This panel and its three companions at the Gallery—Saint Matthew, Saint Simon, and Saint James Major—together with six other busts of apostles [fig. 1] [fig. 2] [fig. 3] [fig. 4] [fig. 5] [fig. 6] [fig. 7] [fig. 8] [fig. 9] [fig. 10] [1] originally formed part of a polyptych. The ten panels, acquired as a group by Johann Anton Ramboux in the early nineteenth century, remained together until the 1920s, when they were deaccessioned by the Wallraf-Richartz Museum in Cologne and dispersed.

The horizontal graining of the wood of the support in all ten panels suggests they are fragments of a predella. [2] The type of predella formed of busts of saints placed below round arches is rather archaic: in fact, it appears in Sienese painting no later than the years around 1320. Subsequently, preference was given instead to the insertion of narrative scenes in the predella; if busts of saints were included in the program, they were usually inserted in circular or mixtilinear medallions surrounded by painted ornamental motifs. [3] The absence from this series of busts of two of the most venerated apostles, Peter and John, may suggest that these panels were already lost at the time of Ramboux’s acquisition of the panels,
together with a bust of Christ (or Christ on the Cross) that normally formed the central image of predellas decorated with busts of saints. [4] But it is more likely that the series of apostles in the predella was originally incomplete and that the images of Peter and John were separated from the rest and incorporated in the main register of the altarpiece, as was the case, for example, in Duccio’s Maestà. [5] As for the sequence of the individual figures, it seems probable that the apostles Andrew and James Major would have been placed closer to the center (and hence in a position of particular emphasis), and that the images of Matthew, Thomas, Simon, and Thaddeus would have been placed closer to the two ends. [6]  

As for the painter of these busts of apostles, an attribution to the Sienese master Lippo Memmi (Sienese, active 1317/1347) was supported by Ramboux in the catalog of his collection (1862). [7] This was endorsed by the older studies, beginning with Joseph Archer Crowe and Giovan Battista Cavalcaselle (1864) and ending with Louis Gielly (1926). [8] It was only when the ten panels reentered the art market that the more prestigious name of Simone Martini was proposed by Robert Lehman (1928) and then by others. [9] Art historians generally accepted the attribution to Simone, though more often than not with the qualifier “shop of” or “school of” Simone. [10] The catalog of the National Gallery of Art also cited the four panels presented by the Kress Collection as works of “Simone Martini and assistants.” The attribution to Lippo Memmi, however, was never wholly discarded and has more recently been revived. [11] Proposed dates vary between c. 1320 and 1333. [12]  

The attempts in recent decades to unite the catalogs of paintings previously assembled respectively under the names of Lippo Memmi and Barna da Siena, as well as under the nebulous formulae “Companions of Simone,” “Lippo and Tederico Memmi,” or “shop of Memmi” have complicated the matter of distinguishing among the paintings executed within the orbits of Simone Martini and Lippo Memmi and have made Lippo’s artistic development difficult to understand. [13] Inextricably linked to this issue, the chronology of the series of apostles discussed here remains equally problematic. To judge from the works signed and dated [14] by Lippo in the years between c. 1323 and 1333, the insertion in his oeuvre of the four busts of apostles in the Gallery seems far from convincing. The softness of the modeling and the spontaneous naturalness of the saints’ gestures recall more readily the manner of his brother-in-law (Simone Martini) than the solemn poses, polished forms, and metallic sheen that often distinguish the works of Lippo himself.
Of the series of apostles of which the four panels in the Gallery form part, the Saint Andrew now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York [fig. 11] has close affinities, both in physiognomic type and in his rather surly expression, with the apostle, presumably Saint Andrew as well, in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, unanimously recognized as Simone’s work. [15] The Saint Judas Thaddeus [fig. 12] in the Gallery similarly invites comparison with the image of the same saint in Simone’s polyptych in the Museo Nazionale di San Matteo in Pisa. [16] In both images the apostle is presented as a beardless youth who turns towards the arch of the frame with a slight Gothic bend, his head bowed to one side in an attitude of meditation. It cannot be said categorically, however, that the version painted for the polyptych of Pisa around 1319–1320 was the model for the painting in the Gallery, given that the contours of the figure and the drapery folds in the latter are far less agitated, following the stylistic models of previous works by Simone that still fall into the second decade of the century. [17] Comparison with the corresponding figures in the Pisa polyptych remains telling, however, and can also be extended to the representations of Saints Matthew and Simon. Simon is represented as still a young man, with a short, dark beard, while Matthew is a man of middle age in frontal position, with a long, forked beard. Matthew is shown in both paintings in the process of writing his Gospel. Less closely resembling his counterpart in the Washington panel is the Saint James Major of the Pisa polyptych, where we may observe the tendency, absent in the panels discussed here, to present the apostles in movement, to envelop their bodies in voluminous mantles that cast deep folds, and to place sharply foreshortened books in their hands. In the Pisa polyptych the books are in general more voluminous and open, and represented in such a way that some lines of calligraphy are visible. The saints, moreover, often seem to be conversing with one another, accompanying or enforcing their remarks with raised hand or exhibiting an object that not infrequently interrupts the outer contour of the figure, set against the gold ground, as if backlit.

Might the reduced emphasis on agitated rhythms and elegant gestures in the busts of apostles in the Gallery and in their companion panels imply a dating for them prior to the Pisa polyptych? Unfortunately, “objective data” deriving from the use of punch marks help us little in this case, since according to Mojmir S. Frinta’s survey (1998), the punched motifs present in the panels now divided between the Metropolitan Museum of Art [fig. 11] [fig. 13] [fig. 14] [fig. 15] and the Gallery recur virtually throughout the entire oeuvre of Simone Martini, from the San Gimignano polyptych to the Annunciation in the Uffizi, Florence (1333), and beyond. [18] It
might be more fruitful to concentrate attention instead on another aspect, namely
the fact that Simone, as far as we are able to judge today, generally avoided the
use of the round arch in his altarpieces. This motif appears for the last time in the
youthful polyptych from San Gimignano, while in later works the arch, if it is not
Gothic, is enriched with small trefoil arches on the inside, as in the Pisa polyptych.
Not only is the framing of the National Gallery of Art panels very similar to that of
the components of the predella of the Saint Louis of Toulouse in Naples (painted in
c. 1317, the year of the saint’s canonization), but also their stylistic character is
consistent with that of the works realized in the years of rapid development
between the Maestà in the Palazzo Pubblico (1315) and the Pisan polyptych of
1319–1320.

These considerations raise the question of identifying the altarpiece of which the
ten busts of apostles formed part. Michael Mallory (1974) argued that the four
Washington panels, together with their six companion panels in other collections,
were in origin the predella of the polyptych by Lippo Memmi of which Saint John
the Baptist in the Gallery also formed part. [19] The proposal has not met with
acceptance in the art historical literature, but no alternative hypotheses have yet
been formulated. A possible candidate for the lost central panel of the polyptych of
which the series of busts of apostles formed part could be, in the present writer’s
opinion, the Madonna and Child from the church of Santa Maria Maddalena at
Castiglion d’Orcia, now in the Museo Civico e Diocesano at Montalcino (80 × 61
cm). [20] The width of the panel is not very different from that of the images placed
at the center of Simone’s polyptychs executed for churches in Pisa, Orvieto, or San
Gimignano, and its height is also close to that from San Gimignano, now deprived
of its original frame. So there is nothing to prevent us from imagining the
Montalcino Madonna at the center of a similar polyptych and with a series of
apostles in its predella. Our panels share with it not only a similar date but also the
external profile terminating in a round arch.

In conclusion, the ten panels of the apostles can, I believe, be firmly attributed to
Simone Martini. In the past scholars have generally undervalued these panels, not
as a consequence of any intrinsic mediocrity but because of the loss of the pictorial
finishes in some of them, flattening the modeling of the figures, and the unhappy
result of successive restorations that have obscured many of the more exquisite
touches of the pictorial technique, especially in the busts of Saints Bartholomew,
Matthias, and Thomas now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. However, the
better-preserved passages in our panels, in particular in the faces of Saints
Thaddeus and James Major, still retain qualities that, in the view of the present writer, seem fully worthy of the hand of Simone.

Miklós Boskovits (1935–2011)
March 21, 2016
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NOTES

[1] In 1924, Maitland Fuller Griggs, acquired four panels of the series—Saints Thomas, Bartholomew, Matthias, and Andrew—through Edward Hutton, and these entered the Metropolitan Museum, New York, in 1943. The bust of Saint James Minor (fig. 9) belonged to the Stoclet Collection in Brussels at least since 1927, and since 2005 it has belonged to the Salini collection at Castello di Gallico (Asciano). Philip Lehman purchased the image of Saint Philip (fig. 8) along with the four panels discussed here before 1928. The Saint Philip was sold at auction at Christie’s in New York on January 11, 1991 (lot 12). It was purchased by Carlo de Carlo (Florence), in whose collection it remained until 1999; its present whereabouts are unknown.


[3] Examples of the predella type with busts of saints set in round-arched frames are Simone Martini’s polyptych now in the Museo Nazionale in Pisa (1319–1320); that of Ugolino di Nerio in the Museo Nazionale in Lucca, datable to c. 1320; and that of Meo da Siena, also dating to around 1315–1320, now in the Pinacoteca Nazionale of Perugia. Cf. James H. Stubblebine, *Duccio di Buoninsegna and His School*, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1979), 2: fig. 375; and Francesco Santi, ed., *Galleria Nazionale dell’Umbria*, vol. 1, *Dipinti, sculture e oggetti d’arte di età romanica e gotica* (Rome, 1969), 58–59. Predellas with medallions surrounded by floriated motifs, by contrast, were used by Giotto in his polyptychs in the Baroncelli Chapel in Santa Croce in Florence and in the Pinacoteca Nazionale in Bologna in the years 1325–1335, and, among Sienese artists, by Ugolino di Nerio in the predella now in the Musée des Beaux-Arts at Besançon (see Stubblebine 1979, fig. 465), and by Bartolomeo Bulgarini in the predella of his polyptych formerly in Santa Croce, now in the storerooms of the Gallerie Fiorentine; see Raimond van Marle, *The Development of the Italian Schools of Painting*, vol. 2, *The Sienese School of the 14th Century* (The Hague, 1924), fig. 72. Sometimes, as in Simone Martini’s altarpiece of St. Louis of Toulouse in the Museo di Capodimonte at Naples (1317), the round arches of the predella contain not the busts of saints but small narrative scenes. Perhaps the practice of adding a predella containing busts of saints to small devotional paintings originated in the shops of Simone and Lippo (cf. the Madonna in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, no. P. 30 w 8, or the Crucifixion no. 156 of the Pinacoteca Vaticana). It seems to reflect a type of altarpiece similar to that of Simone in Naples: paintings, that is, with a single scene (instead of several panels with figures of saints) in the main register.

[4] However, sometimes, as in the above-cited predella of Meo da Siena’s polyptych, Christ does not appear among the apostles, and the center of the sequence of busts of apostles is occupied instead by Saints Peter and Paul.

[5] In Duccio’s masterpiece, the large scene representing the Madonna and Child flanked by saints and angels is surmounted by a horizontal second
register of half-length saints (from left to right): the busts of Saints Thaddeus, Simon, Philip, James Major, Andrew, Matthew, James Minor, Bartholomew, Thomas, and Matthias. The apostles Peter and Paul, and John the Evangelist, on the other hand, are represented, together with the Baptist, as full-length figures flanking the throne of the Madonna.

In his analysis of the problem of the sequence of busts, Giovanni Previtali (1987) proposed the following order, from left to right: Matthias, Thomas, Bartholomew, James (Minor or Major), Matthew, Andrew, James(?), Philip, Simon, and Thaddeus, observing that this would be the exact reverse of the order followed by Duccio in representing the ten apostles in the Maestà and by Simone Martini in the predella of the Pisa polyptych, in which Peter and Paul are naturally added to the ten, in a central position (John the Evangelist appears here among the saints in the main register). See Giovanni Previtali, “Problems in the Workshop of Simone Martini,” Center/National Gallery of Art, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts 7 (1987): 83–84. But the sequence represented in the works of Duccio and Simone Martini is not the only possible one. For example, Simone represented the apostles in the Maestà he frescoed in the Palazzo Pubblico in Siena in the order of: Bartholomew, Philip, Matthew, Thomas, James Minor, James Major, Matthias, Andrew, Thaddeus, and Simon (with Paul, John the Evangelist, John the Baptist, and Peter placed in the foreground); for the identification of the apostles, cf. Alessandro Bagnoli, La Maestà di Simone Martini (Cinisello Balsamo, Milan, 1999), 155–157. Different again is the sequence of apostles adopted by Giotto in the Last Judgment of the Scrovegni Chapel in Padua, and in the Stefaneschi polyptych in the Pinacoteca Vaticana; cf. Margrit Lisner, “Die Gewandfarben der Apostel in Giottos Arenafresken: Farbgebung und Farbikonographie mit Notizen zu älteren Aposteldarstellungen in Florenz, Assisi und Rom,” Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 53 (1990): 309–375; and Margrit Lisner, “Giotto und die Aufträge des Kardinals Jacopo Stefaneschi für Alt-St. Peter; 2; der Stefaneschi-Altar; Giotto und seine Werkstatt in Rom; das Altarwerk und der verlorene Christuszyklus in der Petersapsis,” Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana 30 (1995): 59–133. Only the central position of Peter, Paul, and John (if they form part of the series), as well as James Major and Andrew, holds good as a general rule.

Katalog der Gemälde Alter italienischer Meister (1221–1640) in der Sammlung des Conservator J.A. Ramboix (Cologne, 1862), 15, no. 75.


At least as regards the panels that entered the Griggs collection in New York through Edward Hutton, the attribution to Simone presumably had been made by the dealer/amateur Hutton himself. The Saint James Minor


[12] Fern Rusk Shapley (1966, 1979) and Giovanni Previtali (1987) proposed the date c. 1320; Cristina De Benedictis (1974), 1325—i.e., the date of the lost

[13] After the publications by Gordon Moran (1976), who was the first to cast doubt on whether a painter called Barna da Siena had ever existed—according to him, the name was an erroneous transcription of Bartolo di Fredi—and that of Antonino Caleca (1976, 1977), who argued that the works formerly attributed to “Barna” should be reassigned to the catalog of Lippo Memmi, art historians have gone their separate ways in trying to identify the masters of the paintings left orphans after Barna’s “demise.” Luciano Bellosi (1977) wrote of the “Famiglia Memmi” as a kind of family concern, while Carlo Volpe (1982) considered probable Moran’s hypothesis attributing the paintings to Federico Memmi, brother of Lippo. Giovanna Damiani (1985) maintained that “la firma di Lippo Memmi corrisponda...ad una sorta di etichetta che indica anziché l’attività di una personalità artistica, quella di una bottega comprendente Lippo e Federico Memmi e che doveva avere al suo attivo anche personalità minori” (Lippo Memmi’s signature corresponds to a kind of label that indicates not the activity of an artistic personality but the activity of a workshop comprising Lippo and Federico Memmi and that must have included minor figures as well). Returning to the question, Bellosi (1985) thought it right to “riconsiderare unitariamente tutta la produzione che fa capo al prestigioso atelier familiare di Simone Martini, ivi comprese le opere attribuite a Lippo e a Barna” (reconsider integrally the entire production of the prestigious family workshop headed by Simone Martini, including the works attributed to Lippo and Barna). Previtali (1988) went further, affirming that “lo stile che siamo soliti chiamare ‘Barna’...sta a


[16] The date of the altarpiece is variously indicated as 1319 or 1320. Both dates are derived from the same source: the sixteenth-century Annali of the Dominican convent in Pisa, which record the placing of the polyptych over the high altar of the church of Santa Caterina in 1320. But this date, if calculated according to the Pisan style in use at the time the polyptych was painted, could be equivalent to 1319 in the modern calendar. Cf. Pierluigi Leone De Castris, Simone Martini (Milan, 2003), 352.

Museum in Madrid, and the J. Paul Getty Museum in Los Angeles (no. 82.PB.72) is usually dated to the 1320s, but the present writer prefers an earlier dating, towards the mid-1310s; cf. Miklós Boskovits, “Da Duccio a Simone Martini,” in Medioevo: La chiesa e il palazzo; Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Parma, September 20–24, 2005, ed. Arturo Carlo Quintavalle (Milan, 2007), 577.

[18] The punch marks in the four Washington panels are registered as follows by Mojmir Svatopluk Frinta, Punched Decoration on Late Medieval Panel and Miniature Painting (Prague, 1998): “Da10a” (present in works by Simone Martini from the San Gimignano polyptych to the late Orsini quadriptych and in various works of Lippo Memmi), 117–119; “Ea1” (present in paintings by Simone with a presumable provenance from Orvieto, in the Orsini quadriptych, and in works by Lippo), 189; “Fd14a” (used in a similar way as the preceding punches); “I16a” (used in Simone’s polyptychs divided among the J. Paul Getty Museum, the Thyssen-Bornemisza Museum, and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, in the Uffizi Annunciation, and in panels attributed to Lippo), 205; “I70” (present in paintings between the Orvieto phase and the Uffizi Annunciation, and in works by Lippo), 321; “Jb59” (present in works of Simone’s Orvieto phase and in the Orsini quadriptych, but not found in authenticated paintings by Lippo), 388; “Jc15” (present in paintings of Simone’s Orvieto phase, the Uffizi Annunciation, and in works by Lippo), 400–401; “Ka27a” (again present in paintings of Simone’s Orvieto phase, the Uffizi Annunciation, and in various works by Lippo), 444; and “Ka63” (used in a similar way as the previous punch), 453–454.


[20] The Madonna formerly at Castiglion d’Orcia was not necessarily painted for that town and was variously attributed in the past. Serena Padovani (1979) attributed it to Simone, and Alessandro Bagnoli (1997) accepted the attribution, whereas Leone de Castris (2003) thought it was painted “in buona parte” by studio assistants of Simone and dated it to the early 1320s. With regard to the dating of the painting, it should be borne in mind that Frinta (1998) found in it a punch mark present in various works by Simone executed during his period in Orvieto, as well as in the Pisa polyptych of 1319–1320, and in the San Gimignano polyptych. See Serena Padovani, “Una tavola di Castiglione d’Orcia restaurata di recente,” Prospettiva 17 (1979): 82–88; Alessandro Bagnoli, Museo civico e diocesano d’arte sacra di Montalcino (Siena, 1997), 33, 35; Pierluigi Leone De Castris, Simone Martini (Milan, 2003), 209, 354; Mojmir Svatopluk Frinta, Punched Decoration on Late Medieval Panel and Miniature Painting (Prague, 1998), 428.
TECHNICAL SUMMARY

This painting and its three companions, Saint Matthew, Saint Simon, and Saint James Major, were executed on panels apparently made of a single piece of wood with horizontal grain, which has been thinned to 2.5 cm thick, backed, and cradled. Stephen Pichetto applied the backings and cradles in 1944, at which time he may also have thinned the panels and added the wooden strips that are currently affixed to all sides of each. The inner molding of the arch as well as the capitals and bases of the engaged frame surrounding the painted surface of each panel are original. Before the painting process, the panels were covered with a fabric interleaf, on which a layer of gesso ground was applied. The areas to be gilded were prepared with red bole and the halos decorated with punch marks—those in Saint Matthew and Saint Simon extend onto the top arches of the engaged frames. Incised lines were used to demarcate the figures; a green underpainting was laid in beneath the flesh tones; and the paint was applied with fine, unblended brushstrokes. Infrared reflectography at 1.2 to 5 microns shows a linear underdrawing in the figures’ hands but not in their clothing, except in Saint Judas Thaddeus, in which all the folds in the saint’s cloak were delineated in a liquid medium. [1] Mordant gilding was used for embellishing the borders of the saints’ robes and the bosses and clasps of their books. The books are further decorated with punch marks, and a black material, which might have been silver, has been applied over the gilded clasps and bosses.

The painted surfaces of all four panels are slightly worn but in fair state apart from a number of small, scattered losses largely associated with the damages to the supports and the removal of parts of the original engaged frames and moldings along the borders. Two small repairs are visible in the gold ground in Saint Matthew, and retouchings around the saint’s throat, chest, and shoulders have discolored. Retouching in Saint Simon mostly affects the saint’s right cheek and left shoulder. Vertical and diagonal cracks, with attendant minor paint loss, are more prominent along the bottom edge of Saint James Major, while retouching in Saint Judas Thaddeus is largely confined to the saint’s face and book. The lettering of the inscriptions in all four panels has been reinforced. When he applied the cradles in 1944, Stephen Pichetto also “cleaned, restored, and varnished” the paintings. Robert Lehman (1928) mentioned an earlier cleaning, probably in the early 1920s. [2]
PROVENANCE

Acquired between 1832 and 1842 by Johann Anton Ramboux [1790-1866], Cologne, together with six other components of the same series, presumably in Siena;[1] (his estate sale, J.M. Heberle, Cologne, 23 May 1867, no. 75 [all ten panels], as by Lippo Memmi);[2] the whole series purchased by the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne, which deaccessioned it in 1922-1923;[3] the four NGA panels, 1952.5.23-.26, purchased together with a fifth panel of the same series, by Philip Lehman [1861-1947], New York, by 1928;[4] the four NGA panels sold June 1943 to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York;[5] gift 1952 to the NGA.


[2] Without quoting their provenance, the sale catalogue entry states only that the ten busts "... stimmen im Ausdruck wie in der übrigen Technik mit den Wandmalereien im Stadthause zu Sangeminiano überein."


TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Infrared reflectography was performed using a Mitsubishi M600 focal plane array PtSi camera.

[2] Robert Lehman, The Philip Lehman Collection, New York (Paris, 1928), n.p., stated that the panels “were covered by an old varnish which has lately been removed.” For the intervention in 1944, see Fern Rusk Shapley, Catalogue of the Italian Paintings, 2 vols. (Washington, DC, 1979), 1:433.

The bill of sale for the Kress Foundation’s purchase of fifteen paintings from the Lehman collection, including NGA 1952.5.23-.26, is dated 11 June 1943; payment was made four days later (copy in NGA curatorial files). The documents concerning the 1943 sale all indicate that Philip Lehman’s son Robert Lehman (1892-1963) was owner of the paintings, but it is not clear in the Lehman Collection archives at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, whether Robert made the sale for his father or on his own behalf. See Laurence Kanter’s e-mail of 6 May 2011, about ownership of the Lehman collection, in NGA curatorial files. See also The Kress Collection Digital Archive, https://kress.nga.gov/Detail/objects/1906.
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