971, no. 437, ill. (as 1665); Martin and Lecaldano 1973, no. 437, ill.; Szabo 1973, pp. 73–74, pl. 79; Bolten and Bolten-Kempt 1978, p. 203, no. 558, ill.; C. Campbell 1978, pp. 32–35; Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, p. 536 (as the only dated painting by Rembrandt for 1665); Bataer 1980, p. 150, ill. p. 417; C. Brown 1980, no. 392, p. 82, ill. p. 85; Raupp 1984, pp. 167–68; Schwartz (1984) 1985, p. 341, fig. 401; White 1984, pp. 188–89, fig. 156; Guillaud and Guillaud 1986, pl. 426; Tümpel (1986) 1993, pp. 315, 414, no. 222, ill. p. 327; Focillon 1989, p. 107, fig. 14; Berlin-Amsterdam–London 1991–92, pp. 13, 288, fig. 2;9 Langedijk 1992, pp. 67–68, fig. 12a; Roy 1992, pp. 48, 57, 110–11, 158, 365, frontis.; Baetjer 1995, p. 317, ill.; Schama 1995, p. 118; De Vries 1998, pp. 5, 5, fig. 5; Van de Wetering 1997, p. 156, fig. 189.

The painter and writer Gerard de Lairesse (1640–1711) sits in an armchair holding several folded sheets of paper in his left hand while he tucks the other hand into his cloak. Something resembling a curtain appears to be draped behind him from the upper left down toward the right, and the obscured shape of a table can be seen to the left.10 De Lairesse is elegantly clad in a black cloak over a brownish gold doublet and a white lace-edged collar fastened with tassels. His blond curly locks fall to his shoulders, a hairstyle that apparently first emerged in the 1640s and became especially popular after mid-century.11 A black hat partly shades the ungainly features – broad cheeks, large deep-set eyes, bridgeless nose, and mottled skin – that make De Lairesse’s countenance so distinctive. Yet in spite of the physical irregularities, which Rembrandt seemingly recorded with little embellishment, the portrait conveys an overall impression of elegance and ease.
Gerard de Lairesse was born in Liège. He fled his hometown in 1664 allegedly because of a failed and volatile romantic entanglement. After a brief interlude in Utrecht, he arrived in Amsterdam, probably in 1665, where he became a citizen in 1667. De Lairesse’s startling physiognomy is known most reliably from his Self-portrait in the Uffizi, Florence (Fig. 31.7), which was probably painted about 1675–77, when the painter was in his mid-thirties. The self-portrait leaves no doubt about the identity of the man in the Lehman painting. Rembrandt’s portrait of De Lairesse in the Robert Lehman Collection is the only independent formal portrait of him apart from the Uffizi painting. It is also the earliest one, painted when De Lairesse was only about twenty-five years old. That De Lairesse is posed turned to the left indicates that the painting was probably always autonomous. If this were a pendant to a portrait of his wife, Marie Salme, whom he married in 1664, the conventions of marriage portraiture would have dictated that he be turned in the opposite direction.
Figs. 31.4 and 31.5 Photographs of No. 31 taken by William Suhr during conservation treatment in 1953. Photographs courtesy of the Research Library, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles

Fig. 31.6 Photograph of No. 31 taken by William Suhr during conservation treatment in 1953. Photograph courtesy of the Research Library, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles
X radiographs (Figs. 31.1–31.3) and autoradiographs of the painting show Rembrandt’s extensive reworking of certain sections of the figure. The general pose, lighting, and position of the face and hat seem to have been determined from the beginning. Rembrandt structured the face in lead white paint with characteristic boldness, clearly demarcating the deep eye sockets, heavy eyelids, bridgeless nose, and slightly open mouth. Apparently at a late moment in painting the face, he boldly applied firm brushstrokes from the upper part of the nose toward the lower right, near the sitter’s left nostril. This swath seems to reflect a feature of De Lairesse’s face, since it also appears in his self-portrait in the Uffizi. Another alteration appears in the sitter’s collar. Originally a small, plain rectangle, it was modified by the addition of a strip of lace around the edge. Rather than being articulated, the pattern of the lace was roughly scratched into the paint.

Significant changes are also evident in the positions and gestures of De Lairesse’s hands. Although his left hand itself underwent only minor changes, the paper it holds was altered. Visible on the X radiograph as a
inscriptions except for the signature. If indeed there ever was a date, it was probably spurious, and it might have been removed when the painting was cleaned.20

The mid-1660s is nonetheless an acceptable approximate date for the portrait. Rembrandt's other portraits from the same period offer a number of parallels. In *The Syndics* of 1662 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam), especially in the figures at the far right, the buildup of the facial features resembles that in the De Lairesse portrait. Also similar is the depiction of the hair and hands in the *Portrait of a Fair-haired Man* of 1667 (Melbourne) and *An Old Man* of the same year (Cowdray Park).21

De Lairesse's irregular appearance was recorded by his biographers. In 1721 Houbraken wrote that when the artist first arrived in Amsterdam in 1665, two colleagues "gazed at him in horror because of his nauseating appearance." According to Houbraken, the deformity was congenital, and not caused by the "Venus disease" (syphilis), as had been implied by his fellow painter Emanuel de Witte.22 Earlier, in the 1683 edition of his *Academia*, Sandrart had reported that De Lairesse had caught the plague in Utrecht prior to his arrival in Amsterdam, omitting any mention of facial deformities.23 Beginning with Bode in 1908, twentieth-century scholars have consulted medical experts who identified the bridgeless nose, colorless lips, and uneven skin as manifestations of syphilis. The original hypothesis was that it was contracted syphilis, but the diagnosis was changed to hereditary syphilis in 1913 and that opinion has subsequently prevailed.24 The evidence of a painting cannot be conclusive in this regard, but we do know

---

Fig. 31.7 Gerard de Lairesse, *Self-portrait*. Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence. Photograph: Soprintendenza per i Beni Artistici e Storici, Florence

rectangular patch of white lead paint extending above the hand, it seems originally to have been smaller, resembling a letter. His right hand may have assumed as many as four positions before it was tucked into the coat, leaving only the thumb and back of the hand visible.27 As suggested by one of the autoradiographs, in an earlier state this hand may have gripped the end of the armrest and at another time the sitter's arm seems to have been bent inward, leaving the hand in the lap. X radiographs also indicate that the sitter's right hand was once opened and raised in what may have been a speaking gesture. In addition, this hand seems to have once held or touched the paper, with one finger placed between the pages.18

Early writers on the Lehman portrait reported that a date of either 1663 or 1665 could be discerned at the lower left beside the signature, which itself is probably not autograph. A date of about 1665 may have been favored because according to De Lairesse's biographers he arrived in Amsterdam at that time.19 Recent thorough examination of the painting, however, revealed no

---

Fig. 31.8 Pieter Schenk, *Double Profile Portrait of the Artist and Gerard de Lairesse*. Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig, Bl. 46. Photograph: Museumsfoto Bernd-Peter Keiser
that De Lairesse went blind in 1690, an affliction that can result from the advanced stages of syphilis.\(^5\) Whatever the cause of the sitter’s deformity, its appearance is most deliberately recorded in a double profile portrait in the Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig, that was drawn in red chalk by Pieter Schenck (Fig. 31.8) and shows the artist’s own aquiline features set against De Lairesse’s misshapen silhouette.\(^6\)

De Lairesse was evidently little known as a painter in Amsterdam when he arrived there in 1665. He may have owed his contact with Rembrandt to the picture dealer Gerrit van Uylenburgh, who according to Houbraken employed De Lairesse immediately after his arrival. Van Uylenburgh was the son of Rembrandt’s dealer in Amsterdam, Hendrick van Uylenburgh, and a cousin of Rembrandt’s first wife, Saskia van Uylenburgh.\(^27\) Because of De Lairesse’s relatively obscure status and probably modest means at the time, it is unlikely that he commissioned the Lehman portrait. Late in his life Rembrandt tended increasingly to portray individuals from his circle of acquaintances, rather than the commercial and social elite of Amsterdam who had patronized him earlier in his career.\(^28\)

De Lairesse did become a leading painter and, after blindness had struck him, a theorist who championed the smooth manner and clear palette that dominated painting in the Netherlands in the late seventeenth century. In his widely read treatise on painting, the Groot Schilderboek of 1707, he denounced Rembrandt’s pastose handling and pronounced chiaroscuro, admitting that he had once had a “particular inclination to [Rembrandt’s] style” but had felt obliged to reject it as soon as he “became aware of the infallible rules of this Art.”\(^29\) Although Rembrandt’s portrait violates the rules of lighting and handling De Lairesse was to advocate later on, there is no reason to think it would have displeased him at this early moment in his career.

As a painter De Lairesse was to develop very differently from Rembrandt.\(^30\) Whereas Rembrandt’s technique moved away from refined and smooth brushstrokes toward a bold, textured painterliness, De Lairesse ventured further into an academic and neoclassical style. His subjects, mostly mythological and some allegorical, were also taken from the classical canon. Only a few portraits by him are known. His history paintings range from easel-size canvases to entire decorative ensembles. He was evidently the first painter in the northern Netherlands, in about 1670, to fully develop the art of monumental ceiling paintings on canvas.\(^31\) Whether small or large, his paintings are in the grand manner, complex and theatrical narratives rendered in fine, clean strokes. De Lairesse’s large, colorful, and accomplished Apollo and Aurora (Apotheosis of William of Orange) of 1671, which is also in the Metropolitan Museum,\(^32\) is certainly the antithesis of Rembrandt’s later works, as exemplified by the Lehman painting.

In giving his sitter some papers to hold and thereby endowing him with an air of learning or administrative concern, Rembrandt seems to have anticipated De Lairesse’s later theoretical treatises. On the other hand, there is a certain irony in the fact that Rembrandt employed his late, painterly manner in this portrait of the very artist who was to lead Dutch painting into the next century by way of neoclassical and academic clarity.

**EHB**

**NOTES:**

1. Other late paintings by Rembrandt are on canvas of the same weave and preparation that has also been pieced together. For example, the canvas of the Flora of 1654 in the Metropolitan Museum (Bredius and Gerson 1969, no. 114, ill. p. 103; New York 1995–96, no. 12, ill.) is comparable, as observed by Hubert von Sonnenburg (conversation with the author, April 1991). In 1662 Rembrandt’s Sicilian patron Antonio Ruffo complained that the canvas seams of the Alexander (Glasgow; Bredius and Gerson 1969, no. 480, ill. p. 389) he obtained from the painter were “so terrible they cannot be believed” (Strauss and Van der Meulen 1979, no. 1662/11). For Rembrandt’s reply, defending his method of enlarging the canvas, see ibid., no. 1662/12.


3. Von Sonnenburg (ibid., p. 104) mentions small paint losses in the sitter’s left hand.

4. The painting described as “Rembrandt. Portrait of Titus, the artist’s son, in brown dress and large black hat, seated, holding a paper 43½ in. by 33½ in.” is probably this portrait of De Lairesse, in spite of the erroneous identification. Bode (1908, p. 182) recalled that when it appeared at auction in London “a few months ago,” the portrait was entirely and thickly overpainted and therefore considered an imitation even by experts, in spite of the signature, until Hauser removed the overpaint with brilliant success.


6. The note in Art Prices Current refers to the painting in the Lord Young sale, which was probably this Lehman painting (see note 4 above).

7. The source of the Van der Helst “attribution” De Gelder was refuting may have been a mistaken interpretation of
Friedländer (1908–9, p. 424), who posited a nonexistent painting by Van der Helst of the same sitter for hypothetical comparison with Rembrandt’s treatment. 

8. Graves was referring to the painting in the Lord Young sale (see notes 4 and 6 above).

9. The Lehman portrait is illustrated on p. 13 of the catalogue in the context of De Lairesse’s opinion of Rembrandt’s manner of painting, and it is discussed on p. 288 in comparison with the portrait in Lord Cowdray’s collection (Bredius and Gerson 1969, no. 323) and the one in the National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne (ibid., no. 323a).

10. Parallel vertical shapes appear to the right of the table in Suhr’s conservation photographs of the painting and in Bredius 1935, no. 321. These shapes might be books.


12. De Lairesse’s life and career were fully discussed by Roy in 1992. De Vries provided some additional data in 1998. See also notes 16, 19, and 22 below.

13. Chiariini 1899, p. 235, ill. p. 236; Hendrick 1987, p. 166, pl. 144; Langedijk 1992, no. 115, ill.; Roy 1992, pp. 50, 276–77, no. p. 103, ill. The Uffizi painting is first listed in an inventory of transfer to the Uffizi of 1699 as “Gérard de Géffré Francesse.” It was probably acquired in the Netherlands by one of the agents of Cosimo III de’ Medici (1642–1743) for his gallery of self-portraits. Schmidt-Degener did not know the Uffizi portrait but referred instead to a “self-portrait” in Schleissheim (cat. 1905, no. 1051; not in Roy 1992) that he knew only by description. The painting in the Uffizi was oval at least until the middle of the eighteenth century (Langedijk 1992, pp. xxii, 68), when it was changed into a rectangle, according to Chiariini. The present dimensions are 89 by 73 centimeters. See also note 14 below.

14. In the catalogue of the Lafontaine sale of 1807 the sitter in the Lehman painting was referred to as “an Advocate with a Brief in his Hand.” In 1913 Schmidt-Degener convincingly identified him as De Lairesse. This identification has been accepted in the literature with the exception of Timmers 1942, who expressed doubts. Schmidt-Degener based his conclusion largely on a comparison with three prints representing the artist: two mezzotints, one by and one after Pieter Schenck (Keyes 1981, nos. 714, 715), and an illustration from Arnold Houbraken’s Groote Schouburgh (vol. 3). In each instance, the resemblance is convincing. Langedijk’s opinion (1992, p. 68) that all the portrait prints of De Lairesse ultimately were based on the Uffizi self-portrait (see note 13 above) seems sensible. The oval drawing in the Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin (black and red chalk, 163 x 139 mm), that Roy (1992, pp. 47, 365, no. D.2) discussed and illustrated as a self-portrait of the artist is in my opinion a copy of the print in Sandrart 1683 (opposite p. 389, by B. Kilian). On Pieter Schenck’s profile drawing of De Lairesse, see note 26 below. Roy (1992, p. 57) gives an “Iconographie de Gérard de Lairesse.”

15. Houbraken (1718–21, vol. 1, p. 285) mentioned that he saw a self-portrait of De Lairesse that was painted when the artist was seventeen years old (therefore in 1657).

16. According to Louis Abrv ([ca. 1715] 1867, p. 248), a painter from Liége who lived with De Lairesse for at least a year in Amsterdam, De Lairesse and Marie Salme had married “à la soldatesque” outside Liége during his flight from the city in 1664. As Roy (1992, pp. 46, 141, n. 42) supposed, this term probably means they were married without posting banns. On the convention of marriage portraiture, see also No. 32, especially note 11.

17. As always in the case of X-ray photography and autoradiography, it is impossible to determine in which order these and other changes were made.

18. The extensive reworking and the configurations of the lead underpaint in the Lehman portrait are similar to those seen in The Syndics of 1662 in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (Bredius and Gerson 1969, no. 415, ill. pp. 327, 329; Van Schendel 1956, especially figs. 1, 2, 7, 9, 10, 13).

19. When exactly De Lairesse came to Amsterdam is not known. Abrv’s narrative ([ca. 1715] 1867, cited in Roy 1992, pp. 46–48) is the most detailed and may well be based on information obtained directly from the artist (see also notes 12, 16, 22, and 25). He gives the impression that little time elapsed between De Lairesse’s flight from Liége in or shortly after April 1664 and his arrival in Amsterdam. He states that the painter and his new wife had a stopover in ‘s Hertogenbosch (Bois-le-Duc), whereas Sandrart (1683, p. 389) and Houbraken (1718–21, vol. 3, pp. 109–10) locate them in Utrecht. The couple’s son, Andries, was baptized on 5 April 1665 in Utrecht (Roy 1992, p. 46). The family may have moved to Amsterdam shortly afterward.

20. The last record of a date, apparently based on observation, is found in Hofstede de Groot (1915) 1916. In Berlin 1930, no. 387, the signature and date were characterized as “unclear.”

21. Bredius and Gerson 1969, nos. 323, 323a, 415, ill. pp. 250, 251, 327, 329. Two male portraits in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. (ibid., nos. 312 [1663], 313, ill. pp. 238, 241), that were discussed by Bode (1908, p. 181) are not as close in terms of handling, but they share the same general format.

22. Houbraken 1718–21, vol. 1, p. 285, vol. 3, p. 110. In about 1715 Abrv remarked on the painter’s “misshapen nose” without giving any reason for the malformation, adding that De Lairesse tried to compensate by displaying certain charms, particularly to women: “Il étoit fort camard, mais naturellement joli et bien coiffé; dans la croyance qu’il étoit de ne devoir agréer à personne à cause de ce défaut de nez, il se récompensait de certaines complaisances qui ne rebutoient pas les belles mêmes, qui ont aussi bien fait des avances” (Abrv [ca. 1715] 1867, p. 244, quoted in Roy 1992, pp. 46, 174; see also note 16 above).

23. Sandrart (1683, pp. 388–89) says that “Ultrajecti in transitu... morbo corripuerat” (in transit in Utrecht... he contracted the pest). The Latin text is reprinted in Roy 1992, pp. 168–70, with French translation. Joachim Sandrart (1606–1688) first published his Teutsche Academie in 1675. In 1683 he published an expanded version in Latin, Academia nobilissimae artis pictoriae, in which the
entry on Gerard de Lairesse (pp. 388–89) appears under "Omissa" (Addenda). In the original version the entry on De Lairesse had been only two paragraphs long; in the Latin version it takes up almost two pages.

24. For a history of the speculation on De Lairesse's disease, see Panofsky 1961, p. 20, n. 43; Bode (1908, pp. 180–81, n. 1) cited Professor Eugen Holländ's diagnosis of the sitter's illness as syphilis and his estimate of his age as 45–48. Schmidt-Degener (1913b) said that according to Dr. J. H. Hanken, De Lairesse's disease was congenital. The anonymous author, presumably a physician, of the 1936 article "Le nez de Gérard de Lairesse" (Aesculape, n.s. 26, p. 239), on the mezzotint by Schenck (see note 14 above), called it hereditary syphilis. Long before medical experts had made their diagnoses, Houbraken had stated that De Lairesse's problem was congenital (see above and note 22). Van de Wetering (in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92, p. 13) does not concur with the prevailing opinion about De Lairesse's ailment: "The strange deformation of De Lairesse's face has been ascribed, probably wrongly, to the effects of syphilis."


26. Roy 1992, p. 52, ill. This is the only portrait that depicts De Lairesse in profile. It was made "in haste" for the liber amicorum of Johann Jakob Müller.


28. The pair of Trip portraits (see note 27 above) are one example. The Syndics of 1662 (Bredius and Gerson 1969, no. 415, ill. pp. 327, 329) was Rembrandt's last official group commission. An instance of a sitter with no previous relationship with Rembrandt was the German merchant Frederick Rihel, whose regal equestrian portrait was painted by Rembrandt in about 1663, after Rihel had moved to Amsterdam (National Gallery, London; ibid., no. 255, ill. p. 239; on the identity of the sitter, see MacLaren and Brown 1991, vol. 1, no. 6300, pp. 358–62; vol. 2, pl. 294).

29. De Lairesse 1707, vol. 1, pp. 324–25. As Schmidt-Degener noted in 1913, De Lairesse (ibid., vol. 2, pp. 10–14) also argued that portrait painters should be tactful in representing the facial defects of their sitters, obscuring or minimizing them whenever possible. De Lairesse does not seem to have been as concerned with this issue as Schmidt-Degener suggested, however, and recorded his upturned nose rather frankly in his self-portrait (Fig. 31.7). Disturbed by De Lairesse's disavowal of Rembrandt's style, Schmidt-Degener and several others (see Amsterdam 1925 and Amsterdam 1932) described the Lehman portrait as a psychological exercise in which Rembrandt discerned and captured the sitter's presumably arrogant character. For more nuanced views of De Lairesse's opinions, which extended to many of Rembrandt's contemporaries, see Slive 1953, pp. 159–66, and Emmens 1968, pp. 80–83.


European Paintings

Amsterdam Artist
ca. 1640–50

32. Portrait of a Man Seated in an Armchair

1975.1.139
Oil on canvas. 108.3 x 82.6 cm. Annotated at the upper right: Rembrandt f. / 1638.

The canvas is made up of two pieces joined by a horizontal seam about 13.5–16 centimeters from the bottom. Although the overall condition of the painting is good, the paint surface has been flattened somewhat in pastose areas due to past relining, mostly noticeably in the face, hands, collar, and cuffs. Technical investigation and conservation undertaken by Hubert von Sonnenburg in the spring of 1997 indicate that the painting probably was trimmed along the left and bottom sides. If so, the sitter would originally have been seated closer to the center of the canvas, and there would have been noticeably more space between him and the left and lower edges. The face and hands have been overpainted rather heavily. Removal of these overpaints revealed that the face was more broadly painted than the hands. The substantial difference in execution suggests that two artists were at work.

Provenance: Probably Mrs. J. E. Fiseaux; her sale, Amsterdam, 30 August 1797, lot 184 (as Rembrandt; to Van Santen for £ 870);2 earl of Mansfield (bought at a sale in London about 1818);3 David William, third earl of Mansfield, Scone Palace, Perth, still in 1890, possibly 1910;4 [R. Langtron Douglas, London];5 [M. Knoedler and Co., New York]. Acquired by Philip Lehman from Knoedler in April 1911.6


The middle-aged man with graying hair, beard, and mustache who looks out at the viewer from his armchair appears to be self-possessed and prosperous. In the painting’s original state, when there was more space to the left and below the sitter, he may have projected his dignity and well-being with even greater emphasis. Seen in three-quarter profile from just above the knees, he is turned to the viewer’s right. He is lit from the left, and he casts a faint shadow onto the brownish gray, indeterminate wall. He is both elegantly and fashionably dressed in a short black doublet that is fastened down the front except for the lower buttons. What appears to be an extra pair of black sleeves hang loosely from the shoulders of the doublet in a fashion that was current in the early seventeenth century. The sleeves the sitter actually wears are boldly slashed, revealing the greenish silk of the shirt underneath, in the style of the 1630s and 1640s. By 1640 plain cambric collars with tassels and simple cuffs like the sitter’s had replaced the more elaborate lace ruffs of earlier decades,8 and the elegant broad-brimmed hat is also in keeping with contemporary styles.9 Since the man portrayed here faces right, the painting probably had a pendant, now lost, in which his wife would have faced left, toward him.10

On the strength of the annotation at the upper right, “Rembrandt f · / 1638,” and the painting’s superficial resemblance to some of Rembrandt’s portraits of the 1630s and 1640s, the Lehman portrait was listed without much comment as a work by Rembrandt of 1638 in catalogues of his oeuvre published between 1900 and 1966.11 In 1969 Gerson voiced his doubt about the authenticity of the signature and stated that he found the attribution to Rembrandt “not convincing.”12 Recently the painting has been excluded from the discussion of Rembrandt’s oeuvre by the members of the Rembrandt Research Project in their catalogue of his paintings, presumably because they considered its relationship to his work too tenuous.13

An examination of the painting confirms the justness of the doubts regarding the attribution. The signature is too labored to be Rembrandt’s, most letters having been drawn uncertainly or even doubly. More significantly, the entire portrait looks very different from Rembrandt’s work of the 1630s and 1640s. Although the man’s pose and gesture are not incompatible
with Rembrandt’s portraits, the face is rosier than those of the sitters in his paintings from the late 1630s and early 1640s, the period to which this portrait evidently belongs, and the flesh of the face and hands lacks the blend of larger and smaller strokes that accurately follow and define forms in Rembrandt’s work. As well, the brushwork in the broad handling of the costume, even in well-preserved passages like the sleeves of the doublet and the shirt, is unlike Rembrandt’s. X radiography (Fig. 32.1) shows that the artist used lead white to block in the face and hands, without the rapid yet precise definition characteristic of Rembrandt’s preliminary demarcation in his portraits. Furthermore, the painting is missing the quick and varied sketch in the underlying layers of ground and pigments familiar from autoradiographs of Rembrandt’s paintings.  

Gerson has proposed, without actually venturing an attribution, that the Lehman painting is comparable to the few known early portraits of Bartholomeus van der Helst, who was to become a leading Amsterdam portraitist in the second half of the seventeenth century. Van der Helst’s Portrait of a Minister of 1638 (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam), 16 which Gerson mentioned specifically, shares features with Rembrandt’s portraits of the early 1630s and 1640s, but mainly in composition and motif. In this and other early works, Van der Helst’s sitters tend to have more roundly constructed bodies and hands and smoother flesh than the Lehman man. The flickering highlights with sharp, nervous edges of varying size that are so pronounced in the Lehman portrait are absent from Van der Helst’s paintings.

The painter of the Lehman portrait was apparently well aware of Rembrandt’s innovations, among the most significant of them the lively presentation of the sitter. 17 The effect of Rembrandt’s new portraits is registered in the work of numerous Amsterdam portraitists of the 1630s, and Rembrandtesque portraiture soon became familiar outside Amsterdam as well. 18 By the end of the decade Thomas de Keyser and Nicolaes Elias, called Pickenooy, Rembrandt’s slightly older contemporaries in Amsterdam, had enlivened their smooth handling and the previously formal poses of their sitters. Jacob Backer and Govert Flinck, both just slightly younger than Rembrandt, were especially close to his style in their portraits of the 1630s.

Much closer to the Lehman portrait than Van der Helst’s Minister is The Goldsmith Jan Pietersz van den Eeckhout of 1644 by Gerbrand van den Eeckhout (1621–1674) in the Musée de Grenoble (Fig. 32.2). 19 Van den Eeckhout’s painting of his father, his earliest dated portrait, is of the same high quality as the Lehman Man Seated in an Armchair. It is also remarkably similar in the definition of the head, face, and hands. Even the manner of painting is similar, both in the hands and face and in the smaller, unequally pronounced edges of the highlights.

Without further evidence, however, the Lehman portrait cannot be attributed to Van den Eeckhout. We can say only that the Man Seated in an Armchair was certainly painted by a portraitist active in Amsterdam in the 1640s. 20 Although the date of 1638 written in the same hand as the spurious signature would not be impossible, the broad handling and the costume favor a somewhat later date.

**NOTES:**

1. According to Maryan Ainsworth’s report of January 1980 on the results of autoradiography of the painting (Robert Lehman Collection files), the canvas pieces were joined before the ground was prepared.
2. Hofstede de Groot ([1915] 1916) posited this provenance. The description of the painting and the measurements ("hoog 42, breed 32 duim") do indeed agree with the Lehman painting. No signature or date is mentioned.
3. According to Bode 1900 and repeated in most of the subsequent literature.
4. If Von Wurzbach 1906–11 was up-to-date.
7. In one copy of the catalogue, in the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague, Hofstede de Groote has annotated the entry for this painting (no. 74) in his personal stenographic script (it awaits deciphering).
8. There are two catalogues for this exhibition; the smaller one is unillustrated and the slightly larger one has illustrations and updated information for some entries, although not for the present painting. The page numbering is the same in both catalogues, although the larger one does not have entry numbers.
10. Compare, for example, the hats in Rembrandt’s Standing Man (Cornelia Witsen?) of 1639 in the Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Kassel, and his Herman Doomer dated 1640 in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (Bredius and Gerson 1969, nos. 216, 217, ill. pp. 175, 176; New York 1995–96, no. 8, color ill.).
11. The most extensive discussions of this convention of marriage portraiture are found in D. Smith 1982, pp. 47–49, and Haarlem 1986, pp. 36–40, 63. See also No. 31, note 16.
12. The only doubt about Rembrandt’s authorship was expressed by an anonymous critic whose review of the 1902 Winter Exhibition at the Royal Academy, “Old Masters at Burlington House,” was published in the London Times on 21 January 1902 (p. 15). He referred to the painting as “a false Rembrandt” and noted that although the face and composition seemed Rembrandtesque, “the weak and timid painting of the black coat bears no relation whatever to the style and handling of the master.” His comments seem to have gone unnoticed by later writers on the painting.
13. In their catalogue of the same year Arpino and Lecaldano included the painting in a list of works that could not be attributed to Rembrandt, without indicating reasons or alternative attributions.
15. Report of January 1980 by Ainsworth (Robert Lehman Collection files). As Ainsworth noted, however, few of Rembrandt’s portraits of the 1630s have been autoradiographed, so adequate comparative material is lacking for this decade. Van de Wetering provides a comprehensive discussion of Rembrandt's brushwork and technique in Berlin–Amsterdam–London 1991–92, pp. 12–39, and see also London 1988–89.

16. De Gelder 1921, pp. 36–37, no. 24, fig. 2; Ekkart 1995, pp. 100, 101, no. 24 (Ekkart points out that in this portrait Van der Helst was influenced by Nicolaes Eliasz. Pickenoy).
18. The immediate impact of Rembrandt’s portraiture is documented in the six volumes of Sumowski 1983–94.
20. The Amsterdam origin finds further confirmation in the execution of the highlights on the gold brown shirt visible through the slashed sleeves, which resemble the reflections on the shiny drapery in a half-length figure of a woman (Pomona or portrait of a woman as Pomona?) in the Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest, that Gerson attributed to Jan van Noordt, who was active in Amsterdam about 1646–75 (see Pigler 1967, p. 768 [as Jan Weenix, earlier attributed to Van der Helst], and Ildikó Ember in Milan–Bad Homburg–Wuppertal 1995, p. 112, color ill.).
Gerard Terborch
Zwolle 1617–Deventer 1681

Gerard Terborch was taught to draw by his father, Gerard Terborch the Elder, a tax collector and a very gifted draftsman and painter in Zwolle. Gerard the Younger's earliest known drawing, made at the age of seven, is preserved in the Rijksprentenkabinet in Amsterdam along with hundreds of drawings by his father, siblings, and cousin. He was apprenticed to the landscape painter Pieter Molijn in Haarlem by 1634.

Terborch became a master in Haarlem in 1635, and that same year began his extensive foreign travels, first visiting his uncle Robert van Voest in London. As an engraver, Van Voest worked closely with Anthony van Dyck, and through him Terborch must have become well acquainted with Van Dyck's refined, graceful portraiture. Terborch's exact itinerary between 1636 and 1646 remains unclear, but the accounts of the early biographers and his datable works suggest that by about 1640 he had visited Italy and Spain and returned briefly to Holland, and that he then went on to Antwerp and France. The early biographers report that he found high patronage in Spain, where he apparently painted a portrait of King Philip IV (known only from a presumed copy).

In Amsterdam about 1644–45, Terborch developed a new type of small full-length portrait in which the finely detailed face and costume of the figure are set off against a neutral, grayish ground. In their restraint and subtle coloring these portraits evoke the court portraiture of Velázquez, but their size and delicate brushwork owe more to Netherlandish traditions of high finish and portraiture on a small scale. In 1636 Terborch accompanied Adriaen Pauw, the representative of the state of Holland in the peace negotiations with Spain, from Amsterdam to Münster. While in Münster he painted numerous miniature portraits of the various deputies and entered the service of the Spanish count of Peñaranda. He also painted a remarkable record of the signing of the Peace of Münster in 1648 (National Gallery, London).

From the fall of 1648 Terborch worked in several Dutch cities, painting genre interiors with figures in quiet settings that reflect innovations introduced by his contemporaries in Delft. Indeed, he signed a document with the young Jan Vermeer in Delft in 1653, and a courtyard painting of that period in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin, suggests that he had contact with the Delft painter Pieter de Hooch (see Nos. 35 and 36) as well. In 1654 he married Geertruyt Matthijs and settled in Deventer, becoming a citizen of the town in 1655. In the late 1650s he further developed his genre interiors with an increasing emphasis on figures, especially women, absorbed in domestic or leisure activities. Beginning about 1660 his portraits were mostly of prosperous citizens of Deventer. That he was his patrons' social equal is indicated by his election as town councillor in 1666 and by his distinguished self-portrait in the Mauritshuis, The Hague.

In his genre paintings and portraits of the last two decades of his career Terborch set new standards for the illusionistic representation of the textures of skin, hair, leather, and silk that influenced younger "fine painters" such as Caspar Netscher and Eglon van der Neer.
Gerard Terborch

33. Burgomaster Jan van Duren (1613–1687)

1975.1.141

Oil on canvas. 81.5 x 65.5 cm. Signed on the back wall just above the floor, to the left of the coat: GTB. On the reverse, an old label that reads: “Jan van Duren, Burgemeester en Camerar van Deventer.”

The canvas, which has been relined, and the paint surface are in exceptionally fine condition, without evidence of abrasion, losses, or retouches. The imprint of the narrow stretcher is visible all around the edges but does not disturb the appearance of the paint surface.


EXHIBITED: Zwolle 1882, no. 1181 (lent by M. van Doorninck); Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, 1901–9, no. 574 (lent by P. W. van Doorninck);2 New York 1913a, no. 16; Colorado Springs 1951–2, fig. 33; New York 1954; Paris 1957, no. 52; Cincinnati 1959, no. 133, ill.; New Haven 1960, no. 16, ill. p. 18; New York 1973, no. 11; New York 1991.


This painting and its pendant are discussed under No. 34.

NOTES:

1. Knoedler invoice dated 30 November 1912 (Robert Lehman Collection files). The Van Duren–Van Doorninck provenance for Nos. 33 and 34 is outlined in the Knoedler invoice of 1 February 1912 for No. 34 (see No. 34, note 1) and in Gudlaugsson 1959–60, no. 201; Gudlaugsson cites N. H. van Doorninck as his source. The Kleinberger invoice of 30 November 1912 lists Beistegui as the last owner of No. 33 before Philip Lehman, as do Hofstede de Groot (1912) 1913 and Gudlaugsson 1959–60. The De Wild ownership is recorded by Hofstede de Groot and Gudlaugsson.

2. According to a letter of 14 October 1922 from J. Witsen of the Rijksmuseum (Robert Lehman Collection files), P. W. van Doorninck lent the painting and its pendant to the museum from 15 February 1901 to 16 February 1909. According to Witsen, Van Doorninck lived at Bennebroek (mistakenly for Bennekom) in 1901, and later in Colmschate. This information is confirmed by Van Riemsdijk’s catalogues of paintings in the Rijksmuseum. From 1903 to 1908 the catalogues list the painting and its companion as nos. 574 and 575, on loan since 1901 from P. W. van Doorninck of Bennekom; in the 1909 and 1911 catalogues, nos. 574 and 575 are included among the “canceled numbers” and identified as the Van Duren and Van Haexbergen portraits that had been returned to P. W. van Doorninck.

Gerard Terborch

34. Margaretha van Haexbergen (1614–1676)

1975.1.142

Oil on canvas. 81.3 x 65.1 cm.

The canvas, which has been relined, and the paint surface are in excellent condition, without evidence of losses or abrasion. There are some minor patches of irregular varnish in the lower parts of the skirt and between the skirt and the right edge of the painting. Only the contour of the sitter’s right hand appears to have been strengthened with a very fine line in a dark brownish red.


EXHIBITED: Zwolle 1882, no. 1182 (printed erroneously as no. 1882, lent by M. van Doorninck, Deventer); Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, 1901–9, no. 575 (lent by P. W. van Doorninck);3 New York 1912, p. 51, no. 47, ill.; New York 1915a, no. 17; Colorado Springs 1951–2; New York 1954;
Fig. 34.1 Gerard Terborch,
*The Magistracy of Deventer.*
Town Hall, Deventer
Gerard Terborch

No. 34, detail


The subjects of these pendants (Nos. 33 and 34) are identified on an old label on the reverse of the man’s portrait, which reads: “Jan van Duren, Burgemeester en Camraar van Deventer.” Jan van Duren was born in Deventer, also Gerard Terborch’s hometown, in 1613, and he married Margaretha van Haexbergen there in 1637. Van Duren was burgomaster of Deventer from 1644 to 1673, serving as a member of the town council at various times. He died in his birthplace in 1687. His identity is confirmed by his appearance in Terborch’s group portrait The Magistracy of Deventer of 1667 (Town Hall, Deventer; Fig. 34.1),3 and it is further supported by the provenance of the Lehman paintings, which remained in the possession of the Van Duren family and their descendants the Van Doornincs until 1909 or shortly afterward.

Van Duren’s facial features, his costume, and his pose from the waist up are virtually identical in the Lehman pendant and the Magistracy painting, in which he is seated against the back wall, to the immediate right of the two reigning burgomasters of Deventer, who are seated on a dais. The likeness in the group portrait differs only in that he is wearing his hat and he is seated. The similarity indicates that Terborch used the Lehman portrait as a model for the sitter in the Magistracy painting. This is corroborated by Gudlaugsson’s observation that the artist painted the sitters individually rather than as a group, even to the point of varying the fall of light...
on each member of the council. It is likely that the Lehman portrait originated shortly before 1667, when Terborch painted the _Magistracy_.

Terborch had portrayed Van Duren earlier, probably toward the end of the 1650s, in an oval format on copper (Centraal Museum, Utrecht). Gudlaugsson also published a portrait of Van Duren by an anonymous artist that is reminiscent of the style of Antonie Palemedes (Fig. 34.2). It is unlikely, however, that either of these earlier portraits served as models for the Lehman painting because of the numerous differences in the sitter's hairstyle, facial features, and costume. Furthermore, the very detailed and lively rendering of the facial features in the Lehman portrait (see detail) suggests that the face was painted from life.

Jan van Duren and Margaretha van Haexbergen are dressed conservatively and elegantly. He wears a plain black cloak with a cambric collar over black knee-length breeches and black stockings, and his dark brown hair falls onto his shoulders in the fashion of the 1660s. His brown-soled black leather shoes and the hat on the table beside him are decorated with black pompons and ribbon. He holds one brown leather glove in his gloved left hand. She is wearing the long, voluminous black gown with a layered skirt, set off by a simple collar and cuffs of transparent white tulle, that had become fashionable by midcentury. Her hair is tucked beneath a black cap that forms a widow's peak and is held in place by a headband. Her jewelry, elegant yet restrained, consists of earrings and a bracelet and ring on each hand.

Terborch posed each of his sitters in the empty, neutrally gray space that characterized his portraiture throughout his career. The two pieces of furniture that enliven the space, a table and a chair covered with red velvet luxuriously fringed with gold thread, began appearing either singly or together, the chair with or without armrests, in Terborch's pendant portraits beginning in the early 1660s. The furniture situates the sitters and unifies their indeterminate spaces, which in the Lehman paintings are articulated at the left and right by a faint indication of the juncture between the back wall and the floor. Terborch replicated these compositions in the pendant portraits he painted of Willem and Geerttruid Marienburg, probably in the early 1670s. Either he or his patrons must have recognized how effective they are. This monumental setting enhanced by the full-length pose and contrasting with the miniaturistlike execution of the facial features is Terborch's fundamental contribution to Dutch portraiture.

---

Fig. 34.2 Deventer artist, _Jan van Duren_. Present location unknown. Reproduced from Sturla J. Gudlaugsson, _Gerard Ter Borch_ (Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, 1959–60), vol. 2, pl. 20

---

NOTES:

1. Knoedler invoice dated 1 February 1912 (Robert Lehman Collection files). See also No. 33, note 1.

2. See No. 33, note 2.

3. Gudlaugsson 1959–60, vol. 1, pp. 142–43, ill. p. 345, vol. 2, no. 205. Two other sitters in the _Magistracy_ portrait are known from other paintings by Terborch. For the bust-length portrait of Cornelis de Vos (ibid., vol. 1, ill. p. 340, vol. 2, no. 198) the situation is very similar to Van Duren's. The single portrait of Hendrik Nilant (ibid., vol. 1, ill. p. 377, vol. 2, no. 250) seems to have been painted a few years after the group painting, but his pose was changed significantly.


5. Ibid., vol. 2, no. 150, ill. p. 306. A partial copy on panel of Van Duren's portrait, in which he wears a hat as in the _Magistracy_ group, was in the collection of Sir Hickman Bacon at Gainsborough (ibid., vol. 2, no. 2014; present whereabouts unknown). Although that painting bears Terborch's monogram, it was not painted by him.

6. Ibid., vol. 2, pl. 20, fig. 1 (as in the collection of J. H. Klein, The Hague). Gudlaugsson suggested that Terborch adopted
the pose and the position of the hand from this earlier portrait in the style of Palamedes.

7. The elegant conservatism of Margaretha van Haexbergen's dress is even more evident when it is compared with that of the female sitters, mostly younger, in many of Terborch's other portraits from the same period, for example *Catrina van Leuninc, Wife of Jan van Suchtelten* of about 1663 in the Hermitage, Saint Petersburg (New York–Chicago 1988, no. 3, color ill.), and the *Portrait of a Young Woman* of about 1665 in the Cleveland Museum of Art (Cleveland Museum of Art 1982, no. 94, ill.). Her attire also contrasts with that of the young women in some of Frans Hals's portraits, as described by Dumortier (1989, pp. 50–52). The elaborate collars and cuffs in Hals's *Portrait of a Standing Woman* of about 1643–45 in the National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh (Grimm 1990, fig. 131a), offer a foil to the relatively simple details of Margaretha's dress.

8. For example, Gudlaugsson 1959–60, nos. 193, 194 and 212, 213 (pendants); 210/1 and 211 (single female portraits); and 206, 207, 208, 222, and 223 (male portraits). In Terborch's portraits and to some degree in his genre paintings as well, women's chairs almost always have armrests, as in Margaretha van Haexbergen's case. When they do not, the women are seated or the chair is not prominent (see ibid., nos. 182, 251, and 252, for example). The men's chairs usually are without armrests, most exceptions being questionable attributions (ibid., no. 256), for instance.

9. Some later owners of such portraits felt uncomfortable with the emptiness of the spaces and had them enlivened with more furnishings. Examples are the portrait of Gosewyn Hogers (Gudlaugsson 1959–60, no. 195), who may himself have asked Terborch to add a library setting after the portrait had been completed, and the pendents in a private collection (ibid., nos. 183, 186), to which interior settings and dogs were added at a considerably later date. Gudlaugsson considered the furniture in the Lehman portraits and in many other works by Terborch not fully autograph. The continuity of the paint surface makes it difficult, however, to determine the exact share, if any, of an assistant.

10. Ibid., nos. 254, 255. I am grateful to Alison M. Kettering of Carleton College for reading and correcting this entry. In a forthcoming article, Professor Kettering will clarify the special nature of Terborch's portraits of the Deventer elite.

---

**Pieter de Hooch**

Rotterdam 1629–Amsterdam 1684

Pieter de Hooch was baptized in Rotterdam on 20 December 1629. According to Arnold Houbraken, writing early in the eighteenth century, among his teachers was the painter of Italianate pastoral landscapes Nicolaes Berchem in Haarlem, an apprenticeship he younger compatriot Jacob Ochtervelt shared. De Hooch's work shows considerable affinity with that of Ochtervelt, but none at all with Berchem's. His career is closely linked with Delft, where he painted from at least 1653 to 1657, and Amsterdam, where he is recorded from April 1661 until his death in a home for the mentally ill in 1684. In 1652 he appeared as a witness in Delft with Hendrick van der Burch, the genre painter whose best work is often confused with his. De Hooch married Jannetje van der Burch, who may well have been Hendrick's sister, in Rotterdam in 1654.

After painting guardroom scenes in the early 1650s, De Hooch began to share the Delft painters' interest in the representation of interiors. About 1650 Gerard Houckgeest, Hendrick van Vliet, and others had used orthogonal geometry to paint church interiors. Soon after, Isaack Koedijnck, Quirijn Brekelenkam, and Nicolaes Maes transformed the previously inarticulate architecture of genre interiors into plausible spaces. By 1657–58 De Hooch had achieved more complex spatial illusions, at the same time suffusing his interiors with finely modulated light. A similar light creates the palpable atmosphere in the sequences of courtyards, passageways, and streets of the late 1650s that seem to have been his invention. De Hooch filled these interior and exterior spaces with scenes of everyday pleasures and domestic virtue. He represented tavern vice as well, though with understatement and ambiguity rather than the explicit imagery of his contemporaries Jan Steen and Frans van Mieris. De Hooch's approach to genre in his Delft period resembles that of his fellow citizen Jan Vermeer, and questions of creative priority for their particular themes, motifs, compositions, and spatial constructs remain unresolved.
Pieter de Hooch

35. Leisure Time in an Elegant Setting

Oil on canvas. Extended canvas 58.3 x 69.4 cm; original visible painted surface 55 x 66 cm. Signed at the lower left on the crosspiece of the chair: *P. D. Hooch*.

The painting is in fair condition. It was cleaned by William Suhr in 1953. When the canvas was relined sometime before that, the tacking edges of the original canvas, measuring 1 to 1.5 centimeters in width, apparently were unfolded onto the relining canvas. Old nail holes in these edges at the left, bottom, and right are evidence of this procedure; the absence of such holes along the top suggests that the top tacking edge may have been cut off. The relining canvas extends another 1 to 1.5 centimeters beyond all four edges of the original canvas, increasing the height and width of the paint surface by about 3 to 4 centimeters each. Some minor overall abrasion has affected the shadows in the faces of the figures, the hair, and the blues in the costumes; the whites, flesh tones, and deep blacks are well preserved. No overpaints are visible except in the tacking and relining edges.


Beneath a brightly lit window in the shadowy corner of a tall room, a man sits at a table, a dog at his feet, looking at the woman seated across from him. Daylight falls on his back and casts a strong reflection on the wall to his left, illuminating the clay pipe he holds in his right hand. A Persian rug covers the table, and on it sit an elegant salt, probably of silver, and a metallic plate holding a cut loaf of bread. The seated woman holds a half-full wine flute in her left hand and gestures with her right as she exchanges glances with the woman standing to her left, highlighted by the sun streaming in the window.

Fig. 35.1 Pieter de Wit, *Interior with a Portrait of Dirck Wirie*. Present location unknown. Photograph courtesy of Sotheby’s, London
The boy standing between the two women seems to be serving wine from a jug. On the back wall a large painting representing the union of Salmacis and Hermaphroditus hangs above a wooden cabinet called a kast. In the next room, glimpsed through the open door to the right, a man stands with his back to the viewer, facing an older man with a beard and a bald head who leans on a stick at the threshold of a door that leads outside, into the sunshine.

The sequence of rooms and the careful foreshortening of the left wall and the marble floor are conceived with the geometric lucidity characteristic of Pieter de Hooch’s best work. Although De Hooch had attained such clarity in the courtyards and more modest interiors he painted in Delft, he did not use it to construct grandly furnished rooms like the Lehman interior until the early 1660s, when he had moved to Amsterdam. Several of his interiors from this period are similar to the Lehman painting in theme, spatial construction, and figural composition, with a primary group of figures in the left middle ground and a view to a secondary space and scene at the right. Sutton has convincingly dated these paintings to about 1663–65, by comparison with De Hooch’s Family Portrait dated 1663 (Cleveland Museum of Art) and the Interior with a Man Drinking Wine and a Woman Lacing Her Bodice dated 1665 (Lord Barnard collection, Raby Castle, Darlington). All the rooms in these and De Hooch’s other contemporary paintings
tend to have more elaborate marble floor patterns and grander wooden furniture than his interiors of the mid-1650s. The same imposing kast, with the addition of a few brass rings on the drawer below the cornice, appears in De Hooch’s Interior with a Woman Knitting, a Serving Woman, and a Child in the Harold Samuel Collection, London (Fig. 35.2).12

Notable as well is the reappearance of the costly gold leather patterned wall covering in the Interior with a Portrait of Dirck Wilre by the little-known painter Pieter de Wit (Fig. 35.1).13 That painting, dated 1669, represents the director general of the Dutch Gold Coast of Africa in his official residence, the castle of Saint George at Elmina. The gold leather specialist H. A. B. van Soest, who noted the similarity between the wall coverings in the Lehman interior and the Wilre portrait, believes the leather pattern to have been created in Amsterdam about 1640.14 De Hooch covered the walls in three other interiors he painted about 1663–65 with similar gold leather wall coverings.15

As is so often the case in De Hooch’s work, the interactions between the figures here are cautiously suggestive. Although the smoking and drinking might subtly set an amorous tone, the painting of the legendary lovers Sal-macis and Hermaphrodite has been included as a direct allusion to love.16 On another level, Sutton has argued that the older man seen through the distant door at the right, juxtaposed with the high living depicted in the foreground, may allude to the biblical theme of the poor man Lazarus at the rich man’s door.17 There is no evidence, however, that the elderly man is actually in need, or that like Lazarus, he will be denied access. At most, the small subsidiary scene emphasizes the elegance of the home, and it may also allow a moralizing interpretation, without forcing it on viewers.

NOTE:
1. Note in the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documen-
tatie, The Hague. Suhr’s photograph of the painting taken during this cleaning is in the Robert Lehman Collection files. According to P. Sutton (1980, no. 56), a relining took place sometime before the 1953 cleaning.
2. According to Hofstede de Groot (1907, no. 187) and the unpublished papers of Clotilde Brière-Misme at the Rijks-
bureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague.
3. Hofstede de Groot 1892, p. 184, no. 47.
7. Ydema (1992, no. 414) identified the carpet as Persian.
8. Because the central figure and the small boy with the jug are standing and because she is wearing an apron, we might interpret these figures as servants. Closer inspection reveals, however, that beneath her apron the woman is wearing brightly colored and carefully trimmed costly silk garments, surely not the attire of a servant. Frantis (1993, pp. 95–114) has pointed out that to symbolize her virtue De Hooch sometimes depicted the mistress of the house wearing an apron and performing domestic duties. De Hooch also painted a number of works in which the mistress is shown working alongside her maid (see Frantis 1989 and Frantis 1992). Valentinier’s suggestion (1929, p. 277) that the painting may represent the artist himself with his two children is not supported by any evidence.
10. For example, An Officer and a Woman Conversing in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nürnberg; A Party of Five Figures in the Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga, Lisbon; and Card Players beside a Fireplace in the Louvre, Paris (ibid., nos. 55, 57, 58, pls. 58, 60, 61).
11. Ibid., p. 50, nos. 53, 69, pls. 73, 72, colorpl. 12. The Linen Closet, also dated 1663 (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; ibid., no. 52, pl. 56), gives further support to a dating of about 1663–65. It also includes a kast with fine workmanship similar to the one in the Lehman interior.
12. Ibid., no. 103, pl. 106; P. Sutton 1992, no. 33. This was first noted by Hofstede de Groot (1907, no. 187). Sutton has dated the Woman Knitting about 1673, for its many similarities with De Hooch's Woman and Child with a Parrot, which is dated 1673 (present location unknown; P. Sutton 1980, no. 102, pl. 103). An actual kast of the same type is in the Stedelijk Museum de Lakenhal in Leyden (1987); it is dated about 1650-60 and described as a kussenkast, or pillow chest, a name that refers not to its function as a linen cupboard but rather to its projecting door panels constructed of several kinds of fine wood. This piece is characteristic of a new mid-seventeenth-century fashion for oak cabinets luxuriously veneered with rosewood. See also note 11 above.

13. Vroom 1979, p. 8, ill., formerly on loan to the Rijksmuseum from the collection of Lord Harlech, sold Sotheby's, London, 6 July 1994, lot 61 (with a detailed description and color ill.).

14. See Vroom 1979, pp. 9, 12, n. 7. On the history and technique of gold leather production in the Netherlands, which involves silver leaf and yellow varnish rather than actual gold, see Van Soest 1975.

15. P. Sutton 1980, nos. 55 (Germanisches Museum, Nürnberg), 57 (Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga, Lisbon), 58 (Louvre, Paris), pls. 58, 60, 61.

16. P. Sutton (1980, pp. 43-45) discussed De Hooch's infrequent resort to pictures within pictures for commentary on the scene he was representing. Keyselitz was the first, in 1956, to analyze the appearance and function of paintings within Dutch genre paintings. Extensive interpretation of the moralizing uses of this device in genre painting is found in Amsterdam 1976 and subsequent publications. A number of representations of Salmacis and Hermaphrodite are listed in Pigler 1974, vol. 2, pp. 235-35, and Reid and Rohmann 1993, vol. 1, pp. 501-3. I thank Donald Posner for pointing out that Carracci's Farnese Ceiling is another instance where Hermaphrodite does not repel the advances of Salmacis.

17. P. Sutton 1980, no. 56.

Pieter de Hooch

36. A Couple Playing Cards,
with a Serving Woman

1975.1.143
Oil on canvas. 68.6 x 58.4 cm. Annotated by a later hand above the plinth of tiles on the back wall: PDH.

The canvas has been relined, and the painting is covered with a heavy layer of discolored varnish. The paint surface has suffered from flattening, abrasion, and retouching. Many contours and shadows and some light areas have been strengthened in past restorations; in particular, the screen at the right, the coat draped over it, the round portrait above it, and the clothing of the main figures have been abraded and retouched. The darkening of these and other retouchings in the shadows is visible to the naked eye.

PROVENANCE: Probably Mr. Pastor, Geneva; Count de Morony; his sale, S. J. Phillips, London, 20-21 June 1848, lot 81 (sold for £315); Count de Mory; his sale, Paris, 24 May 1852 (Lugt 20851), lot 10 (bought in at FF 18,800); Duke (formerly Count) de Morony; his sale, Paris, 31 May 1865 (Lugt 28564), lot 54 (to Baron Seiller for FF 12,700); Baron de Bournonville, Paris; George d'Epernon; Boesch, Vienna; sale, Christie's, London, 14 July 1888 (Lugt 47575), lot 166 (to Sedelmeyer for £220 10s.); Durand-Ruel and Sons, Paris and New York; Charles H. Senft, New York, 1896 (bought from Durand-Ruel); his sale, Anderson Galleries, New York, 28-29 March 1928, lot 21, ill. (to Scott and Fowles for $24,000); [Scott and Fowles, New York]; Joseph J. Kerrigan, New York, 1929; his wife, Esther Slater Kerrigan, New York; her sale, Parke-Bernet, New York, 8-10 January 1942, no. 279, ill.; [Scott and Fowles, New York]; their sale, Parke-Bernet, New York, 28 April 1946, no. 73, ill. Acquired by Robert Lehman by 1954.


Pieter de Hooch laid out this sparsely furnished room with his usual concern for geometric clarity, sharply foreshortening the left wall, tiled floor, and ceiling beams that define the space. The shadows of the tall casement window at the left and the small birdcage, dark window, and round male portrait placed above and behind the figures articulate the back wall, while the screen with a cloak hung on it acts as a repousoir in the right foreground.

Midway within the space a cavalier, seen from behind, plays cards with a young woman sitting facing him across a table. The maidservant standing to their right pours wine from a carafe into a glass, as the dog in the lower left corner watches her. De Hooch chose to represent the moment in the card game when the woman reveals her hand to the cavalier. Neither her hand nor his is clearly marked, but her discreet smile seems to announce her imminent victory. Pictorially she is already triumphant, luminous in the daylight on the back wall that leaves the man and servant woman largely in shadow.

A photograph of the painting taken during an earlier conservation treatment, probably carried out about 1928–29 (Fig. 36.1), indicates that the seated woman once shared the focus of attention with a man standing over her right shoulder, opposite her partner and apparently looking either at him or at the viewer. This fourth figure was probably painted out by the artist himself. The photograph also records other changes that show the artist's careful consideration of the composition. At first, the headgear of the woman pouring wine was broader than the tightly fitting cap of the final version. De Hooch reduced the illumination of the back wall below her right elbow by widening the skirt around her hips and thighs. In a similar adjustment, he covered a bright area on the wall between the two women with the strong diagonal shadow of the window's crossbar (though the window at the left lacks the horizontal bar that would logically throw the shadow). As a result of these modifications, the seated woman gained clarity, and the disclosure of her cards became the focus of the painting.

Although the activities of drinking and card playing could and frequently did evoke negative commentary from Dutch moralist writers in the seventeenth century,9 the mild-mannered attitudes of the protagonists and the carefully stabilized composition of this picture create an impression of intimacy and simple pleasure. The absence of explicit references to sin or its consequences and the indeterminate locale, which could be a quiet inn or a domestic room, leave the viewer a full range of options for response.10 Above all, De Hooch was inviting viewers to enjoy the scene and to savor the artistic skills involved in its representation.

The painting is difficult to date. The vanishing point, lower than that in De Hooch's pictures of the 1650s, is in keeping with his spatial constructions of the 1660s and later. The well-rounded forms of the servant woman, the repousoir placement of the man in shadow, the grouping of the figures around the table at the left, and the theme of the card game itself recall some of De Hooch's earliest inventions of the later 1650s.11 Yet the simplicity of the interior, the emphatic illumination of the back wall, the cast shadows of the casement window, the plain pattern of the tile floor, and the unadorned ceiling beams are characteristic of his domestic scenes of the second half of the 1660s.12

In spite of these parallels, Valentiner ventured an approximate date of 1670–75 or somewhat earlier for the painting. Sutton proposed an even later date of about 1675–80, primarily on the basis of the figure types. Indeed, Valentiner's date seems to be confirmed by the dainty oval face and elegant hands of the central
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woman. Figures like this appear frequently in De Hooch’s paintings of the early 1670s, often clad in similar freely arranged headgear and silky dresses with light, puffy sleeves. Therefore, Valentinier’s date of about 1670–75, or a bit earlier, is probably correct for the Couple Playing Cards.

EHB

NOTES:
1. From the condition report prepared by Rustin S. Levinson, 21 December 1978 (Paintings Conservation Department files, Metropolitan Museum).
2. According to the De Morny sale catalogues of 1848 and 1852 and reiterated by Blanc 1858 and Lagrange 1863. Hofstede de Groot 1907, no. 262, erroneously lists Pastor as the owner after the De Morny sale of 1865 with a purchase price of FF 18,800 that seems to refer, however, to the price at which the painting was bought in at the De Morny sale of 1852 (see note 4 below). Valentinier 1929, p. 285, also lists Pastor as the owner of the painting after the De Morny sales.
3. The sale price is according to James 1896–97, vol. 1, p. 592.
4. The De Morny sale catalogue of 1865 indicates that the painting was bought in at the 1852 sale. In 1858 Blanc merely reported the sale price of FF 18,800, but in 1859 Kramm stated his belief that the painting was bought in at FF 18,000 (sic). In his description of the De Morny cabinet of pictures in 1863, Lagrange noted that the work had been withdrawn in the 1852 sale at FF 18,800. Nevertheless, according to the annotated copy of the sale catalogue at the National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, the painting was sold for FF 18,800 to Et. Leroy. The annotator of the catalogue carefully noted which pictures were withdrawn. Et. Leroy bought several other lots in the sale, a few of them for another buyer, again according to the annotator. It therefore seems most likely that Leroy acted on behalf of the count de Morny when he “bought” the painting at FF 18,800. That price is also noted in Closotte Brière-Misme’s unpublished papers on De Hooch at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague.
5. The buyer and purchase price are recorded in an annotated copy of the sale catalogue at the National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, and are also noted in the unpublished papers of Brière-Misme (see note 4 above).
6. The Beurunville, d’Epernay, Boesch, and Durand-Ruel provenance is given in the Senff sale catalogue of 1928. Havard (1880, p. 131) gave the location of the painting, probably incorrectly, as the De Morny collection.
7. The buyer is noted in the copy of the sale catalogue at the Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie, The Hague (where the price is given as £210), and in Graves 1918–21, vol. 1, p. 211 (price, £220 10s.). The unpublished notes of Brière-Misme (see note 4 above) erroneously list the painting as sold with the Exeter collection at the same venue under the same lot number for £210, but on 14 June rather than 14 July. The Exeter sale took place on 9 June 1888, however, and did not contain paintings by De Hooch.
8. The photograph records a stage in the cleaning of the painting carried out by C. F. Louis de Wild. Certain repoussoirs (the man behind the table, the narrower skirt and broad-rimmed hat of the serving woman) are clearly visible. De Wild told me in September 1976 that he started removing a bed that had been added toward the right, and uncovered the figure of a man entering the room. That figure, however, was not well preserved, and he therefore repainted the bed over him.
9. P. Sutton (1980, pp. 43, 68, n. 27) discusses other depictions of card games by De Hooch with moralizing intent. See also Amsterdam 1976, no. 35.
10. P. Sutton (1980, pp. 42–45) discusses De Hooch’s occasional use of emblematic references to make explicit contrasts between reprehensible and morally correct behavior and notes his frequent refusal to specify such commentary.
11. The disposition of the figures in space is indebted to De Hooch’s paintings of men and women drinking or playing cards of 1658 and thereabouts; see, for example, Sutton 1980, nos. 25 (private collection; Switzerland; ca. 1657–58), 26 (Louvre, Paris; dated 1658), 28 (Royal Collection, Buckingham Palace, London; dated 1658), 29 (National Gallery, London; ca. 1658), pls. 22, 23, 26, 27, colorpl. 6. De Hooch must first have developed the grouping with its striking repoussoir device in the Card Players in a Swiss private collection (ibid., no. 25), at about the same time Jan Vermeer applied it more boldly in his undated Officer and Laughing Woman in the Frick Collection, New York (Blankert 1978, no. 3). De Hooch then used modified versions of it in his newly airy and lucid spaces of about 1658 (P. Sutton 1980, nos. 26, 28, 29), which may have influenced Vermeer’s works, for example the Woman and Man Drinking Wine in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin (Blankert 1978, no. 8). De Hooch was probably still working in Delft, Vermeer’s hometown, in this period, and the exact contributions of each artist to the creation of the repoussoirs or their rational habitats cannot be specified. For a lucid history and a reasonable view of the question of inventive priority, see P. Sutton 1980, pp. 23, 61–62, n. 22.
12. The distinctive light–shadow grid of the casement window, for example, appears on the back wall in the Mother and Child by a Cradle in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, and the one in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, and in the Woman Plucking a Duck in the Muzeum Narodowe, Gdansk, all three of which P. Sutton (1980, nos. 71–73, pls. 74–76) plausibly dates about 1665–68 by comparison with the Man Drinking Wine and a Woman Lacing Her Bodice in the collection of Lord Barnard, Raby Castle, Darlington (ibid., no. 69), which is dated 1665. Sutton rightly considers a similar painting, the Woman before a Mirror, with Two Women by a Hearth (present location unknown; ibid., no. 81, pl. 167), which
he tentatively accepts as De Hooch’s, as close to his work of the late 1660s. By contrast, the interior furnishings, costumes, and hairdos in De Hooch’s interior scenes dateable from about 1670 on tend to be fancier.

13. For instance the elegant Woman and a Young Man with a Letter (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; dated 1670), Man Playing a Lute and a Woman Singing (location unknown; probably 1670), and Music Party (Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen; ca. 1674); see P. Sutton 1980, nos. 94, 95, 108, pls. 96, 98, 111, colorpl. 15.

14. Comparable paintings dated or datable about 1668–75 include A Woman Reading a Letter and a Man at a Window in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm; Portrait of the Jacott-Hoppesack Family in a private collection, England; An Officer Paying a Woman in a Stable in the Metropolitan Museum, New York; and A Musical Party with Twelve Figures in the Wellington Museum, Apsley House, London (P. Sutton 1980, nos. 85, 92, 111, 117, pls. 88, 95, 114, 120). A comparable balance between early simplicity and later elegance, of theme as well as interior design, is struck in the Woman with a Basin, a Man Dressing at the Metropolitan Museum, which also features the casement window pattern. P. Sutton (1980, no. 79, pl. 82 [cut down]) plausibly dates this work about 1667–70. The X radiograph showing that the man who was painted out of the Lehman picture wore a fancy scarf characteristic of the 1670s does not clarify the dating.
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Doménikos Theotokópoulos, called El Greco
Crete ca. 1541–Toledo 1614

Little is known of El Greco's early years, except that he was born in Crete and apparently lived there until 1566, when he moved to Venice. He remained in Venice until 1570, studying the works of Titian, Tintoretto, and other masters of Venetian painting. In September 1570, he appeared in Rome. There he associated with artists and scholars in the orbit of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese. In 1576 he left for Spain, settling in Toledo, where he spent the rest of his life. His earliest works in Toledo for the cathedral (Disrobing of Christ) and Santo Domingo el Antiguo are remarkable for their personal interpretation and fusion of diverse sources: post-Byzantine icon painting; Venetian art, especially Titian and Tintoretto; and Roman maniera painters working in the style of Michelangelo. Recent discoveries of El Greco's fragmentary writings show that he was well read in contemporary art theory. His very personal, complex style was placed at the service of the elite group of Spanish theologians who were his principal patrons. El Greco's late works express the religious aspirations and beliefs of his clients in a moving, highly abstracted style.

El Greco

37. Christ Carrying the Cross

1975.1.145

Oil on canvas, 105 x 79 cm. Signed on the cross above the left hand in cursive Greek letters (partly abraded): doménikos theotokópoulos eposièi.

The canvas has been lined in the past using aqueous adhesive. Despite a sizable repair in the blue cloak and flattening of the surface texture, color and tonal values are still remarkably in keeping. In 1978 the painting was superficially cleaned. Lifting paint was set down and losses in the background and the edges were inpainted.

PROVENANCE: Javier de Quinto, conde de Quinto (d. 1860), Madrid and Paris; condesa de Quinto, Paris (sale catalogue 1862 [no auction held], lot 68[?]); Sir William Stirling Maxwell (1818–1878), Pollok, Keir, and Cadder, Scotland; General Archibald Stirling; Lieutenant Colonel William Stirling. Acquired by Robert Lehman in 1953.

EXHIBITED: London 1895–96, no. 101; London 1913–14, no. 125; Edinburgh 1951, no. 20; New York 1953–56; New Haven 1956, no. 5; Paris 1957, no. 23, pl. 31; Cincinnati 1959, no. 137, ill.


Fig. 37.1 Sebastiano del Piombo, Christ Carrying the Cross. State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg, 177
Christ Carrying the Cross was one of El Greco’s most popular compositions. Wetley lists eleven versions as partly or wholly by El Greco and another ten by followers, imitators, and copyists. The composition, which is common in northern Italian painting of the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, appears to have been introduced into Spain through the work of Sebastiano del Piombo. His narrative version of the subject (Prado, Madrid) and the reduced devotional picture (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg) are both first recorded in Spanish collections.

The Saint Petersburg painting (Fig. 37.1) was commissioned by Fernando de Silva, conde de Cifuentes,
and completed in 1537. Both it and the picture in Madrid were described in the Escorial in 1626 by Cassiano dal Pozzo, who mentioned that the reduced version was “especially dear to Philip II.” That the Saint Petersburg composition was known far and wide in Spain is shown by several works by Luis de Morales, who worked in Badajoz during the period 1550–70.

Nevertheless, as Cossío pointed out, El Greco substantially modified the composition and significance of the motif. In Sebastiano’s Saint Petersburg picture, Christ is oppressed by the weight of the cross he carries on his shoulder. In El Greco’s interpretation, he stands erect and gently embraces the cross, while his eyes look heavenward. Thus, the cross is transformed from an instrument of martyrdom into a medium of salvation through sacrifice. The beautiful expression and the almost gentle embrace of the cross make this a powerful representation of Christ’s willing sacrifice for the redemption of mankind, and appear to have struck a responsive chord in El Greco’s clientele.

The dating of the picture is an unsettled question. Cossío, the first to publish it, assigned a date of about 1594–1604, while Lafuente and others posited a date of about 1590–95. Wethey has argued for a date of about 1585–90; Waterhouse dated it in the early 1580s. The reasonably normative proportions of the body especially noticeable in the face and hands, the restrained expression, the concern for the sense of volume, and the crisp naturalism of the crown of thorns and the cross all point to a date within ten years of El Greco’s arrival in Spain in 1577. Thus, it is likely that the Lehman picture is El Greco’s first version of the subject, upon which the other examples of Wethey’s types I and II depend.

NOTES:
1. In Legendre and Hartmann 1937, no. 181; Legendre 1947, p. 101; Camón Aznar 1950, pp. 140, 163, no. 126, fig. 215; and Camón Aznar 1970, pp. 368, 1345, no. 131, fig. 245, the painting was wrongly listed as being in Athens.
2. For these paintings by Sebastiano and related works, see Prado 1995, pp. 99–104.
5. See, for example, the painting in the Colegio del Patriarca, Valencia (Benito Domenech 1980, no. 124, ill.).

El Greco

38. Saint Jerome as Scholar

1975.1.146

Oil on canvas. 108 x 89 cm.

The canvas support was prepared with a thin white ground and reddish brown imprimatura. The dimensions of the painting have been altered; both the right and left edges of the original paint surface have been folded over to form tacking margins. The area along the bottom edge has been severely damaged and may have been extended. There are two tears on the left side of the canvas, in the background and in the cloak. The painting has been lined using aqueous adhesive. The lining treatment has caused flattening of the impasto and emphasized the impression of the fabric weave on the surface. Damage caused by lining and cleanings in the past has affected the paint film. Some of the vigor of the brushwork in the face and hair has been lost.


LITERATURE: Justi 1888, p. 79; Sanpere y Miquel 1902, p. 41; Lafond 1906, p. 85; Cossío 1908, pp. 96–97, 565, no. 85; Mayer 1911, p. 86; London 1913–14, p. 313; Mayer 1916, pp. 322–23, fig. 7; W. Cook 1924, pp. 51–54, fig. 1; Mayer 1926a, p. 14, no. 277, pl. 62; San Román 1927, pp. 299, 301; Lehman 1928, no. 101; Byron and Rice 1930, pl. 84; Mayer in Valentiner 1930b, pl. 86; Mayer 1931, pp. 130, 135, pl. 99; Legendre and Hartmann 1937, no. 444; Camón Aznar 1950, pp. 881, 1381, no. 502, fig. 687; MacLaren 1952, p. 18; Gaya Nuño 1958, p. 201, no. 1362; Ipser 1960, p. 372; Sindona 1961, ill. p. 177; Wethey 1962, vol. 1, pp. 52, 59, fig. 288, vol. 2, p. 131, no. 241; Xydis 1964, pp. 62–65, fig. 41; Frick Collection 1968, p. 312; Manzini 173
Saint Jerome (ca. 342–420), one of the Four Doctors of the Latin Church, is famous as the translator of the Bible from Greek into Latin (the Vulgate). His cult became popular in the fifteenth century when a religious order was founded in his name. Thereafter, images of his activities as a scholar and penitent began to proliferate.

This painting was first published in 1888 by Justi, who suggested that the sitter was Cardinal Gaspar de Quiroga (1512–1594), archbishop of Toledo. In 1905 Beck proposed a new identification, Cardinal Luigi Cornaro, based on an old inscription on the book in another version of the portrait in the National Gallery, London. These identifications were challenged by Cossío in 1908 on the basis of comparison to portraits of Quiroga and Cornaro that bear no resemblance to El Greco's work. Following a suggestion in the catalogue of the National Gallery, he proposed that the subject was Saint Jerome. This idea was confirmed by San Román's publication of the 1614 inventory of El Greco's possessions, where two entries refer to paintings of Saint Jerome as cardinal. In a second inventory of 1621, this of the possessions of El Greco's son, Jorge Manuel, two paintings, perhaps the same ones, are also identified as depicting Saint Jerome.

It has sometimes been suggested that the artist used a model for the figure of the saint. Cook noted a certain resemblance to the Portrait of a Cardinal (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), the sitter for which is usually identified as Cardinal Fernando Niño de Guevara but has been reidentified as Cardinal Bernardo de Sandoval y Rojas.3 Xydís proposed identifying the sitter for the Lehman painting as Cardinal Sandoval on the basis of a comparison to a portrait by Luis Tristán in the cathedral of Toledo. None of these hypotheses are convincing; rather it seems that El Greco infused a characteristic Saint Jerome type with exceptional spiritual vitality.

Saint Jerome as Scholar is one of five versions attributed entirely or partly to El Greco. The finest is the signed painting in the Frick Collection, New York (Fig. 38.1), which is approximately the same size as the Lehman painting and usually considered to be somewhat earlier in date.4 The differences between the two works are most evident in the color: in the Frick version the saint wears a robe of orangish red, while in the Lehman version the robe is of a more reddish hue, with more luminous white highlights. There are also small differences in the treatment of the head and face and a different treatment of the beard, which is longer on one side than the other in the Frick version and more evenly cut in the Lehman picture. The superb quality of execution leaves no doubt, however, about the authenticity of the Lehman picture, which in the opinion of most scholars appears to date to the last period of El Greco's life (1600–1614).

The Lehman painting has often been associated with the work listed in the 1621 inventory of Jorge Manuel's possessions. San Román confusingly identified number 131 of the inventory — "Un San Jeronimo de Cardenal, de bara y bara y terza" (ca. 84 x 111 cm) — with the painting in the Frick Collection, which he said was owned by the marqués del Arco in Madrid.5 The Arco painting, however, was the one acquired by Philip Lehman. The confusion was compounded by San Román's identification of inventory number 162 — "Un San Jeronimo de
Cardenal, del mismo tamaño” (of the same size [as the painting described in the preceding entry], or “tres quartas de alto y dos terzias de ancho,” ca. 63 x 55 cm) – with the Lehman painting, which he believed was previously owned by the marqués de Castro Serna. The Castro Serna picture, now owned by José Vázquez-Fisa, Madrid, does in fact measure 64 by 54 centimeters, and may therefore be the one described in the inventory, although the dimensions also conform to the version in the Musée Bonnat, Bayonne, which, however, may have been reduced in size. This mistake originated with Mayer in 1926 and was repeated by Camón Aznar in 1950.

Attempts have been made to identify both the Frick and Lehman paintings with number 131 of the 1621 inventory. The pictures are too close in size, however, to permit a definite conclusion. Also, it should be noted that according to the conservation report of 1 December 1978, the Lehman picture was originally somewhat wider, which would reduce further the discrepancy between it and the Frick painting (which measures 111 x 96 cm). Frequently, the dimensions in the inventory are qualified by the words “de alto” (high) and “de ancho” (wide). When these words occur, the vertical measurements precede the horizontal without exception. Unless a mistake was made in transcription, number 131 measured about 84 centimeters high by 111 centimeters wide and therefore corresponded to neither of the two pictures. Yet it is admittedly difficult to envision this vertical composition in a horizontal format, and the possibility remains that either the scribe or San Román erred when recording the dimensions of the picture.

Although on the basis of the inventory entry this picture is usually called Saint Jerome as Cardinal, it is more precisely titled Saint Jerome as Scholar. The subject of Saint Jerome as a scholar originated in northern Italy during the second half of the fourteenth century, inspired by Johannes Andreae’s Liber de laudibus S. Hieronymi (1348). As Meiss has noted, Andreae “stressed not only the saint’s learning and piety, but, with far less reason, his prominence in the Church as a cardinal.” This image became popular during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and was interpreted with considerable flexibility. The earliest images of the saint in his study show him with a long, flowing white beard, seated in a small room with books and manuscripts and pointing to or reading a text (see, for example, Tomaso da Modena’s Saint Jerome in San Niccolò, Treviso). This type continued to be used until late in the fifteenth century (see Ghirlandaio’s Saint Jerome in the Ognissanti,
Gradually, however, variations were introduced. In Dürer's influential woodcut of 1511 and engraving of 1514 (Bartsch 114, 60; Meder 228, 57; Panofsky 334, 67), Saint Jerome, still an old, bearded man, is represented and is accompanied by the attribute of a lion. In the later print a skull is depicted, alluding to the saint's virtue as a penitent. Sometimes, as in Dürer's woodcut of 1492 (Meder 227, Panofsky 414), the saint is represented as a younger man and beardless, removing the thorn from the lion's paw. During the sixteenth century, images of Jerome increasingly emphasized his penitence rather than his accomplishments as a scholar (see, for example, Lorenzo Lotto's *Saint Jerome* in the Hamburger Kunsthalle). 11

In certain respects, El Greco's version returns to the original iconography. Both the saint's long white beard and his depiction in the act of reading a text are faithful to that tradition. As Jordan has pointed out, the composition of the hands and book resembles that in the *Portrait of Francisco de Pisa* (Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth). 12 Yet the elimination of almost all the scholar's paraphernalia from his *Saint Jerome* marks a departure from most depictions of the subject. Also unusual is the gaunt, haggard look of the face, which is, however, common to scenes of Saint Jerome in penitence. It can therefore be suggested that El Greco was attempting a novel fusion of the two most important facets of Saint Jerome— as scholar and as penitent. El Greco did in fact use a similar facial type in his representations of Saint Jerome in penitence (National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh, and National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.). 13 The suppression of the background cluttered with books and implements of the scholar contributes to the ascetic aspect of the picture, and compels the viewer to concentrate attention on the powerful, intense face of the saint, which still seems to bear traces of his trials in the wilderness.

Diego de Velázquez y Silva
Seville 1599–Madrid 1660

Velázquez was born in Seville and was the apprentice of Francisco Pacheco, a conservative painter and erudite writer on art. His early works are original interpretations of naturalist paintings from northern Italy and the Low Countries. In 1623 he was appointed royal painter by Philip IV, whom he served faithfully as an artist and courtier until his death. Velázquez made two trips to Italy: in 1629–30 to improve his art and in 1648–50 to collect works of sculpture and painting for the royal palace. After 1640 he became increasingly occupied with court duties and painted relatively few pictures.

In his mature years Velázquez was primarily a portraitist and only occasionally painted other subjects. His approach was based on the observation of nature and natural effects, which he rendered with an original technique based on a sketchy, notational use of the brush. His interest in the inherent expressive qualities of light and color was unsurpassed by other painters of his time.
Figure 39.1 Velázquez, María Teresa, Infanta of Spain. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, GG353


Workshop of Velázquez

39. María Teresa, Infanta of Spain

1975.1.147
Oil on canvas. 48 x 37 cm.

The painting support is a plainly woven, medium-weight canvas with a thread count of 12 per square centimeter in both warp and weft. The tacking edges at the top, bottom, and left have been cropped; on the right the tacking edge has been opened out and the painting has been extended by 2.5 centimeters with a later addition. Cupping is seen at the top and bottom, and light cupping at the left and right, indicating that the painting was not originally significantly larger than its current dimensions at the top, bottom, and left. The canvas addition is much finer and more regularly woven than the original, and it was primed more densely and uniformly with lead white. The painting has been lined using an aqueous adhesive onto a medium-weight canvas, and is attached with tacks to a four-member keyable stretcher. The work has also suffered some abrasion, and lining has caused some slight motting of the impasto. There is some localized retouching over abrasion on the face, especially the cheeks. Some of the abrasion in the dress has been retouched. The painting of the addition at the right extends somewhat onto the original.

Figure 39.2 Velázquez, María Teresa, Infanta of Spain. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Jules Bache Collection, 1949 49.7.43
The infanta María Teresa, daughter of Philip IV and Isabella of Bourbon, was born on 20 September 1638. On 9 June 1660 she was married to Louis XIV of France. She died in Paris on 30 July 1683.

This portrait was unknown until it appeared on the Paris art market in 1908 as by Velázquez and was published by Beruete the following year. Beruete mistakenly identified the sitter as Mariana of Austria, the niece of Philip IV, who married the king in 1649. In 1905, unbeknownst to Beruete, Zimmermann had clarified the confusion between the infanta and her stepmother, who were only three years apart in age and somewhat resembled each other.² By correctly identifying portraits in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (by Velázquez; Fig. 39.1),³ and the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (a workshop replica),⁴ as of María Teresa, Zimmermann made possible the correct identification of the sitter for the Lehman portrait. Mayer recognized her as María Teresa in 1913, and all later writers have agreed with him.

Although the preponderance of scholarly opinion has held, and continues to hold, the view that the painting is an autograph work of Velázquez, stylistic and technical analysis argues strongly for the view taken in 1964 by Camón Aznar, who ascribed it to the master’s disciple and son-in-law, Juan Bautista Martínez del Mazo (ca. 1610/15–1667). Camón’s proposition is worthy of consideration because the execution here is weaker than in authentic works by the master. A useful point of comparison is Velázquez’s portrait of the same sitter in the Jules Bache Collection at The Metropolitan Museum of Art (Fig. 39.2).⁵ In general, there is both a firmness and subtlety of execution in the Bache version that is lacking in the Lehman picture. The weakness stands out in the hair ornament, which is painted with desultory strokes that fail to coalesce into a convincing image of the object. Another problematic area is the bodice of the dress, where strands of pearls meander over the surface. Finally, the face of the infanta is somewhat flat and lacking in volume when compared to the Bache version, where the shadows and highlights are sensitively modeled.

That said, there is no extant work by Velázquez which corresponds to the portrayal of the infanta in the Lehman picture. It has been noted by several authors that the infanta appears to be somewhat younger in this portrait than in the Bache portrait. This suggests that the Lehman work might be based on a lost prototype, inasmuch as only Velázquez was permitted to make portraits from life of the royal family.

Although the attribution to Mazo can be regarded only as provisional until a full study of his work is published, that the author of the Lehman portrait was a member of Velázquez’s workshop seems likely given his knowledge of the master’s technical procedures.

NOTEs:
1. Knoedler invoice dated 28 February 1913 (Robert Lehman Collection files).
2. Zimmermann 1905, pp. 185–89.
4. López-Rey 1965, no. 387, pl. 33.
Francisco de Goya y Lucientes

Fuendetodos 1746–Bordeaux 1828

Goya was born in the village of Fuendetodos, near Zaragoza. His early training was with a local Zaragoza painter, José Lujoán or Luzán. After a stay in Italy in 1770–71, he returned to Zaragoza. In 1773 he married Josefa Bayeu, sister of the successful painter Francisco Bayeu, who arranged for his employment at the Real Fábrica de Tapices de Santa Barbara (Royal Tapestry Factory) in Madrid. Between 1775 and 1792 Goya designed sixty-three tapestry cartoons and executed commissions for important noble families. In 1789 he was appointed first painter to King Charles IV.

Goya's work before 1792 conforms to the main to the prevailing international Rococo style. In 1792–93, however, he suffered an almost mortal illness, which left him deaf. Thereafter, he began to explore a private world of the imagination which complemented his public commissions. In the later years of his long life, Goya turned increasingly inward in search of inspiration for his art. During the 1790s he also began the serious practice of etching, of which he became a great master.

Goya lived quietly in Madrid until the outbreak in 1808 of the Peninsular War, the brutality of which he recorded in such famous works as the Executions of 3 May 1808 (Prado, Madrid) and the print series Disasters of the War. He remained in Spain until 1824, when, for political reasons, he went into exile in France. He died in France in 1828.

During his long, productive career Goya explored many of the themes which have come to be regarded as characteristic of the modern age. To express these new ideas, he invented a style which broke with the classical tradition and achieved a remarkable and still palpable emotional power.

Goya

40. Condesa de Altamira and Her Daughter, María Agustina

1975.1.148
Oil on canvas. 195 x 115 cm. Inscribed in the lower margin: “LA EX.ª MA S.ª D.ª MARIA IGNACIA ALVAREZ DE TOLEDO MARQUESA DE ASTORGA CONDESA DE ALTAMIRA Y LA S. D. MARIA AGUSTINA OSORIO ALVAREZ DE TOLEDO SV HJANCI. EN 21 DE FEBRERO DE 1787.”

Painted on a fabric of tabby weave, the painting has previously been glue-lined and the edges removed. The old lining treatment resulted in the weave being impressed into the paint layer and the flattening of the paint impasto. The ground is beige in coloration and thinly applied. The painting has been unevenly cleaned and coated in the past and is now obscured by irregular areas of discolored varnish. The paint layer itself is worn and eroded, especially in the arm, face, and hair of the countess and in the shadows of her dress. Excessive surface grime was removed from the painting in 1978, and it was sprayed with several coats of varnish.

PROVENANCE: Commissioned by Vicente Joaquín Osorio Moscoso y Guzmán (1756–1816), eleventh conde de Altamira and marqués de Astorga; by descent to Vicente Pio Osorio de Moscoso Ponce de León (1801–1864), conde de Altamira; by descent to his daughter, María Rosalía Luisa, duquesa de Baena, until about 1870; marqués de Corvera, Madrid, 1900; Léopold Goldschmidt, Paris, about 1903; Count Pastré, Paris; [F. Kleinberger Galleries, Paris], about 1910. Acquired by Philip Lehman from Kleinberger in October 1911.


LITERATURE: Lafond 1902, p. 123, no. 70; Von Loga 1903, p. 192, no. 171; Calvert 1908, p. 131, no. 78, pl. 29; Bieger-Wasservogel 1912, ill. p. 14; Stokes 1914, p. 337, no. 221; Beruete y Moret 1916, pp. 24–25; Beruete y Moret 1922, no. 122; Mayer 1923, p. 187, no. 207; W. Cook 1924, pp. 64–67, fig. 17; Desparmet Fitz-Gerald 1928–50, vol. 2, p. 60, no. 341; Lehman 1928, no. 102; Salas 1931, p. 176; Sánchez Cantón 1949, pp. 76–77, pl. 11; Sánchez Cantón 1951, p. 42;
European Paintings

No. 40
As noted in the autograph inscription, the sitters are María Ignacia Álvarez, condesa de Altamira (d. 1795), and her daughter, María Agustina. Goya had come in contact with the Altamira family about 1786, when he painted the portrait (paid for on 29 January 1787; now Banco de España, Madrid) of María Ignacia’s husband, Vicente Joaquín Osorio Moscoso y Guzmán, eleventh conde de Altamira and marqués de Astorga, as part of a series of portraits of the directors of the Banco Nacional de San Carlos. Subsequently, he executed portraits of two of Altamira’s four sons, Vicente Osorio de Moscoso (private collection, Switzerland) and Manuel Osorio Manrique de Zúñiga (Metropolitan Museum, New York), as well as the Lehman portrait. Glendinning suggested in 1981 that the portrait of Manuel Osorio may have failed to please the family, which led to the termination of their patronage of the artist.

The date of the Lehman portrait depends on the age of the child, who as the inscription states was born on 21 February 1787. There is no agreement on her precise age, however. Trapier, who believed the child to be less than one year old, dated the portrait to 1787, while Cook, Gudiol, and Gassier and Wilson, who saw her as somewhat older, assigned a date of 1788. Mayer and Desparmet Fitz-Gerald unaccountably placed the date as late as 1789. In the absence of concrete evidence, it is prudent to date the work to late 1787 or early 1788.

As Sánchez Cantón and Glendinning have pointed out, the patronage of the Altamira was important to the advancement of Goya’s career in the 1780s, which eventually led to his appointment as court painter in 1789. Glendinning also drew attention to the fact that the count of Altamira was heir to the great picture collection of Diego Messía Felípe de Guzmán, marqués de Leganés (d. 1655). The symmetrical, balanced composition of the Lehman double portrait may have been inspired by the Renaissance and Baroque masterpieces in the collection. The work of Anton Raphael Mengs (1728–1779), who set the fashion for portraiture at the court of Spain in the late eighteenth century, was equally important, and its influence is especially evident in the brilliant treatment of the costume.

According to Salas, the existence of this picture was first recorded by Valentín Carderera in notes written between 1834 and 1840, when it was still in the Altamira family’s possession. Much of the collection was sold about 1870 by the heirs of the count of Altamira in order to settle his estate. The provenance given by Desparmet Fitz-Gerald and repeated by Trapier is mistaken, and apparently results from the confusion of the Lehman portrait with a double portrait of María Luisa of Spain and her son.

JB

NOTES:
1. Letter of 6 August 1992 from Mary Crawford Volk (Robert Lehman Collection files), attached to which is a copy of the relevant page from the count’s will of 25 February 1864 from the Madrid notarial archive.
2. Kleinberger invoice dated 16 October 1911 (Robert Lehman Collection files).
5. Salas 1931, p. 176. When Salas published the notes, they were in the possession of a descendant of Carderera, Dolores Pavía de Amunátegui, Madrid.
GREAT BRITAIN

Eighteenth Century
George Romney

Dalton-on-Furness, Lancashire 1734–Kendal, Cumbria 1802

George Romney was a glamorous and highly successful society portrait painter. Sir Ellis Waterhouse has aptly written that he rendered “all those neutral qualities which are valued by Society – health, youth, good looks, an air of breeding.” He was also a prolific draftsman of historical subjects, most of which are now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, and the Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven.

After eight years in the workshop of his cabinetmaker father, two years’ apprenticeship to a local Cumbrian painter, Christopher Steele, and six years working in Kendal, principally painting portraits-in-little in the style of Arthur Devis, Romney settled in London in 1762, where he was to win premiums for history paintings from the Society of Artists. In 1773 he traveled to Italy, remaining there until 1775, chiefly in Rome. On his return to London he took the fine house previously occupied by Francis Cotes and became the only rival of Sir Joshua Reynolds and Thomas Gainsborough. Due partly to his sensitivity to criticism and partly to the antagonism between him and Reynolds, he never exhibited at the Royal Academy. Introspective by temperament, he grew increasingly disenchanted with the fashionable world and the schedule he was obliged to maintain, and sought solace in his own imagination. Infatuated with the beautiful Emma Hart, he painted her some fifty times in a variety of graceful and sentimental attitudes, and he devoted his evenings to sketching historical compositions (which were never realized) in a style that developed from the Neoclassical to the Sublime.

George Romney

41. Lady Lemon (1747–1823)

1975.1.235

Oil on canvas. 127 x 101.6 cm.

The canvas has been lined. The ground is cream-colored. The head is solidly painted; the skirt is fully modeled and quite thickly painted; the ruffles are more sketchily handled, with slight impasto, and the hair and background are both sketchily and thinly painted: the canvas weave is apparent at the top right. The dress is white in color, with a blue sash, bows, and ribbon. There is a pentimento in the landscape on the left, where a slender tree trunk appears to have been painted out a little to the right of the existing tree. There are a few retouchings, the impasto has been very slightly flattened, and there is slight abrasion in the clouds at the top left. Otherwise the painting is in good condition. The varnish has not discolored.

PROVENANCE: Commissioned in 1788 by the sitter’s husband, Sir William Lemon, first baronet, Carcowl, Cornwall; by descent through his youngest daughter, Caroline Matilda, to his grandson Lieutenant Colonel Arthur Tremayne (1827–1905), Carcowl, 1882–1904 or later;[1] [Lewis and Simmons, London], 1919;[2] [Duveen Brothers, New York]; Edward T. Stotesbury, Philadelphia, by 1932;[3] Stotesbury sale, Parke-Bernet, New York, 18 November 1944, lot 8, ill. Purchased by Robert Lehman at the Stotesbury sale in 1944.


The sitter, Jane Buller, the eldest daughter of James Buller, of Morval, Cornwall, about twenty miles west of Plymouth, was born on 19 July 1747. She married William Lemon (1748–1824), of Carcowl, near Penryn, between Truro and Falmouth in the southwest of Cornwall, on 3 April 1771. The couple had two sons and

Fig. 41.2 Sir Joshua Reynolds, *Selina, Lady Skipwith* (1732–1832). Photograph © The Frick Collection, New York

eight daughters. Lemon had inherited a fortune from his grandfather, who had developed the copper mining industry in Cornwall. He was M.P. for Penryn from 1770 to 1774, was created a baronet on 24 May 1774, and sat as M.P. for Cornwall for fifty years, from 1774 to 1824, becoming the “father of the House.” Lady Lemon died the year before her husband, on 17 June 1823.¹

Lemon commissioned half-length (actually three-quarter-length, as the images extend to below the knees) portraits of himself (Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes, Havana; Fig. 41.1) and his wife from George Romney in 1788, when Lady Lemon was forty years old. Lady Lemon had six sittings during the London season, on 27 May; 4, 9, 18, and 23 June; and 1 July.⁵ Romney received one hundred guineas from Lemon for the two pictures in July 1788, and they were dispatched on 25 August.⁶ Lady Lemon sat for Romney again on 25 May 1795, but for what purpose is unknown.

Posing the sitter in an armchair against a landscape background became a common convention in later Georgian British portraiture. The composition is pyramidal, and the ample folds of the dress, beneath which the shape of the legs is apparent, fill out the lower part of the canvas. The expression is gentle and appealing. Weakness of construction, not uncommon in Romney’s work, is apparent in the sitter’s right sleeve, which does not hang comfortably from the shoulder, and in the positioning of the chair arms. The landscape background is integrated with the portrait through the strong form of the tree trunk on the right, the branch that runs along the top of the canvas, and the foliage, which seems to echo Lady Lemon’s bushy hair. The long vertical brushstrokes on the left represent a waterfall, a picturesque feature enlivening the landscape. There are some bluish tones in passages above the chair arm.

The portrait is an especially attractive example of Romney’s three-quarter-lengths of women set against landscape backgrounds, with or without intervening balustrades, of the mid- to later 1780s.⁸ The folds of the dress are now subtler and softer than in his grand full-lengths of the 1770s and very early 1780s, when his imagination was dominated by the contrapposto and
graceful but elaborate flowing draperies of classical sculpture. In style the picture is close to Reynolds's work of the same period, represented by the portrait of Lady Skipwith in the Frick Collection, New York, painted in 1787 (Fig. 41.2).

JH

NOTES:
1. Arthur Tremayne succeeded to the lemon estate of Carcraw by the will of his uncle Sir Charles Lemon, the second and last baronet, in March 1868. He lent Lady Lemon to the Royal Academy exhibition in 1882, and it was listed as his property by Ward and Roberts in 1904.
2. The date of the portrait's sale from Carcraw is not known. Arthur Tremayne's son, William (1862–1930), succeeded in 1905. It seems likely that the sale occurred following the First World War, at the time the picture is recorded in the possession of Lewis and Simmons. Silver from Carcraw was sold at Christie's on 3 March 1923.
3. He lent it to the Philadelphia exhibition that year.

Henry Raeburn

Sir Henry Raeburn
Stockbridge, near Edinburgh 1756–Edinburgh 1823

Henry Raeburn, the spiritual successor to Allan Ramsay (1713–1784), was perhaps the greatest of all Scottish portraitists, and a man prominent in the lively intellectual, social, and sporting life of early nineteenth-century Edinburgh. In about 1780 he married a wealthy widow. Raeburn spent three years abroad, from 1784 to 1786, probably chiefly in Rome. When he returned he settled in Edinburgh New Town, building a grand studio for himself in 1798. In about 1813 he began to develop streets of terrace housing on his wife's estate, just to the west of the then built-up area of Edinburgh.

Largely self-taught as a painter, which accounts for his idiosyncratic technique, Raeburn worked directly on the canvas without preliminary drawings. His bold, personal style is easily recognizable from his square, flat brushwork, allied to strong, dramatic modeling and a high key of color. He had little interest in elaborate composition and concentrated on producing vivid and penetrating likenesses of his independent-minded fellow Scots. After the death in 1810 of John Hoppner, Sir Thomas Lawrence's principal rival as a portraitist of the Romantic age, Raeburn began to exhibit regularly in London, but he decided not to move from Edinburgh. He was elected an associate of the Royal Academy in 1812 and a full academician in 1815, and he played an important part in the formation of the Royal Scottish Academy, which was finally established after his death. Raeburn was knighted during George IV's visit to Edinburgh in 1822.

4. For biographical information, see Burke's Peerage and Namier and Brooke 1964, vol. 3, pp. 34–35.
6. Ibid., vol. 2, p. 93. Romney raised his prices in 1787, and his charge in 1788 for a portrait of this size would have been sixty guineas. The discrepancy is hard to explain, since a deposit, if paid, would normally have been half the fee.
7. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 130.
8. See also Mrs. John Matthews, 1786 (Tate Gallery, London; ibid., vol. 2, p. 101); Miss Kitty Calcraft, 1787 (ibid., vol. 2, p. 23; last recorded in the Norton Simon Foundation sale, Sotheby's, London, 27 June 1973, lot 10, ill.); or Mrs. Catherine Clements, 1788 (Ward and Roberts 1904, vol. 2, p. 30; last recorded when it was offered for sale, by an anonymous owner, at Sotheby's, London, 27 June 1973, lot 65, ill.).
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Sir Henry Raeburn

42. William Fraser of Reelig (1784–1835)

1975.1.234

Oil on canvas. 74.9 x 62.2 cm. Inscribed on the reverse of the original canvas: "Raeburn pinxit. Apl. 1803." The canvas has been lined. The ground is cream colored. The head is solidly painted, with slight impasto in the upper lip and forehead. The white shirt is thickly painted in the lights, showing the marks of the brush, and thinly painted in the shadows. The coat is purplish in hue. The background is very thinly painted in dark grays over a warm reddish brown imprimatura. There are no "pentimenti." There are no losses or retouchings, and the painting is in excellent condition. The varnish has not discolored.

PROVENANCE: Commissioned in 1801 by the sitter’s father, Edward Satchwell Fraser (1751–1835), Reelig, Scotland; his son James Baillie Fraser (1783–1856); his widow, Jane Fraser Tytler (d. 1861); his sister Jane Anne Catherine Fraser (1797–1881); her grandson Philip Affleck Fraser, 1879; Fraser sale, Christie's, London, 10 July 1897 (Lugt 5566), lot 26 (sold to Agnew); [Galerie Sedelmeyer, Paris], 1908; M. Veil-Picard, Paris; Maurice Kann, Paris; his sale, Galerie Georges Petit, Paris, 9 June 1911 (Lugt 70050), lot 47; [Scott and Fowles, New York]. Acquired by Philip Lehman from Scott and Fowles in February 1912.


William Fraser (1784–1835) was the second son of Edward Satchwell Fraser (1751–1835), twelfth of Reelig, near Inverness, Scotland, who lived at nearby Easter Moniack in a house that had been built by his father. Edward and his wife, Jane Fraser (1749–1847) of Balnain, whom he married in 1782, had five sons and three daughters. As they grew up Edward commissioned portraits from Raeburn of his daughter Jane and of four of

Fig. 42.1 Sir Henry Raeburn, Edward Satchwell Fraser Jr. (1786–1813). Taft Museum, Cincinnati, Bequest of Charles Phelps and Anna Sinton Taft, 1931.425

Fig. 42.2 Sir Henry Raeburn, Alexander Charles Fraser (1789–1816). Present location unknown. Reproduced from Art News 32 (June 1933), cover ill.
his sons. (There are no portraits of the two younger daughters, Mary, who died at the age of fifteen, and Jane Catherine, who died as a child, aged three.)

The first to be painted was the Lehman picture; William, who was the second son, sat for Raeburn in 1801 at the age of sixteen. Edward, the third son, who later served in the East India Company Civil Service and died at Saint Helena in 1813, was painted two years later, in 1803, at the age of seventeen (Taft Museum, Cincinnati; Fig. 42.1). Alexander, the fourth son, who later also served in the East India Company Civil Service and who died at Delhi in 1816, was also painted in 1803, at the age of fourteen (whereabouts unknown; Fig. 42.2). George, the fifth son, who served in the East India Company army and died at Delhi in 1842, was painted in 1815 at the age of fifteen (whereabouts unknown). Jane Anne Catherine, who succeeded in 1861 as the seventeenth of Reelig and died in 1881, was painted in 1816 at the time of her marriage, aged nineteen (Philadelphia Museum of Art; Fig. 42.3). James, the eldest son, a well-known traveler and travel writer who died at Easter Moniack in 1856, was not painted until he was twenty-six, in 1809 (whereabouts unknown). In 1823 James married Jane Fraser Tytler, who was also painted by Raeburn but at an unknown date (Taft Museum, Cincinnati; Fig. 42.4); her father, Lord Woodhouselee, was painted by Raeburn in 1804 (collection of Mrs. Fraser-Tytler, Aldourie, 1936).

Edward Satchwell Fraser himself was the first member of the family to sit for Raeburn, in 1800, at the age of forty-nine (whereabouts unknown). No portrait is recorded of his wife, Jane. Indeed, it seems to have been Edward's intention to restrict the commissions to the males of the family; his eldest daughter, Jane, was not painted until her engagement to be married (engagement or marriage portraits, especially of young women, were customary in the upper echelons of society, and remain so). Nonetheless, the series of Reelig portraits, commissioned over a period of sixteen years, from 1800 to 1816, represents an unusual and remarkable act of consistent patronage.

William Fraser, clearly a handsome youth, developed into a man of sterling and resolute character. As a member of the Bengal Civil Service, he was highly regarded for his strength and courage, his decisiveness, his fairness, and his marked sympathy for the native peoples.
When he became chief commissioner of revenue and circuit at Delhi, a post in which he served with great distinction, Fraser paid with his life for his fair-mindedness. One of his acts of natural justice was an attempt to force the nawab of Ferozepore, an illegitimate who had recently succeeded his father, to provide for his legitimate younger brother; the nawab so bitterly resented this interference that, on 22 March 1835, he had Fraser murdered.5

Raeburn’s vivid portrayal of William in his midteens, when he was already a youth of some character, is sharpened by the locks of hair falling over the forehead and the crisp contours of the face and shirt against the dark background. In the portrait of William’s brother George that he painted fourteen years later, Raeburn achieved a more startling liveliness through the intent eyes, more widely parted lips, and loose, broken contours of the frilled shirt. The fresh brushwork in the cravat and on the revers of William’s shirt is equal to anything in Sir Thomas Lawrence’s work, and the beautifully painted hair is reminiscent of Goya.

The strong lighting from above, the firm modeling, the fresh handling, and the crisp delineation of the costume and of such features as the upper lip are characteristic of Raeburn’s work of the 1790s. The closest parallel is his portrait of Alexander Home (1785–1869) as a young midshipman.6

JH

NOTES:
1. According to Lehman 1928, no. 104. The canvas has since been lined. As Mackie has pointed out, “many of the portraits in this family group appear to have carried inscriptions on the back which have later been covered by relining canvas,” or, as in the case of the portrait of George Fraser (Mackie 1994, no. 305), have been transcribed onto the back of the lining canvas.
2. Scott and Fowles invoice dated 3 February 1912 (Robert Lehman Collection files).
3. Until the Lehman portrait was examined by Mackie in February 1988 (Robert Lehman Collection files), its identity had been confused and it had come to be listed as a portrait of Edward Fraser.
4. The Fraser family history is given in the “Catalogue of Paintings – Collection of Mr. and Mrs. C. P. Taft” compiled by Maurice W. Brockwell (an excerpt from the typescript, which was probably never published, is in the Robert Lehman Collection files). The dates of the portraits and brief biographies of the sitters, presumably supplied by the family, are given in the catalogue of the Fraser sale at Christie’s, London, 10 July 1897, lots 25–33. The portrait of George Fraser is reproduced in that catalogue, lot 30, and in the catalogue of the sale at the American Art Association, New York, 3 December 1936, lot 64. No reproductions exist of the portraits of James and Edward Sr.
5. A full account of the event is given in “Murder of Commissioner Fraser – Delhi, 1835,” Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine 123 (January 1878), pp. 32–38.
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