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ENTRY

This handsome picture has presented something of a puzzle since it first appeared on the art market. It entered the Gallery's collection in 1937 with an attribution to Dosso Dossi and was long known as The Standard Bearer. An attribution to Tintoretto and the current title were adopted in 1984, based on acceptance of the work by Tintoretto scholars at that time. [1] However, questions have remained about both the attribution and the subject.

The specificity with which the features of the sitter are represented indicates that the painting is a portrait. Beside the sitter rests a helmet, elaborately decorated with gilded relief. [2] Behind him is what appears to be the body of a grotesque dragon, similar to the one in Titian's Saint Margaret and the Dragon (Museo del Prado, Madrid, and other versions). While the dragon would suggest that the sitter is being presented as Saint George, his flag, bearing a white Latin cross on a red field, is not that of the dragon-slaying saint, which shows a red cross on a white field, but rather the banner of Saint John. This was the battle flag of the Order of the Knights of Malta [fig. 1]. [3] Contrasting with the heroic narrative suggested by these accoutrements are the elegant, decorative costume of the subject and his aloof, pensive expression. [4]

The style of the picture is eclectic, combining elements of Giorgionesque ambiguity, some of the dash and decoratism of Dosso Dossi, and an elegance that evokes Emilian mannerism. Not surprisingly, its attribution has been the subject of considerable debate and has evoked the names of several major artists of the

None of these attributions to artists of the Cinquecento are convincing. As the catalog of Tintoretto’s paintings, especially his early works, has been clarified since the 1980s, it has become clear that the picture is not from that painter’s hand. This was especially apparent when it was juxtaposed with autograph works in the 1994 exhibition of Tintoretto portraits in Venice and Vienna. Tintoretto’s subjects almost always look directly out at the viewer and have a small, white catchlight in their eyes, absent here. His brushwork is looser and drier, and his portrait heads always convey a strong sense of physical structure, of the skull beneath the skin. In the Gallery’s picture the brushwork is carefully controlled, and the paint appears to have been more fluid when applied. X-radiography [fig. 2] reveals none of the underlying structure that is characteristic of Tintoretto’s portraits (as in A Procurator of Saint Mark’s). Nor does the romantic treatment of the subject find a counterpart anywhere in Tintoretto’s oeuvre. Although a revolutionary in his narrative paintings, Tintoretto was relatively conservative in his portraiture, sticking close to formulas developed by Titian in the 1530s. [10]

The approach to the subject does show some characteristics of Dosso, evoking such works as Saint George (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles) [fig. 3] and the Standard Bearer (Allentown Art Museum). However, the Gallery’s painting is more delicate, the mood more pensive, closer to the elusive Giorgione than to the straightforward and less graceful Dosso. While the elegance and slender form of
the figure are evocative of the portraits of Niccolò dell’Abate, such as the Man with Parrot (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), the pictorial technique is softer and more diffuse than Niccolò’s tightly focused precision. Niccolò’s physiognomies also tend to be more mannered and his colors more metallic than in the Gallery’s painting. Rearick’s attribution to Mirola has the appeal of accounting for the Emilian characteristics of the picture, but the relationship to Mirola’s firmly attributed works is too distant to be the basis of an attribution.

As a few scholars have recognized, the picture’s puzzling combination of qualities, which has led to such diverse attributions, is best understood as the “retrospective romanticism” of a 17th-century artist looking back to Giorgione and Dosso through the lens of later painters. Hans Tietze and Erica Tietze-Conrat, in a manuscript opinion in NGA curatorial files, placed the picture in this context, noting the similarity to a portrait of a young man as a halberdier attributed to Pietro della Vecchia (Pietro Muttoni). Creighton Gilbert, in a brief comment, similarly linked the painting to a Dosso revival in the early Seicento. However, the best solution to the conundrum posed by the picture lies in another attribution that has received scant attention, reported by Gilbert to have been made orally by Fiocco, to the 17th-century painter and printmaker Giuseppe Caletti. [11]

Caletti was active from about 1620 until 1660. He signed some of his prints Ioseffo Cremonesi, implying that he was originally from Cremona, but his artistic career seems to have taken place almost entirely in Ferrara. Caletti’s style as a painter and draftsman reflects that of his contemporary Guercino, with whom he may have apprenticed. In addition, Caletti took inspiration from the painters of the previous century—in particular Dosso, who had been court painter in Ferrara for three decades, as well as Giorgione, Titian, and such Lombard painters as Altobello Melone and Romanino. Indeed, Caletti often deliberately worked in the styles of Dosso and the great Venetians. Whether he intended them to be deliberate forgeries or not, such paintings sold during his lifetime and in the years after his death on the antiquarian market as works by Giorgione, Dosso, and Titian. In the modern era, his paintings continued to pass as the work of these masters. [12]

The National Gallery of Art painting shows especially striking similarities to some of Caletti’s etchings. For example, the male figure in The Lovers [fig. 4] is seen in a similar pose, in profile with one arm extended, and sports a similar ostrich feather fastened by a badge in his hat. In Caletti’s etching of David Considering the Head of Goliath [fig. 5], the protagonist’s pensive mood matches that of the sitter in the
The Washington picture. The treatment of the eyes, ears, nose, and hands is also consistent with etchings by Caletti of anatomical studies. [13] A distinctive characteristic of the Gallery’s painting, the deep shadowing of some of the drapery folds, especially those at the bottom center of the painting, reappears in all of Caletti’s works—paintings as well as etchings. [14] Otherwise, the paintings assigned to Caletti, while occasionally similar in mood to the Gallery’s picture, offer fewer direct comparisons than do his etchings. [15] Occasional similarities, such as the treatment of golden embroidery on fabrics or the sharply cut eyelids of some of his figures, seem insufficient to pin down an attribution of the Washington painting to the artist. Nevertheless, the specific connections with his etchings, as well as the more general connections to the sources upon which he relied, make a strong case for his authorship. [16] Caletti’s oeuvre as a painter may not yet be fully understood, and it is possible that further study may provide confirmation for this attribution. (For example, no portraits have yet been attributed to him.) In any case, the picture can be assigned more generally to a painter from the era of Guercino seeking to evoke the spirit of Dosso and other artists of the previous century. A date of circa 1620 to 1630 seems reasonable, since all of Caletti’s etchings mentioned above appear in a book published in the second half of the 1620s.

The iconography of the picture remains ambiguous. Aside from the banner, there is no other indication that the sitter might be a Knight of Malta. The dragon suggests a reference to Saint George; perhaps the sitter was named Giorgio. Alternatively, if the picture did indeed have a Ferrarese origin, the fact that Saint George is the patron saint of Ferrara may have some connection to its subject. The overall mood of the picture, evoking Venetian and Ferrarese painting of a century before, may have been more important to the artist and patron than any specific references.

Robert Echols
March 21, 2019

fig. 2 X-radiograph, Attributed to Giuseppe Caletti, *Portrait of a Man as Saint George*, c. 1620s, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection
**fig. 3** Dosso Dossi, *Saint George*, c. 1513/1515, oil on panel, J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles

NOTES

[1] NGA Board approval October 4, 1984. The title The Standard Bearer was adopted on February 1, 1941; previously, from the time of acquisition, it was known as Portrait of a Man with a Flag.

[2] The helmet, decorated in pseudoclassical style with relief ornament, including foliate scrolls, gilded in the style known as damascening (or the less expensive pseudodamascening), is similar to the “Morosini Helmet” in the Gallery’s collection, 1942.9.356. Armor of this type was a specialty of Milan from about 1530 to 1555. See Carolyn C. Wilson, Renaissance Small Bronze Sculpture and Associated Decorative Arts at the National Gallery of Art (Washington, DC, 1983), 144; Heroic Armor of the Italian Renaissance: Filippo Negri and His Contemporaries (New York, 1998), no. 67, repro., as “Visored Burgonet by Master AP.”

[3] The Latin cross, as distinct from the more familiar eight-pointed Maltese
cross, appeared on the battle flag of the order. Today, the white Latin cross on a red field is the flag of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta. The white Latin cross on a red field appears in a near-contemporary series of paintings depicting the 1565 siege of Malta by Matteo Perez, now in the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich. A 1629 engraving by Joseph Furtenbach (Musée de la Marine, Paris) shows one of the order’s galleys bearing banners and flags with the same emblem. Pinturicchio’s frescoes in Siena Cathedral depict Niccolò Aringhieri wearing the emblem on his armor; see H. J. A. Sire, The Knights of Malta (New Haven and London, 1994), 88, repro., and pl. 3.

[4] The medal holding the plumes on the sitter’s cap appears to depict a reclining, clothed female figure. Nothing further can be determined of its subject. See Yvonne Hackenbroch, Enseignes (Florence, 1996), 124.

[5] Bernard Berenson, Pitture italiane del Rinascimento (Milan, 1936), 151; Edoardo Arslan, “Una Natività di Dosso Dossi,” Commentari 8 (1957): 260; Edoardo Arslan, Le pitture del Duomo di Milano (Milan, 1960), 33. Copies of undated manuscript opinions by Fiocco and Van Marle are in NGA curatorial files, as is a more tentative undated manuscript opinion by Berenson (“most likely Dosso, though hard to tell in the photo”).


Portrait of a Man as Saint George
© National Gallery of Art, Washington
Copies of manuscript opinions by Longhi (1929), Perkins (1932), and Suida (1935) are in NGA curatorial files. Pierluigi De Vecchi listed a *Saint George Killing the Dragon* in the NGA among the “other works attributed to Tintoretto,” which includes wrongly attributed works; this is presumably the Gallery’s painting. See Pierluigi De Vecchi, *L’opera completa del Tintoretto* (Milan, 1970), 134, no. C13.


On Tintoretto’s conservatism as a portraitist, see Miguel Falomir, “Tintoretto’s Portraiture,” in *Tintoretto*, ed. Miguel Falomir (Madrid, 2007), 98; and Frederick Ilchman, “The Titian Formula,” in *Titian, Tintoretto, Veronese: Rivals in Renaissance Venice* (Boston, 2009), 206. Contrary to Shapley, the portrait visible in the x-radiograph also shows a different, much more careful, controlled technique from that in Tintoretto’s portraits, such as *A Procurator of Saint Mark’s* (National Gallery of Art, 1952.5.79), where one can see the artist building up the skeletal structure of the head with bold, broad brushstrokes as he roughs the forms in. Shapley’s suggestion that the Gallery’s painting and the x-radiograph both show a similarity to Tintoretto’s self-portraits is equally unconvincing. See Fern Rusk Shapley, *Catalogue of the Italian Paintings* (Washington, DC, 1979), 1:463.

Creighton Gilbert mentioned the Washington painting only peripherally, noting that Fiocco agreed that there was a romantic revival of Dosso c. 1600, “personified by Giorgio Caletti [sic] to whom he attributes the Washington *Standard Bearer* generally considered Dosso’s.” Gilbert agreed that the Gallery’s painting is closely based on Dosso but found the connection to Caletti’s documented work “less clear.” See Creighton Gilbert, *The Works of Girolamo Savoldo: The 1955 Dissertation with a Review of Research, 1955–1985* (New York and London, 1986), 476–477. The mistake about Caletti’s name was repeated by Fern Rusk Shapley, *Catalogue of the Italian Paintings* (Washington, DC, 1979), 1:463. Tietze and Tietze-Conrat, in the undated manuscript opinion in NGA curatorial files (also cited by Shapley), described the Gallery’s picture as “almost a companion piece” to the portrait of a man in a plumed hat attributed to Pietro della Vecchia (see Alberto Riccoboni, *Quattrocento pitture inediti: Prima mostra Nazionale Antiquaria* [Venice, 1947], no. 77). “[S]canning Tintoretto’s, and incidentally Dosso’s oeuvre,” they wrote, “we look in vain for such a complicated posture . . . for such an ornamental filling of space, for such retrospective romanticism.” Pietro della Vecchia’s technique is generally more fluid, his colors more saturated, and his chiaroscuro more dramatic than in the Gallery’s painting. Nevertheless, the pose and “retrospective romanticism”
of the Portrait of a Man as Saint George are indeed similar to some of Pietro’s paintings. See, for example, the Portrait of a Philosopher (Chrysler Museum of Art, Norfolk, VA) and the Warrior Attacking a Youth (Galleria Doria Pamphilii, Rome); in addition, the Standard Bearer (or Warrior with a Shield and Lance), known from the mezzotint by Prince Rupert of the Rhine, provides a particularly apt comparison. Bernard Aikema, Pietro della Vecchia and the Heritage of the Renaissance in Venice (Florence, 1990), 116–117, 148, 160; cat. nos. I.10, I.202, IV.3; figs. 56, 89, and 104.


[14] For example, David with the Head of Goliath, David Considering the Head of Goliath, Mary Magdalen (all locations unknown); see Eugenio Riccòmini, Il Seicento ferrarese (Ferrara, 1969), figs. 29, 30a, 30b.

[15] The two Davids cited in the preceding note provide the best overall comparisons to the Washington picture among the paintings attributed to Caletti.

[16] Early works by Guercino that share a somewhat similar pensive mood with the Washington picture include Et in Arcadia Ego (Galleria Nazionale d’Arte, Rome; 1618–1622) and the Return of the Prodigal Son (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna; 1619). A figure in the latter was adopted for a David in a picture attributed to Caletti (Museo Civico, Ferrara). Altobello Melone’s Portrait of a Young Man (Harvard Art Museum/ Fogg Museum; c. 1527–1528) shows a sitter who similarly looks off into the distance.

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The painting has been lined, but the original support is a medium-weight, plain-weave fabric. X-radiographs show shallow cusping along all four margins, but it is
strongest along the bottom edge, indicating that the painting may have been cut down slightly, particularly along the top and sides. In addition, the top and left edges of the painting show fractured paint and losses consistent with edges that have been cut. Microscopic analysis reveals a white ground beneath the paint layer. There is some indication that a thin brown wash was applied as an imprimatura layer over the ground, but this has not been confirmed. Infrared reflectography at 1.5 to 1.8 microns [1] and the x-radiographs show that originally the feathers of the sitter’s hat were taller and extended down the back of his head to the nape of his neck. They also show that originally there was a curtain where the flag is located. Perhaps most significantly, the x-radiographs reveal the presence of another, nearly complete portrait beneath the present one, oriented in the opposite direction [fig. 1]. Based on the x-radiographs, the handling of the paint in the portrait, especially in the treatment of the drapery, appears to be similar to that in the visible picture.

The paint layers are generally thin, with some impasto only in a few highlights. Transparent glazes were applied over white underpainting to create the bright reds and greens. The decorations on the banner are heightened with gold leaf. The texture of the paint has been flattened, probably as a result of excessive pressure during lining. Thin, branched cracks with small areas of loss at the junction are visible in normal light. There are numerous small areas of retouching throughout the painting. The largest areas of retouching appear around the head in the background, in the beard, along the junction of the cloak and sleeve, and on the lower edge of the cloak. The entire picture suffers from abrasion. The flatness and opacity of the dark cloak suggest that it may have been repainted. Overall, the varnish is discolored and cloudy. The painting was treated by Stephen Pichetto in 1932.

Joanna Dunn and Robert Echols based on the examination reports by Carol Christensen and Ina Slama and the treatment report by Joanna Dunn

March 21, 2019

TECHNICAL COMPARATIVE FIGURES
fig. 1 X-radiograph, Attributed to Giuseppe Caletti, Portrait of a Man as Saint George, c. 1620s, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with an H astronomy filter.

PROVENANCE


[1] The first reference to the painting, in a letter by Roberto Longhi of 1929, a copy
of which is in NGA curatorial files, does not mention the painting’s location, although Longhi’s opinion may have been solicited by Contini-Bonacossi.

[2] The bill of sale that includes the painting, which is listed as *Portrait of a Man with Flag* by Jacopo Tintoretto, is dated 4 March 1932; copy in NGA curatorial files. A handwritten annotation reads “on records as: Dosso Dossi or Jacopo Tintoretto or Francisco Mazzola.”

**EXHIBITION HISTORY**

1932 An Exhibition of Italian Paintings Lent by Mr. Samuel H. Kress of New York to Museums, Colleges, and Art Associations, travelling exhibition, 24 venues, 1932-1935, mostly unnumbered catalogues, p. 40 or p. 45, repro., as *Portrait of a Man with a Flag* by Dossi.

1938 Exhibition of Venetian Painting From the Fifteenth Century through the Eighteenth Century, California Palace of the Legion of Honor, San Francisco, June-July 1938, no. 24, repro., as *Portrait of a Man with a Flag* by Dosso Dossi.

1938 Special Exhibition of Venetian Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection, Seattle Art Museum; Portland Art Museum, Oregon; Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts, Alabama, August-October 1938, no catalogue.


**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


60 and fig. 19, as by Tintoretto.


Caliari, Benedetto
Venetian, 1538 - 1598
In keeping with a well-established iconography, the penitent, half-naked saint is shown contemplating a crucifix and about to mortify his flesh by beating his breast with a stone. Prominently visible are his attributes of a tame lion, the Bible he translated into Latin, and the memento mori symbols of a skull and an hourglass.

While the generic style is clearly that of Paolo Veronese, there exists some critical disagreement both on the extent of the master’s involvement and on its place in his career. Following Wilhelm Suida and Bernard Berenson, Terisio Pignatti and Rodolfo Pallucchini accepted the picture as autograph; [1] but Richard Cocke called it a workshop piece, and Fern Rusk Shapley conceded that it is weaker in quality than Veronese’s altarpieces of the same subject from Santa Maria degli Angeli, Murano (now in San Pietro Martire), and Sant’Andrea della Zirada, Venice (now in the Gallerie dell’Accademia). [2] Although the present appearance of the picture is compromised by its poor condition, details, such as the weak drawing of the saint’s right foot and the awkward conjunction of the lion and the saint’s left leg, do indeed seem to indicate that it is by a studio assistant. This assistant may perhaps be most plausibly identified as Paolo’s younger brother Benedetto Caliari (1538–1598), who is already recorded as a collaborator on the paintings at San Sebastiano in the 1550s, and who became Veronese’s primary artistic heir after his death in 1588. [3] Benedetto’s own artistic personality is usually submerged.
beneath that of his brother, but the Gallery’s picture shares a number of stylistic traits with two of his best-attested independent works: the *Washing of the Disciples’ Feet* and the *Christ before Pilate* (both Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice), painted in the late 1570s for the now-demolished church of San Niccolò ai Frari. [4] In particular, the treatment of the drapery in the *Saint Jerome* closely resembles that in the foreground draperies of the *Washing of the Disciples’ Feet*: hard, shiny, and planar; and in both works, the musculature, too, falls into similarly stylized patterns.

The attribution of the present picture to an assistant, perhaps Benedetto, rather than to the master himself in turn affects any assessment of the date. Whereas Pignatti and Pallucchini placed the picture close to the Murano *Saint Jerome* of 1565, [5] Shapley and Annalisa Perissa Torrini argued for a rather later date, close to the Sant’Andrea version, which is generally agreed to date from circa 1580. [6] This later dating is the more convincing: apart from the fact that the lion is closely repeated from its counterpart in the finer Sant’Andrea altarpiece, the Gallery’s picture shares with this work the planar pose of the saint and the twilit, atmospheric landscape, both of which contrast with the Murano version, with its clear projection of firmly modeled forms into space. The saint’s profile also closely resembles that of other elderly figures by Veronese of about this time, such as the foremost king in the Hermitage *Adoration of the Magi* of circa 1580–1582. A likely date, therefore, is one close to that of Benedetto’s two paintings of the late 1570s for San Niccolò ai Frari, or perhaps slightly later.

According to Suida, the work may be identical with “a little picture with Saint Jerome” by Veronese recorded by Carlo Ridolfi (1648), Marco Boschini (1664), and Anton Maria Zanetti (1733) in the passage leading to the sacristy in the church of San Sebastiano in Venice. [7] This suggestion is not necessarily contradicted by the probable provenance of the Gallery’s picture from the collection of Sir Peter Lely in the late 17th century, since Zanetti could have been simply repeating the information of Boschini, without realizing that the picture had already been sold to England. Yet Ridolfi’s phrase “piccolo quadretto” seems to imply a picture considerably smaller than one measuring nearly four feet by three, and the identification remains doubtful.

Shapley recorded the existence of a coarse copy in the Museo Provincial, Gerona. [8]
NOTES


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The support consists of a twill-weave, medium-weight fabric. The painting has been lined and the tacking margins have been removed, with consequent damage along all four sides. It also appears from x-radiographs and examination with a stereomicroscope that the ground is either very thin or nonexistent. The sky and background were apparently painted prior to the addition of the figure, and the paint was applied unusually thinly, with impasto restricted to the yellow highlights and some of the white on the saint’s drapery.

The paint surface shows medium to heavy abrasion throughout and numerous scattered losses. Conservation treatment in 1986 involved the removal of extensive discolored retouching and overpaint, followed by extensive inpainting to match areas of original paint. Also removed at this time was a small branch above the saint’s head, which was found to be a complete addition.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Ann Hoenigswald, Jia-sun Tsang, and Carolyn Tallent

March 21, 2019

PROVENANCE


(Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Florence); sold 1954 to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York;[4] gift 1961 to NGA.

[1] The presence of the painting in this sale was brought to Fern Rusk Shapley's attention by Ellis Waterhouse (see his letter of 5 March 1959, in NGA curatorial files). The original sale catalogue consisted of a folded sheet of three closely printed pages, with no numbers assigned to the items in the lists; the sale consisted of paintings by artists other than Lely, drawings and pictures by Lely, and copies after Lely. The NGA painting is the fifth item on the first of these lists, described as "of Paul Veronese, St. Jerome, a whole figure with a Landskip [sic]," measuring in length 3 feet 6 inches and in "bredth [sic]" 2 feet 9 inches. See Brian Fairfax, A Catalogue of the Curious Collection of Pictures of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham...also A Catalogue of Sir Peter Lely's Capital Collection of Pictures..., London, 1758: 40, no. 5 (Fairfax numbered the lists); Charles Henry Collins Baker, Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters: A Study of English Portraiture before & after Van Dyck, 2 vols., London, 1912-1913: 2:144; "Editorial: Sir Peter Lely's Collection," The Burlington Magazine 83, no. 485 (August 1943): 185-188; Ellis K. Waterhouse, "A Note on British Collecting of Italian Pictures in the Seventeenth Century," The Burlington Magazine 102 (1960): 54. In support of the identification is the exact correspondence of the dimensions (42 by 33 inches), and the account of the provenance published in 1834 (see note 3).


[3] As pointed out by Burton Fredericksen (message to Peter Humfrey, 7 October 2008), the picture appears as no. 116 in the catalogue of Earl De Grey's collection, published in 1834, Catalogue of Pictures belonging to Thomas Philip Earl de Grey, at his house in St. James's Square. The entry states that the picture had been purchased at the Lely sale by the Earl of Kent.

[4] On 7 June 1954 the Kress Foundation made an offer to Contini-Bonacossi for 16 paintings, including the NGA painting which was listed as St. Jerome. In a draft of
one of the documents prepared for the count's signature in connection with the
offer this painting is described as one "which came from my personal collection in
Florence." The count accepted the offer on 30 June 1954; the final payment for the
purchase was ultimately made in early 1957, after the count's death in 1955. (See
copies of correspondence in NGA curatorial files.)

EXHIBITION HISTORY

2003 Loan to display with permanent collection, Birmingham (Alabama) Museum
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Caliari, Gabriele
Venetian, 1568 - 1631
The saint is identifiable as Lucy by the attributes she holds in her left hand, consisting of a martyr’s palm and a single eye (rather than the usual two) on a rod or stick. This latter attribute refers to a well-diffused legend about the saint, which told of how she plucked out her eyes because their beauty had attracted an unwelcome suitor, but God then restored them as a reward for her virtue and courage. Lucy consequently became a patron saint of sufferers from eye disease.

[1]

The early history of the painting has recently been elucidated by Mauro Lucco, who recognized a painting in the church of San Francesco in Montagnana, near Padua, as a copy. [2] Since this copy was recorded in the mid-19th century by the local historian Giacinto Foratti on the side wall of the former Abriani Chapel in the Duomo of Montagnana, [3] Lucco convincingly deduced that the present painting was originally painted for this chapel, situated to the right (facing) of the chancel. The painting must then have been removed at the time of the refurbishment and rededication of the chapel in the 1720s and sold off, leaving the copy on the wall. As Lucco also pointed out, the figure of the kneeling donor almost certainly therefore represents a member of the Abriani family. From all of this, it may further be inferred that the original dedication of the chapel was to Saint Lucy and that the painting served as its altarpiece. [4]
Half a century later, in 1782, a subsequent owner of the painting, Vincenzo Ranuzzini, apostolic legate to Venice, sent it to his native city of Bologna, as an intended gift to Pope Pius VI; according to a letter announcing the arrival of the picture, the owner declared the donor to be a self-portrait of the artist. When publishing this letter, Fabio Chiodini compared the portrait with various other supposed portraits of the painter and expressed some sympathy with this identification. However, these supposed portraits represent very unreliable sources of evidence; and as Chiodini himself pointed out, the donor figure looks older than 60, the age at which Veronese died in 1588. Ranuzzini’s identification may be dismissed, in fact, as pure invention.

Represented in profile in the immediate foreground, in a gesture of prayer, and cut off at the waist by the lower edge of the picture, the donor figure conforms to a convention closely associated with Veronese’s native city of Verona, dubbed by André Chastel “le donateur ‘in abisso’” (the donor in the abyss). This convention, which found particular favor in the years circa 1470–1530, was adopted by the artist in one of his earliest works, the Bevilacqua-Lazise altarpiece of circa 1547–1548 (Museo del Castelvecchio, Verona) for the church of San Fermo Maggiore. Although even by this date it had become archaic, the painter or a member of his shop may well have revived it as late as the 1580s, perhaps in response to a specific request by the patron. In this connection it may be noted that the town of Montagnana is situated well to the west of Padua, on one of the main roads to Verona.

The striking disjunction of scale between the saint and the donor should not be interpreted as miscalculation, but as a deliberate means to express differing degrees of reality, contrasting the ideal, divine nature of the saint with the humble supplicant, living in the here and now. Indeed, the difference of scale is complemented by a contrast in the pictorial handling between the two figures, with the draperies of the saint executed broadly and freely, and the head of the donor painted much more minutely. Even so, the somewhat empty rhetoric of the saint and mechanical quality of the execution fall below the standard of Veronese himself, and ever since the picture entered the Gallery, there has been general critical agreement that it is at best a work of collaboration with the master, but is more probably by a member of the studio. A possible candidate, proposed by Remigio Marini, Rodolfo Pallucchini, and Terisio Pignatti and Filippo Pedrocco, is Veronese’s younger brother Benedetto Caliari (1538–1598), who is recorded as his assistant by 1556, and who continued to perpetuate the externals of his style for a
decade after his death. It is suggested here, however, that Benedetto was possibly responsible for the Gallery’s Saint Jerome in the Wilderness, datable to circa 1575/1585, in which case, the stylistically rather different Saint Lucy may be by another member of the family workshop and artistic heir, namely Paolo’s son Gabriele (1568–1631). [8] One of the very few surviving works definitely known to have been painted by Gabriele is the signed Immaculate Conception in the church of Liettol di Campolongo, near Padua [fig. 1], a work in which the figure of Saint Anne is very close to that of Saint Lucy in her somewhat vacuous facial expression and stiff rhetorical pose. Furthermore, Veronese’s biographer Carlo Ridolfi, who was a friend of Gabriele’s son Giuseppe, noted that Gabriele painted “many portraits,” implying that he was a specialist in the genre, and perhaps even that his portraits—as here—were of a higher quality than his religious figures. The painting is unlikely, in any case, to date from before about 1585, as may be judged from the fractured highlights on the draperies, which may be interpreted as an attempt to approximate the handling of Veronese’s late works. Similarly, the donor’s collar may be related to male fashions of the 1580s and 1590s rather than earlier.

It would have been very natural for any patron in Montagnana to look to Veronese or to a member of the family workshop when commissioning an altarpiece. In 1555 the master had painted the Transfiguration for the high altar in the neighboring chancel of the Duomo (in situ), apparently through the agency of the Venetian patrician Francesco Pisani; and a decade later he had painted one of his greatest works, the Family of Darius before Alexander (National Gallery, London), for Francesco’s residence the Villa Pisani, just outside the city walls. [9] When commissioning their own, modestly scaled altarpiece in the 1580s or 1590s, the local Abriani family could evidently not hope to compete with such masterpieces, but it could perhaps aspire to derive from them some reflected glory.

Peter Humfrey
March 21, 2019

COMPARATIVE FIGURES
fig. 1 Gabriele Caliari, *Immaculate Conception*, c. 1560/1570, oil on canvas, Chiesa parrocchiale di San Lorenzo, Liettoli. Parrocchia di San Lorenzo di Liettoli (Pd)

NOTES

XXIII nella Pontificia Università lateranense (Rome, 1967), 8: col. 252.


[4] In a MS opinion of 1926 (NGA curatorial files, quoted by Fern Rusk Shapley, Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection: Italian Schools, XVI–XVIII Century [London, 1973], 40; Fern Rusk Shapley, Catalogue of the Italian Paintings [Washington, DC, 1979], 1:528), Detlev von Hadeln suggested that the original site of the picture was the church of Santa Croce in Belluno, where Carlo Ridolfi in 1648 had recorded an image of Saint Lucy by Veronese. But it now turns out that Ridolfi was referring rather to the Gallery’s The Martyrdom and Last Communion of Saint Lucy, 1984.28.1.


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The support is a tightly woven, medium-weight, plain-weave fabric. There is a vertical seam approximately 15 centimeters from the right edge. This smaller area is made up of three pieces of fabric joined with two horizontal seams. The support has been lined, but cusping around all four edges indicates that the painting retains the original dimensions.

The fabric was prepared with an off-white ground, covered by a transparent reddish-brown imprimatura. Infrared reflectography (Vidicon) [1] revealed no sign of underdrawing. The appearance of the paint surface is compromised by overall abrasion and scattered paint losses, resulting in a flattening of the forms. In the most abraded areas, the ground is visible to the naked eye. The face of the saint has been extensively retouched, and the position of the ear now appears spatially confused. Mario Modestini removed a discolored varnish and inpainted the painting in 1955. The varnish applied at that time has discolored.

Joanna Dunn and Peter Humfrey based on the examination report by Michael Swicklik

March 21, 2019

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Hamamatsu c/1000-03 Vidicon camera and a Kodak Wratten 87A filter.

PROVENANCE

February 1925, no. 128); purchased by Kendal, possibly for (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Rome and Florence); sold 1954 to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York;[5] gift 1961 to NGA.

[1] E-mail from Mauro Lucco to NGA curator David Alan Brown, dated 22 January 2011, in NGA curatorial files. Lucco recognized a painting in the church of San Francesco in Montagnana, near Padua, as a copy of the NGA painting. Since the copy was recorded by the local historian Giacinto Foratti in the mid-19th century hanging on the side wall of the former Abriani Chapel, Lucco deduced that the NGA painting was originally painted as the altarpiece for this chapel, situated to the right (facing) of the chancel, and that the figure of the kneeling donor probably represents a member of the Abriani family. The painting must then have been removed at the time of the refurbishment and rededication of the chapel in the 1720s and sold off, leaving the copy on the wall. See Giacinto Foratti, *Cenni storici e descrittivi di Montagnana*, 2 vols., Venice, 1862-1863: 2(1863):124 (“Si rimarca pure sopra una parete un quadro, che rappresenta Santa Lucia, onde diede il modello Paolo Veronese. Era anche questo altare dei suddetti conti Abriani”).

Detlev von Hadeln suggested (in a 1926 manuscript opinion, in NGA curatorial files) that the painting was the one described in 1648 by Carlo Ridolfi as having been painted by Veronese for the church of Santa Croce in Belluno (Carlo Ridolfi, *Le Maraviglie dell’arte*, 2 vols., Venice, 1648: 1:303; Berlin edition, 1914-1924, ed. by Baron Detlev von Hadeln, 1914: 317). The same text is also found in Ridolfi’s earlier *Vita di Paolo Caliari Veronese*, Venice, 1646: 23. Citing Florio Miari (*Dizionario storico-artistico-letterario bellunese*, Bologna, 1843: 140), von Hadeln noted that the church was torn down in the early 19th century and that the painting had disappeared; he located it again in Contini-Bonacossi’s collection. It now turns out that Ridolfi was referring instead to NGA 1984.28.1, Veronese’s *The Martyrdom and Last Communion of Saint Lucy*.

[2] Fabio Chiodini, “Una sosta bolognese per una tela di Paolo Caliari e indizi per un possibile autoritratti dell’artista,” *Arte Cristiana* 93 (2005): 116-117. The painting was an intended gift to Pope Pius VI. Chiodini kindly shared with NGA his discovery of the previously unpublished document that recounts this transfer, which is in Ms. B 2382, pp. 270-271, Biblioteca Comunale dell’Archiginnasio, Bologna; see his e-mails of 13 and 30 September 2004, in NGA curatorial files.
[3] Lot number 108 is crossed out in the copy of the sale catalogue held by the library of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (copy in NGA curatorial files). The sale catalogue indicates that the painting was part of the property removed not from the earl’s Scottish seat of Ethie Castle near Arbroath, but from his English residence of Longwood, Winchester.

[4] This name is provided by the Getty Provenance Index, Getty Research Center, Los Angeles.

[5] On 7 June 1954 the Kress Foundation made an offer to Contini-Bonacossi for 16 paintings, including the Veronese. In the draft of a document prepared for the count’s signature in connection with the offer this painting is described as one “which came from my personal collection in Florence.” The count accepted the offer on 30 June 1954; the final payment for the purchase was ultimately made in early 1957, after the count’s death in 1955. (See copies of correspondence in NGA curatorial files.)
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1957 Berenson, Bernard. Italian Pictures of the Renaissance. Venetian
2005 Chiodini, Fabio. “Una sosta bolognese per una tela di Paolo Caliari e indizi per un possibile autoritratti dell’artista.” Arte Cristiana 93 (2005): 115-120.
Pace, Gian Paolo
Italian, 1528 - 1560
Despite the circumstantial information provided by the inscription, the attribution of
the portrait remains problematic. To the difficulty of identifying the artist on
grounds of style is added the fact that the second half of the second line, which
was almost certainly originally inscribed with the painter’s name and the date, has
been completely effaced—perhaps deliberately, to make way for the false
signature “Paolo Cagliari [Paolo Veronese] 1557” that had been inserted by 1856.
[1] Nevertheless, from the authentic parts of the inscription, it is safe to infer the
following: that the name of the sitter was Alessandro Alberti; that the portrait was
painted when he was 30; and that it was painted in Venice.

On this basis, Ettore Camesasca connected the portrait with a letter written by
Pietro Aretino to Alessandro Alberti in 1548, in which the author mentions that
Alberti, in common with the Venetian patricians Niccolò Tiepolo and Daniele
Barbaro, had had his portrait painted by Gian Paolo Pace. [2] This somewhat
obscure artist was unfortunately confused by Camesasca, followed by other
scholars, with Gian Paolo Lolmo, who is documented in the area of Bergamo
between 1581 and 1595, with whose style the present work has nothing in
common. [3] More recently, however, the biography of Pace has been clarified,
with new documentary information, by Mattia Biffis, the essentials of which may be summarized as follows. [4] The painter was first recorded in Venice in 1528, but by the 1530s he was active in Padua, where he seems to have remained based for the rest of his life. In 1543 he made a brief trip across the Alps to Augsburg, apparently following a recommendation by Aretino to the Fugger family that he was an able portraitist. Probably soon afterward he painted the portraits of Tiepolo, Barbaro, and Alberti, and in 1545, at the time of Titian’s visit to Rome, Pace painted a posthumous portrait of Giovanni dalle Bande Nere (Uffizi, Florence), father of Cosimo de’ Medici, duke of Florence, as a pendant to Titian’s portrait of Aretino (Pitti, Florence), likewise intended as a diplomatic gift to the duke. In 1553, still in his capacity as a painter of courtly portraits, Pace sent an unspecified number from Padua to Alfonso Gonzaga, lord of a little court at Novellara, in Emilia. In about 1558 he began, but did not apparently complete, the pair of portraits of Irene and Emilia di Spilimbergo, now also in the National Gallery of Art. By this date, however, he had secured for himself a valuable ecclesiastical benefice that seems to have liberated him from having to earn his living as a full-time painter.

In his 2012 article, Biffis also established for the first time the identity of Alessandro Alberti. It was already clear from Aretino’s correspondence that a gentleman of this name was the recipient of nine letters from him between November 1544 and October 1550, and Alberti is mentioned in a further four letters to other correspondents. From these it emerges that he was a “creato”—in other words, a member of the entourage—of Giovanni della Casa, apostolic legate to Venice during this period of six years. [5] Aretino addresses him affectionately, even paternally, calling him “il mio caro” and “figliuolo,” and offers him personal advice. But Biffis has now also shown that Alessandro was a member of the same Florentine noble family as the celebrated architect and humanist Leon Battista Alberti, that he was born in 1514 and died in 1554, that he belonged to a fiercely republican branch of the family, and that he lived mainly in Rome as an exile from ducal Florence. If he is, indeed, the subject of the Gallery’s portrait, it must have been painted between his arrival in Venice and his 31st birthday—in other words, between October 1544 and March 1545. Although the whereabouts of the portrait are mysterious for three centuries after it was painted, it is probably no accident that it should have reemerged in modern times in Florence.

For Biffis the circumstantial evidence surrounding the presence of Alberti in Venice fit the Gallery’s portrait perfectly, and he fully endorsed Camesasca’s identification of Pace as its author. He further plausibly argued that the falsified name of “Paolo
Cagliari” on the sheet of paper was inspired by the original signature “Gian Paolo Pace,” which was probably effaced by some unscrupulous dealer in the 19th century, with the probable purpose of transferring the authorship of the portrait from a minor, unknown artist to one of the most famous of Venetian painters. A problem, however, with accepting Pace’s authorship is that the other three surviving paintings by him—the Giovanni dalle Bande Nere and the pair of Spilimbergo portraits—bear very little stylistic resemblance to that of the Alessandro Alberti. These other portraits are much closer in style to Titian, whereas on the purely visual evidence, the Alberti has been variously thought to be Flemish, Emilian, or Lombard. Indeed, the sharp, factual precision of the handling of the costume is far from typically Venetian, and the physiognomical type of the subsidiary figure bears some resemblance, as was recognized by Fern Rusk Shapley, to works by Parmese painters, such as Girolamo Mazzola Bedoli. Yet as pointed out by Biffis, Pace was never, contrary to what is usually thought, an assistant in Titian’s workshop, but practiced rather as a portrait painter in Padua; and while the Titianesque style of the Giovanni dalle Bande Nere and the Spilimbergo portraits may be interpreted as a response to the needs of particular commissions, it can be argued that Pace’s own character as a portrait painter is more faithfully reflected by the Alessandro Alberti. It may certainly be imagined that the rich costume and self-conscious elegance of the portrait give a good idea of his lost portraits for the Fuggers and for the court at Novellara. The courtly aspect of the image is further emphasized by the subsidiary figure of the page, who is occupied in lacing Alberti’s breeches to his doublet. Biffis has pointed to similar figures in Titian’s Alfonso d’Avalos of circa 1533 (J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles) and Beccaruzzi’s Ball-Player of circa 1540 (Staatliche Museen, Berlin); a later example is Paris Bordone’s Portrait of a Man in Armor with Two Pages of circa 1555 (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York).

For many scholars it may still be difficult to accept that the Alessandro Alberti, on the one hand, and the Giovanni dalle Bande Nere and the Spilimbergo portraits, on the other, are by the same artist. Further, it cannot be excluded that the purportedly apocryphal date of “1557,” now removed, in fact recorded a correct date—especially since it can be argued that the costume worn by the sitter corresponds better to the fashions of the later 1550s than to 1544/1545. Yet to reject the attribution to Pace would be to conclude that the sitter represents an unidentified, quite different Alessandro Alberti from the one who was present in Venice in the entourage of the papal legate between 1544 and 1550, and who died in 1554; and it would also be to draw the improbable conclusion that this...
namesake, who also happened to be aged 30 when he visited Venice a decade later, likewise had his portrait painted there by a painter whose style did not belong to local tradition.

Peter Humfrey
March 21, 2019

NOTES


Ferdinando Bologna, “Un doppio ritratto di Tiziano, inedito,” Arte Veneta 11 (1957): 70 n. 3, attributed the portrait to the Bruges painter Pieter Pourbus (c. 1523/1524–1584), by comparison with a signed Allegory of Love in the Wallace Collection, London (no. 531). But the stylistic relationship is only very general, and Pourbus is not known to have visited Italy.

Fern Rusk Shapley, Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection: Italian Schools, XVI–XVIII Century (London, 1973), 26–27 (also Fern Rusk Shapley, Catalogue of the Italian Paintings [Washington, DC, 1979], 1:355–357), who lists a number of other inconclusive attributions proposed by earlier scholars, labeled the portrait “Parmese School.” She suggested that a point of departure both for the style and the composition is provided by the Portrait of Camilla Gonzaga, Countess of San Secondo and Her Three Sons (Prado, Madrid), begun by Parmigianino in the late 1530s and completed after his death by a follower; it is true that the Alessandro Alberti resembles the Prado portrait in the three-quarter-length format, with the boy placed in intimate proximity to the adult, and in the precise description of the elaborate courtly costume. David Brown (letter to Peter Humfrey of Feb. 8, 2001) has also pointed out that the pose of the page appears to derive from that of Christ in Correggio’s Madonna della Scodella of 1530 (Galleria Nazionale, Parma). Further, in type this figure closely resembles the sitter in Girolamo Mazzola Bedoli’s Parma Embracing Alessandro Farnese of c. 1555 (Galleria Nazionale, Parma). Yet Shapley was certainly right to exclude Bedoli, whose work retains the sinuous rhythms of Parmigianino combined with a certain softness of surface, as the author of the Gallery’s portrait; and the supposed Parmese connection ignores the fact that the Alessandro Alberti was painted in Venice.

Bernard Alkema and John Martin, in Le botteghe di Tiziano (Florence, 2009), 346, considered it to be in the style of Bergamo.

See note 7 above.


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Alessandro Alberti with a Page
© National Gallery of Art, Washington
The support consists of a single piece of fabric. Although the tacking margins have been cut, cusping is visible along the edges, indicating the present dimensions are probably close to the original. The imprimatura is a warm dark brown in color and lies on top of a white gesso ground. The x-radiographs suggest that the first sketching was applied with paint containing lead white. The upper layers were applied opaquely and brought to a meticulous finish, unlike most Venetian paintings of the period; similarly un-Venetian is the way in which the background color neatly abuts the outline of the figures. Surprisingly, the x-radiographs exhibit bold and vigorous strokes executed with a wide brush in the background, the page’s costume, and the tablecloth, all of which contrast with the meticulous finish of the rest of the surface. Many compositional changes are evident. Most notable are the two pairs of eyes and two ears for the page, indicating that his head was first sketched in more to the right of the present viewing position. His body position also appears to have been changed, and Alberti’s proper left pant leg was painted in with detail before it was covered with the page’s torso. Alberti’s arms were originally sketched in straighter and his proper right arm was closer to his body. His red mantle originally extended more outward on both sides at the bottom. In addition, a number of alterations of detail were made, as in the white book ties, which were once longer. Examination of the inscription shows that all the surviving letters are original, since a craquelure of the same age traverses the brown paint of the inscription and the original paint layer below; there is not enough information, however, to reconstruct any of the removed letters, which presumably gave the artist’s name and the date. Despite a certain amount of retouching, the general condition of the painting is good. Stephen Pichetto lined the painting in 1948, and Mario Modestini inpainted it and applied a varnish two years later.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Susanna Griswold

March 21, 2019

PROVENANCE


[1] Otto Mündler recorded seeing the painting in September 1856; see "The Travel Diaries of Otto Mündler 1855-1858," ed. Carol Togneri Dowd, Walpole Society 51 (1985): 131-132, 327. He described it as "A singular picture...with a letter, on which the name of Paolo Cagliari and 1557 is lisible[sic]." Mündler spelled the family name Torreggiani.


[3] According to Everett Fahy, L'Archivio Storico Fotografico di Stefano Bardini: Dipinti, Disegni, Miniature, Stampe, Florence, 2000: 28, no. 81, Bardini acquired the painting from Torrigiani's heirs by 1895, but he provides no documentation for this date, and the introduction to the book states that the fact of Bardini owning a photographic negative did not always mean he owned the work of art.


[6] The Kress Foundation made an offer to Contini-Bonacossi on 7 June 1948 for a group of twenty-eight paintings, including Lotto's "Gentleman with a Page," the offer was accepted on 11 July 1948 (see copies of correspondence in NGA curatorial files).
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The portraits of the sisters Emilia and Irene di Spilimbergo, presumably painted as a pair, remained in the possession of the Spilimbergo family and their descendants until 1909, when they were sold under controversial circumstances to Duveen and exported from Italy to America. Much of the controversy stemmed from a persistent local tradition that the portraits were by Titian. An engraving of the Irene, for example, had served as the frontispiece of Count di Maniago’s influential account of the history of art in Friuli of 1819. [1] From about 1930, however, most critics have seen them rather as by a close follower, perhaps identifiable as Gian Paolo Pace.

Emilia (1536–1585) and her younger sister Irene (1538–1559) were the daughters of the Friulian nobleman Adriano di Spilimbergo and Giulia, daughter of the wealthy Venetian citizen Zuan Paolo da Ponte. According to Giorgio Vasari, Titian painted the portraits of the members of three generations of the family: “Among the portraits by Titian is one . . . of Paolo da Ponte, whose beautiful young daughter Giulia (who was a confidante of his) Titian also portrayed, as he did the lovely Signora Irene, a young woman well versed in literature and music who was studying design. When she died about seven years ago she was honoured by nearly every Italian writer.” [2] At least part of this information is certainly correct, as has been shown with the recent rediscovery of Titian’s portrait of Zuan Paolo da Ponte, together with references in the latter’s Memoriale—a manuscript journal in five volumes covering the years 1520 to 1562—which show that this portrait and that of Giulia were commissioned from the painter in 1534. [3] And in his last remark about Giulia’s daughter Irene, Vasari is clearly referring to a volume of nearly 400
Latin and Italian poems, including contributions by Torquato Tasso and Lodovico Dolce, which was published in 1561 by Dionigi Atanagi, in honor of the gifted young woman who had died at such a tragically early age. [4]

Atanagi’s biography of Irene, together with further modern research, provides considerable information about her personality and accomplishments. [5] After the death of their father in 1541, she and her sister were educated under the supervision of their maternal grandfather, who actively encouraged their interest in the arts, and who in about 1555 brought them to Venice. Irene was remarkable in her ambition to excel, and stimulated by the example of Sofonisba Anguissola, she persuaded Titian, as a family friend, to allow her to copy his works and to give her tuition as a painter. But her very determination apparently led to overexertion and hence to illness and early death. Much less is known of Emilia, who was born in 1536, married in 1561, and died in 1585. But three of the poems in Atanagi’s volume praise her as the image of her sister, and two years later she was the dedicatee of Anton Maria Amadi’s edition of one of Petrarch’s Sonnets. [6]

On June 28, 1560, a few months after Irene’s death the previous December, her grandfather noted in his Memoriale that a portrait of her—and presumably also one of her sister—had been begun two years previously by Gian Paolo Pace, but that this painter had sketched it so poorly that the patron asked Titian to complete it. [7] If begun in 1558, the portraits had as their original function, as observed by Elsje van Kessel, some probable relation to the sitters’ prospective marriages: either to present two highly eligible, aristocratic young woman to prospective husbands; or, given their character as balancing pendants, as permanent souvenirs for their family after they were married. [8] With the premature death of Irene, however, the function of her portrait was suddenly changed to become an elegy for what might have been, in a way analogous to the volume of poems. [9] A number of details are certainly consistent with this change of function, notably the inscription (“If the fates had allowed”). Although there is no particular reference to her activity as a painter, the laurel crown in her hand presumably alludes to her achievements in the arts in general, and the evergreen palm to her everlasting fame. Another obvious symbol is the unicorn in the left middle ground, which as already pointed out in 1819 by Di Maniago, refers to her perpetual virginity. [10] The column with its base further invests Irene’s portrait with a grandeur not present in that of her sister. Too little information exists about Emilia’s biography to know for certain why the seascape to the right shows a storm-tossed ship; but since the portraits were almost certainly painted contemporaneously as pendants, the motif probably alludes to the
turbulent state of her emotions on the loss of her sister. Such an allusion, and such a close linkage with Irene, would perhaps have been less appropriate after Emilia’s marriage in 1561. On circumstantial evidence, therefore, the pair of portraits—like Atanagi’s celebratory volume—is likely to have been completed in the immediate aftermath of Irene’s death in 1559.

The traditional attribution of the portraits to Titian, based on the account of Vasari, and also on the very similar one by Carlo Ridolfi, was still unchallenged at the beginning of the 20th century. [11] Only Joseph Archer Crowe and Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle had expressed doubts about their quality, but they attributed any shortcomings to damage and repaint. [12] In 1904, when they were in the possession of Count Niccolò D’Attimis Maniago, a descendant of the Spilimbergo and Da Ponte families, they were listed in an Italian government catalog as works of “sommo pregio” (the highest value), implying that they were by Titian. In 1908, however, Count Enrico D’Attimis Maniago applied to the Italian commission on the export of works of art for a downgrading of the status of the portraits, and hence for permission to sell them abroad. In 1909 the commission agreed that they were not by Titian, and an export license was granted; within the same year, they passed through the hands of the dealer Elia Volpi and were acquired by Joseph Duveen. [13] It was clearly now in Duveen’s interest to revert to the traditional attribution, and this case was greatly aided by the discovery of Zuan Paolo da Ponte’s Memoriale in 1910, and the publication in 1911 by Ferruccio Carreri of the passages referring to Titian’s involvement (see Entry note 7). In 1949 doubts about the authenticity of these passages were raised by Michelangelo Muraro, who having examined the original manuscript, noted first that the two relevant pages were now missing, and second that the name of Titian does not appear in the index to the volume. Muraro observed that the publication of the two passages coincided closely with the controversy surrounding the sale of the portraits from the Spilimbergo family to Duveen, and suggested that they had been fabricated to prove Titian’s authorship of the Irene. [14]

In the absence of the original document, it is difficult to assess the reliability or otherwise of the passages published by Carreri; yet it seems likely that even if they were tampered with, they were not, after all, complete fabrications. It is true that in terms of their aesthetic quality neither of the Spilimbergo portraits can be accepted as the work of Titian, even in part; and although a case has sometimes been made for seeing the Irene as superior to the Emilia—for instance by the Tietzes, Harold Wethey, and Fern Rusk Shapley [15]—the two works are perfectly homogenous in
terms of their style and handling. Yet in these respects, as well as in their compositions, they are undeniably Titianesque, and the suspicions about the authenticity of the documentation do not disprove the obvious inference that they are products of Titian’s workshop. At this stage of his career, the master himself would have been devoting his best efforts almost exclusively to King Philip II of Spain, and when undertaking what he could only have regarded as an unwelcome chore at the request of a former patron, it is hardly surprising that he should have delegated it to one of his various studio assistants.

Whether or not this assistant was Gian Paolo Pace is another matter. Again, the mention in the Memoriale that he was responsible for making a start at least on the portrait of Irene may be regarded as reliable, since no unscrupulous historian or dealer would have had any interest in inventing a story about a painter who was almost entirely obscure. Since 1911 Pace has, in fact, been widely accepted as the author of the portraits, in whole or in part, including by Corrado Ricci, the Tietzes, Ettore Camesasca, Wethey, and Giorgio Tagliaferro. [16] Recently, however, Mattia Biffis has again minimized Pace’s involvement, following his demonstration that, contrary to previous assumptions, this painter was never an assistant in Titian’s workshop, but rather an autonomous master based in Padua. [17] Further, Biffis provided good reasons for thinking that the most reliable touchstone for his own personal style is neither the Titianesque portrait of Giovanni delle Bande Nere (Uffizi, Florence) [fig. 1], nor the Spilimbergo portraits, but the Gallery’s own, stylistically very different, portrait of Alessandro Alberti. If Biffis is correct, then Pace may indeed have begun both portraits, making studies of the faces from life and blocking out the compositions on their canvases; but then the upper layers would have been executed by an assistant in Titian’s workshop. Unfortunately, the evidence of the x-radiographs [fig. 2] does not provide a clear solution to the attributional conundrum.

Sometimes associated with the pair is a stylistically and compositionally similar Portrait of a Woman, formerly in the Quincy Shaw collection, Boston, and the Peterkin collection, Andover, Massachusetts. Since it is smaller than the pair (72 × 48 cm), Lionello Venturi suggested that it was Titian’s autograph modello for the Irene. [18] The Tietzes identified it instead as Titian’s much earlier portrait of the sisters’ mother, Giulia da Ponte, recorded in Zuan Paolo’s Memoriale and by Vasari. [19] But Francesco Valcanover was certainly correct in rejecting the attribution to Titian; and his own attribution to Cesare Vecellio is more in keeping with the later style of the costume. [20] Crowe and Cavalcaselle recorded a 16th-
century copy of the *Irene* in the possession of Signor Gatorno, San Vito del Tagliamento. [21] Linda Borean drew attention to a picture formerly in the Brownlow collection, in which the composition of the *Irene*, complete with unicorn in the background, is re-elaborated as a *Saint Catherine*. [22]

Peter Humfrey
March 21, 2019
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![fig. 1](image1.png)  
*fig. 1* Workshop of Titian (Gian Paolo Pace), *Giovanni delle Bande Nere*, c. 1545, oil on canvas, Uffizi Gallery, Florence. Su concessione del Ministero dei beni e delle attività culturali e del turismo

![fig. 2](image2.png)  
*fig. 2* X-radiograph, Assistant of Titian, possibly begun by Gian Paolo Pace, *Emilia di Spilimbergo*, c. 1560, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Widener Collection

**NOTES**


See *Tiziano ritrovato: Il ritratto di messer Zuan Paulo da Ponte* (Venice, 1998). The portrait of Zuan Paolo, which in 1998 was with the dealer Pietro Scarpa in Venice, carries the inscription on the reverse: +ZAN PAULO DA PONTE+/ SPILINBERGO. The picture appears to be in poor condition but authentic. Zuan Paolo’s *Memoriale* is reputedly in a private collection in Venice and is not easily accessible.


The first passage, dated June 28, 1560, reads as follows: “Mandai a messer Titian per l’opera per lui fata nel retrato della nostra già benedetta memoria d’Irene abozata assai malamaente da Ser Zuan Paulo de Pase et lassata imperfetta per due anni si che rimase ben che la poverina andò a miglior vita. Ma Messer Titian per sua gratia si tolse il cargo de volerlo finir et conzata talmente che si può dir per certo che se fusse sta presente meglio non si poteva desiderar. Gli mandai ducati 6 viniciani et per sua cortesia se a contenta che mertia assai più” (I sent for Messer Titian to undertake the work he did on the portrait of our Irene of blessed memory. This had been begun very badly by Gian Paolo Pace two years before the poor girl went to a better life, but was left unfinished by him. But Messer Titian graciously assumed the burden of completing it, making her appear as if really present,
in a way that was better than one could possibly have hoped for. I sent him six Venetian ducats, which he courteously accepted, although his work was worth much more). The second passage reads: “Il qual M. Tutian per haver nella mente la sua effigie l’a finita e fata si che se l’havesse avuto presente non l’haveria potuto far meglio” (Titian had retained her likeness in his mind, and when finishing her portrait he made her appear as if present, in a way that could scarcely be bettered). See Ferruccio Carreri, “Report in La Difesa, 17–18 August 1911,” L’arte 14 (1911): 394, repro.; Michelangelo Muraro, “Il memoriale de Zuan Paolo da Ponte,” Archivio veneto 79 (1949): 83.


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The painting was executed on a medium-weight twill-weave fabric, which was prepared with a white ground, followed by a thin dark-brown imprimatura layer. The artist applied the paint wet-into-wet, often using a well-laden brush to produce impasto. The x-radiographs [fig. 1] show that the composition was roughly sketched in with lead white over the dark imprimatura. They also reveal pentimenti in the seascape to the right, in the position of the ship, and in the form of the clouds.

The support was lined and the tacking margins were removed, and although cusping is apparent only on the top and bottom edges, there is no indication that the painting has been reduced in size. The paint is now in poor condition, with the impasto disrupted by the cupped and crushed surface, and it is covered with thick yellowed varnish and copious overpaint. The awkward position of the sitter’s eyes is explained by the fact that little of the left eye is original, and the mouth has also been altered by retouching.

Joanna Dunn and Peter Humfrey based on the examination reports by William Leisher, Susanna Griswold, and Joanna Dunn
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fig. 1 X-radiograph, Assistant of Titian, possibly begun by Gian Paolo Pace, Emilia di Spilimbergo, c. 1560, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Widener Collection

PROVENANCE

Commissioned by the Spilimbergo family, Spilimbergo, Italy; by inheritance to Count Giulio di Spilimbergo, Domanins, by 1819;[1] by inheritance to Count Niccolò d’Attimis Maniago, Florence, by 1904;[2] and Count Enrico d’Attimis Maniago, Florence until 1909; Elia Volpi [1858-1938], Florence; sold 1909 to (Duveen Brothers, Inc., London and New York); sold October 1909 to Peter A.B. Widener [1834-1915], Elkins Park, Pennsylvania;[3] Inheritance from the Estate of Peter A.B. Widener by gift through power of appointment of Joseph E. Widener, Elkins Park.
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The portraits of the sisters Irene and Emilia di Spilimbergo, presumably painted as a pair, remained in the possession of the Spilimbergo family and their descendants until 1909, when they were sold under controversial circumstances to Duveen and exported from Italy to America. Much of the controversy stemmed from a persistent local tradition that the portraits were by Titian. An engraving of the Irene, for example, had served as the frontispiece of Count di Maniago's influential account of the history of art in Friuli of 1819. [1] From about 1930, however, most critics have seen them rather as by a close follower, perhaps identifiable as Gian Paolo Pace.

Emilia (1536–1585) and her younger sister Irene (1538–1559) were the daughters of the Friulian nobleman Adriano di Spilimbergo and Giulia, daughter of the wealthy Venetian citizen Zuan Paolo da Ponte. According to Giorgio Vasari, Titian painted the portraits of the members of three generations of the family: "Among the portraits by Titian is one . . . of Paolo da Ponte, whose beautiful young daughter Giulia (who was a confidante of his) Titian also portrayed, as he did the lovely Signora Irene, a young woman well versed in literature and music who was studying design. When she died about seven years ago she was honoured by nearly every Italian writer." [2] At least part of this information is certainly correct, as has been shown with the recent rediscovery of Titian’s portrait of Zuan Paolo da Ponte, together with references in the latter's Memoriale—a manuscript journal in five volumes covering the years 1520 to 1562—which show that this portrait and
that of Giulia were commissioned from the painter in 1534. [3] And in his last remark about Giulia’s daughter Irene, Vasari is clearly referring to a volume of nearly 400 Latin and Italian poems, including contributions by Torquato Tasso and Lodovico Dolce, which was published in 1561 by Dionigi Atanagi, in honor of the gifted young woman who had died at such a tragically early age. [4]

Atanagi’s biography of Irene, together with further modern research, provides considerable information about her personality and accomplishments. [5] After the death of their father in 1541, she and her sister were educated under the supervision of their maternal grandfather, who actively encouraged their interest in the arts, and who in about 1555 brought them to Venice. Irene was remarkable in her ambition to excel, and stimulated by the example of Sofonisba Anguissola, she persuaded Titian, as a family friend, to allow her to copy his works and to give her tuition as a painter. But her very determination apparently led to overexertion and hence to illness and early death. Much less is known of Emilia, who was born in 1536, married in 1561, and died in 1585. But three of the poems in Atanagi’s volume praise her as the image of her sister, and two years later she was the dedicatee of Anton Maria Amadi’s edition of one of Petrarch’s Sonnets. [6]

On June 28, 1560, a few months after Irene’s death the previous December, her grandfather noted in his Memoriale that a portrait of her—and presumably also one of her sister—had been begun two years previously by Gian Paolo Pace, but that this painter had sketched it so poorly that the patron asked Titian to complete it. [7] If begun in 1558, the portraits had as their original function, as observed by Elsje van Kessel, some probable relation to the sitters’ prospective marriages: either to present two highly eligible, aristocratic young woman to prospective husbands; or, given their character as balancing pendants, as permanent souvenirs for their family after they were married. [8] With the premature death of Irene, however, the function of her portrait was suddenly changed to become an elegy for what might have been, in a way analogous to the volume of poems. [9] A number of details are certainly consistent with this change of function, notably the inscription (“If the fates had allowed”). Although there is no particular reference to her activity as a painter, the laurel crown in her hand presumably alludes to her achievements in the arts in general, and the evergreen palm to her everlasting fame. Another obvious symbol is the unicorn in the left middle ground, which as already pointed out in 1819 by Di Maniago, refers to her perpetual virginity. [10] The column with its base further invests Irene’s portrait with a grandeur not present in that of her sister. Too little information exists about Emilia’s biography to know for certain why the seascape
to the right shows a storm-tossed ship; but since the portraits were almost certainly painted contemporaneously as pendants, the motif probably alludes to the turbulent state of her emotions on the loss of her sister. Such an allusion, and such a close linkage with Irene, would perhaps have been less appropriate after Emilia’s marriage in 1561. On circumstantial evidence, therefore, the pair of portraits—like Atanagi’s celebratory volume—is likely to have been completed in the immediate aftermath of Irene’s death in 1559.

The traditional attribution of the portraits to Titian, based on the account of Vasari, and also on the very similar one by Carlo Ridolfi, was still unchallenged at the beginning of the 20th century. [11] Only Joseph Archer Crowe and Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle had expressed doubts about their quality, but they attributed any shortcomings to damage and repaint. [12] In 1904, when they were in the possession of Count Niccolò D’Attimis Maniago, a descendant of the Spilimbergo and Da Ponte families, they were listed in an Italian government catalog as works of “sommo pregio” (the highest value), implying that they were by Titian. In 1908, however, Count Enrico D’Attimis Maniago applied to the Italian commission on the export of works of art for a downgrading of the status of the portraits, and hence for permission to sell them abroad. In 1909 the commission agreed that they were not by Titian, and an export license was granted; within the same year, they passed through the hands of the dealer Elia Volpi and were acquired by Joseph Duveen. [13] It was clearly now in Duveen’s interest to revert to the traditional attribution, and this case was greatly aided by the discovery of Zuan Paolo da Ponte’s Memoriale in 1910, and the publication in 1911 by Ferruccio Carreri of the passages referring to Titian’s involvement (see Entry note 7). In 1949 doubts about the authenticity of these passages were raised by Michelangelo Muraro, who having examined the original manuscript, noted first that the two relevant pages were now missing, and second that the name of Titian does not appear in the index to the volume. Muraro observed that the publication of the two passages coincided closely with the controversy surrounding the sale of the portraits from the Spilimbergo family to Duveen, and suggested that they had been fabricated to prove Titian’s authorship of the Irene. [14]

In the absence of the original document, it is difficult to assess the reliability or otherwise of the passages published by Carreri; yet it seems likely that even if they were tampered with, they were not, after all, complete fabrications. It is true that in terms of their aesthetic quality neither of the Spilimbergo portraits can be accepted as the work of Titian, even in part; and although a case has sometimes been made
for seeing the Irene as superior to the Emilia—for instance by the Tietzes, Harold Wethey, and Fern Rusk Shapley [15]—the two works are perfectly homogenous in terms of their style and handling. Yet in these respects, as well as in their compositions, they are undeniably Titianesque, and the suspicions about the authenticity of the documentation do not disprove the obvious inference that they are products of Titian’s workshop. At this stage of his career, the master himself would have been devoting his best efforts almost exclusively to King Philip II of Spain, and when undertaking what he could only have regarded as an unwelcome chore at the request of a former patron, it is hardly surprising that he should have delegated it to one of his various studio assistants.

Whether or not this assistant was Gian Paolo Pace is another matter. Again, the mention in the Memoriale that he was responsible for making a start at least on the portrait of Irene may be regarded as reliable, since no unscrupulous historian or dealer would have had any interest in inventing a story about a painter who was almost entirely obscure. Since 1911 Pace has, in fact, been widely accepted as the author of the portraits, in whole or in part, including by Corrado Ricci, the Tietzes, Ettore Camesasca, Wethey, and Giorgio Tagliaferro. [16] Recently, however, Mattia Biffis has again minimized Pace’s involvement, following his demonstration that, contrary to previous assumptions, this painter was never an assistant in Titian’s workshop, but rather an autonomous master based in Padua. [17] Further, Biffis provided good reasons for thinking that the most reliable touchstone for his own personal style is neither the Titianesque portrait of Giovanni delle Bande Nere (Uffizi, Florence) [fig. 1], nor the Spilimbergo portraits, but the Gallery’s own, stylistically very different, portrait of Alessandro Alberti. If Biffis is correct, then Pace may indeed have begun both portraits, making studies of the faces from life and blocking out the compositions on their canvases; but then the upper layers would have been executed by an assistant in Titian’s workshop. Unfortunately, the evidence of the x-radiographs [fig. 2] does not provide a clear solution to the attributional conundrum.

Sometimes associated with the pair is a stylistically and compositionally similar Portrait of a Woman, formerly in the Quincy Shaw collection, Boston, and the Peterkin collection, Andover, Massachusetts. Since it is smaller than the pair (72 × 48 cm), Lionello Venturi suggested that it was Titian’s autograph modello for the Irene. [18] The Tietzes identified it instead as Titian’s much earlier portrait of the sisters’ mother, Giulia da Ponte, recorded in Zuan Paolo’s Memoriale and by Vasari. [19] But Francesco Valcanover was certainly correct in rejecting the
attribution to Titian; and his own attribution to Cesare Vecellio is more in keeping with the later style of the costume. [20] Crowe and Cavalcaselle recorded a 16th-century copy of the Irene in the possession of Signor Gatorno, San Vito del Tagliamento. [21] Linda Borean drew attention to a picture formerly in the Brownlow collection, in which the composition of the Irene, complete with unicorn in the background, is re-elaborated as a Saint Catherine. [22]

Peter Humfrey
March 21, 2019
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**fig. 1** Workshop of Titian (Gian Paolo Pace), Giovanni delle Bande Nere, c. 1545, oil on canvas, Uffizi Gallery, Florence. Su concessione del Ministero dei beni e delle attività culturali e del turismo

**fig. 2** X-radiograph, Assistant of Titian, possibly begun by Gian Paolo Pace, Irene di Spilimbergo, c. 1560, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Widener Collection
NOTES


[7] The first passage, dated June 28, 1560, reads as follows: “Mandai a messer Titian per l’opera per lui fata nel retrato della nostra già benedetta memoria d’Irene abozata assai malamaente da Ser Zuan Paulo de Pase et lassata imperfetta per dui anni si che rimase ben che la poverina andò a miglior vita. Ma Messer Titian per sua gratia si tolse il cargo de volerlo finir et conzata talmente che si può dir per certo che se fusse sta presente meglio non si poteva desiderar. Gli mandai ducati 6 viniciani et per sua cortesia se a contenta che mertia assai più” (I sent for Messer Titian to undertake the work he did on the portrait of our Irene of blessed memory. This had been begun very badly by Gian Paolo Pace two years before the poor girl went to
a better life, but was left unfinished by him. But Messer Titian graciously assumed the burden of completing it, making her appear as if really present, in a way that was better than one could possibly have hoped for. I sent him six Venetian ducats, which he courteously accepted, although his work was worth much more). The second passage reads: “Il qual M. Tutian per haver nella mente la sua effigie l’a finita e fata si che se l’havesse avuto presente non l’haveria potuto far meglio” (Titian had retained her likeness in his mind, and when finishing her portrait he made her appear as if present, in a way that could scarcely be bettered). See Ferruccio Carreri, “Report in La Difesa, 17–18 August 1911,” L’arte 14 (1911): 394, repro.; Michelangelo Muraro, “Il memoriale de Zuan Paolo da Ponte,” Archivio veneto 79 (1949): 83.


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The painting was executed on a medium-weight twill-weave fabric, which was prepared with a white ground followed by a thin dark brown imprimatura layer. The artist applied the paint wet-into-wet, often using a well-laden brush to produce impasto. The x-radiographs [fig. 1] show that the column was originally more gracefully rounded and shown from a lower viewpoint.

The support was lined and the tacking margins were removed, and although cusping is only apparent on the top and bottom edges, there is no indication that the painting has been reduced in size. The paint is now in poor condition, with the impasto disrupted by the cupped and crushed surface, and it is covered with thick, yellowed varnish and copious overpaint. The overpaint blurs the modeling in many places. The inscription has been reinforced, and only the first two words are visible in the x-radiograph.

Joanna Dunn and Peter Humfrey based on the examination reports by William Leisher, Mary Bustin, and Joanna Dunn


PROVENANCE

Commissioned by the Spilimbergo family, Spilimbergo, Italy; by inheritance to Count Giulio di Spilimbergo, Domanins, by 1819;[1] by inheritance to Count Niccolò d'Attimis Maniago, Florence, by 1904;[2] and Count Enrico d'Attimis Maniago, Florence, until 1909; Elia Volpi [1858-1938], Florence; sold 1909 to (Duveen Brothers, Inc., London and New York); sold October 1909 to Peter A.B. Widener [1834-1915], Elkins Park, Pennsylvania;[3] Inheritance from the Estate of Peter A.B. Widener by gift through power of appointment of Joseph E. Widener, Elkins Park.
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fig. 1 X-radiograph, Assistant of Titian, possibly begun by Gian Paolo Pace, Irene di Spilimbergo, c. 1560, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Widener Collection
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
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</thead>
</table>


Sustris, Lambert
Dutch, 1515 - 1568
The high quality of Christ at the Sea of Galilee has always been recognized. Seascapes are rare in Venetian painting, and here the turbulent waters, with their flickering highlights, as well as the blustering clouds and the play of light on the distant shore, are rendered with a painterly brio that has in retrospect evoked the names of Théodore Géricault and Eugène Delacroix. [1] The disjunction between the vigor of the landscape and the sketchy and attenuated figure of Christ, apparently unfinished in some passages, contributes to a mystical, almost hallucinatory effect that has been compared to some of Jacopo Tintoretto’s great paintings at the Scuola Grande di San Rocco. [2] Most scholars have considered the picture to be an autograph work by Tintoretto, and many have ranked it among his masterpieces. Nevertheless, the painting is so fundamentally different from Tintoretto’s art that it can be removed from his autograph oeuvre without hesitation.
The picture has never been located convincingly in Tintoretto’s oeuvre: datings have ranged from August L. Mayer’s 1546/1555, through Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi’s 1558/1562 and Terisio Pignatti’s later 1570s, to Tintoretto’s last years, 1591/1594, as favored by Lionello Venturi, Erich von der Bercken, and Pierluigi De Vecchi. [3] Nor has the attribution gone unquestioned.

In 1948, Hans Tietze gave the picture to El Greco, a conclusion reached by Manolis Chatzidakis in 1950 as well. [4] In a lengthy written statement in NGA curatorial files, Tietze and Erika Tietze-Conrat argued convincingly that the essential invention, the figure types, the technique, and the coloring of the picture are alien to Tintoretto at every stage of his career. As the Tietzes noted, Tintoretto’s art is always based primarily on the human figure and conveys a fundamental sense of the underlying structure and mechanics of the body, which is absent here. [5] Moreover, in Tintoretto’s paintings, to quote the Tietzes, water is never “in itself an independent means of expression. . . . It is simply the milieu in which some event takes place. In the Washington picture, the sea is not a detail, but the subject of the painting.” [6] The painting’s unusually thin pictorial technique, employing virtually no impasto, is also uncharacteristic of Tintoretto. [7] On the other hand, while the Tietzes’ attribution to El Greco accords with the picture’s mannerist elements and high quality, the technique, in particular the lack of impasto, is equally inconsistent with that of the Cretan painter. [8]

As the present writer has argued elsewhere, the best explanation for the picture’s peculiar genius lies in an attribution to the Amsterdam-born painter Lambert Sustris during his later career in Venice, a period which has remained mysterious and largely unexplored. [9] Born around 1515, Sustris is recorded in Rome in 1536, and within a year or two he had settled in Venice. His paintings there show him to be extremely versatile, moving comfortably back and forth between the conventions of central Italian mannerism, Titian (in whose studio he is reported to have worked), and northern literalism. [10] In the 1540s he was active as a painter of fresco cycles decorating palaces and villas on the Venetian terraferma, and he seems to have played a role in developing the characteristic domestic decoration style there, especially its landscape components, which combine the Roman antiquarian landscapes of Polidoro da Caravaggio with elements of northern panorama and Venetian pastoral lyricism [fig. 1]. [11] He is also recorded by early sources as one of the northern artists who worked in Tintoretto’s studio, as well as Titian’s, painting landscapes. [12] Giorgio Vasari’s 1568 Lives implies that Lambert was still alive but no longer in Venice, and his career is not usually discussed beyond this point. [13]
However, as first noted by Arthur Peltzer, there are indications that he continued to work in Venice, at least occasionally, for more than three decades and received payments there under the name of “Alberto d’Ollanda” for three official portraits in 1591 that Tintoretto was unable to complete. (Sustris signed paintings as Alberto earlier in his career, and he is identified by the name in at least two documents.)

Many direct links between paintings previously attributed to Tintoretto and works by Lambert suggest that during this later phase of his career, Sustris had an association of some kind with Tintoretto. Although the structure of Tintoretto’s studio remains unclear, it seems likely that he had some associates who worked there relatively independently. Northern artists particularly seemed to have gravitated to the Tintoretto bottega. Lambert Sustris may well have been one of them.

The attribution of the Gallery’s painting to Lambert Sustris is based upon strong similarities in works by Lambert to the figure of Christ, the small figures of the apostles, and the landscape. The attenuated figure of Christ, with his rectangular-shaped head, follows the mannerist conventions that Sustris frequently used in his early paintings. Because of the sketchiness of the figure, especially close connections can be found in Lambert’s drawings. For example, in a drawing depicting a Sacrifice to Priapus (Albertina, Vienna) [fig. 2], a female nude seen from the rear is articulated in exactly the same manner as the figure of Christ, especially in the definition of the back, the shoulders, the calves, and the feet, as well as the distinctive mannerist facial profile. Christ’s exaggeratedly extended finger reflects a morphological trait that appears in the central figure in armor in the Sacrifice to Priapus and numerous other drawings and paintings (see fig. 1) by Sustris. The little figures of the apostles in the boat are analogous to those who populate Lambert’s frescoed landscapes, and even closer to figures in his drawings, where the sketchily rendered faces frequently show the same hollow-eyed, skull-like appearance and summary treatment of the limbs. They are particularly close to a compositional sketch for a Roman triumph (Gabinetto dei Disegni, Uffizi, Florence) [fig. 3].

The landscape in the Gallery’s picture shows striking similarities to Lambert’s Paduan frescoes (for example, one at the Villa Godi at Loneda, Lugo di Vicenza; see fig. 1), especially in the treatment of the receding shoreline, the swaths of yellow and green defining the hills in the middle distance, the tree stump, the puffy clouds, and even the boat itself. In addition, the panoramic landscape lying beneath the current painting, though visible only through x-radiography and
infrared reflectography at 1.5 to 1.8 microns [fig. 4]. [20] can also be linked to Lambert’s paintings. As in his Paduan frescoes and other works, the architecture includes both classicizing and contemporary buildings. Among them are several that replicate structures in Lambert’s paintings—for example, a triple-arched bridge with exact counterparts in his fresco cycles. [21] While it is not possible to make judgments about attribution based on the incomplete image of the unfinished portrait painted over the panoramic landscape, what can be seen of the portrait through infrared reflectography is generally consistent with both Lambert’s earlier document portraits and the 1591 paintings by “Alberto d’Ollanda,” while the x-radiographs reveal that it lacks the bold brushwork that Tintoretto typically used to sketch in the structural forms of the head when he began his portraits. [22]

Tintoretto specialists have remained mostly silent about the attribution of the Christ at the Sea of Galilee since it has been linked to Sustris. [23] While the attribution to Sustris cannot be confirmed with certainty, the picture is surely the work of a painter who fits Sustris’s profile: one who was active in Venice in the second half of the cinquecento; probably having some association with Tintoretto and certainly aware of his oeuvre and types; familiar with the iconography of northern painting; and painting in a mode that combines mannerist figure types with the landscape style characteristic of Venetian villa decorations of the 1540s.

Christ’s pose is loosely related to several other paintings from the Tintoretto studio, including two versions of the Raising of Lazarus, datable to 1573 (private collection) and 1576 (Katharinenkirche, Lübeck). [24] The Gallery’s painting can be tentatively dated to around the 1570s on the theory that there must be some relationship among the pictures.

The painting represents one of Christ’s several earthly manifestations following the Resurrection, his appearance on the shore of Lake Galilee on the occasion traditionally known as the second “miraculous draught of fishes.” As recounted in John 21:1–13, seven apostles had fished all night in a boat on Lake Galilee, without success. At dawn, Christ appeared at the shore and told them to cast their nets to the right side of the boat, where the catch would be plentiful. When Peter recognized Christ, he cast himself into the water to swim to the shore. The subject is more frequent in northern than in Italian painting, and the composition of the Washington painting, with its panoramic landscape, is characteristically northern in type. [25] The Gallery’s picture has sometimes been seen as representing Christ walking on the water during a storm, and Peter about to attempt to follow his example, as told in Matthew 14:22–29. [26] Nevertheless, the iconography of the
painting as a whole makes it clear that the subject is indeed the occasion described in John 21: Christ is standing on the shore, as evidenced by the rocks and vegetation at his feet; there are seven apostles on the boat (not twelve as in the scene of Christ walking on the water); the apostles are casting the net off the right side of the boat; and the sky suggests that the event takes place at sunrise.

In 16th-century Venice, biblical narrative pictures of this size and format were often hung in the large central halls (portego or sala) of private palaces. [27]

Robert Echols
March 21, 2019
fig. 1 Lambert Sustris, Landscape, 1549/1551, fresco, Loneda di Lugo di Vicenza, Villa Godi Valmarana, Sala dei Cesari. © Bibliotheca Hertziana / Foto: Bartsch, Tatjana

fig. 2 Lambert Sustris, Sacrifice to Priapus, 1540s, ink and wash on paper, The Albertina Museum, Vienna. Photo © Albertina, Vienna

Christ at the Sea of Galilee
© National Gallery of Art, Washington
fig. 3 Lambert Sustris, *A Roman Triumph*, 1540s, ink and wash, with white heightening, on paper, Gabinetto dei Disegni e delle Stampe, Gallerie degli Uffizi, Florence. Photo: Gabinetto Fotografico delle Gallerie degli Uffizi

fig. 4 Infrared reflectogram, Circle of Jacopo Tintoretto (Probably Lambert Sustris), *Christ at the Sea of Galilee*, c. 1570s, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection

NOTES


attribution, noting that the picture is “ascribed to Tintoretto, but may also be considered as a possible El Greco.”

[5] As Hans Tietze and Erika Tietze-Conrat wrote, in Tintoretto’s figure’s one can always “discern a drawing which explains everything. . . . [Here] Christ is an apparition. Instead of a head between his shoulders, instead of skull, eye and mouth to say words, there is only a profile, or more exactly the shadow of a profile.” An example that shows how differently Tintoretto treats a comparable figure is provided in the Finding of the Body of Saint Mark (Pinacoteca di Brera, Milan); see Robert Echols, “Tintoretto, Christ at the Sea of Galilee, and the Unknown Later Career of Lambert Sustris,” Venezia Cinquecento 6, no. 12 (1996): 94.

[6] A prominent example of Tintoretto’s treatment of a stormy sea is provided by Saint Mark Rescues a Saracen (Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice). Although cited by Fern Rusk Shapley, Catalogue of the Italian Paintings (Washington, DC, 1979), 1:645, and Terisio Pignatti, in Golden Century of Venetian Painting (Los Angeles, 1979), 106, as providing a comparison to the Gallery’s painting, the treatment is utterly different there: the sea is rendered with long, curving strokes of white representing the foam over a dark blue background. The prominent use of green earth as the primary pigment in the seascape in Christ at the Sea of Galilee, noted in the scientific analysis report (see Technical Summary, note 3), is uncharacteristic of Tintoretto and other Venetian painters; it is more common among fresco painters. See Robert Echols, “Tintoretto, Christ at the Sea of Galilee, and the Unknown Later Career of Lambert Sustris,” Venezia Cinquecento 6, no. 12 (1996): 149 n. 109, and the sources cited there.


[8] Among those scholars attributing the painting to Tintoretto, a number have seen a connection to El Greco, stressing the importance of the painting as an influence on the latter and noting how Tintoretto anticipated some of El Greco’s effects; see Georg Gronau’s manuscript opinion of April 28, 1935, transcribed in NGA curatorial files; Harold Wethey, El Greco and His School (Princeton, NJ, 1962), 1:90 n. 113; Denys Sutton, “Venetian Painting of the Golden Age,” Apollo 110 (1979): 386; Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi, Tintoretto: Le opere sacre e profane (Venice, 1982), 1:179.


Unknown Later Career of Lambert Sustris," *Venezia Cinquecento* 6, no. 12 (1996): figs. 8, 9a, and 9b. For other comparable figures, see 113 and figs. 10 and 14 in the same article.


[20] Infrared reflectography was performed using a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with an H astronomy filter.


[22] For example, in *A Procurator of Saint Mark’s*, National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1952.5.79.

[23] Bert W. Meijer, “Flemish and Dutch Artists in Venetian Workshops: The Case of Jacopo Tintoretto,” in *Renaissance Venice and the North: Crosscurrents in the Time of Dürer, Bellini and Titian*, ed. Bernard Aikema and Beverly Louise Brown (Milan, 1999), 143, rejected Echols’s attribution to Sustris of several other paintings previously assigned to Tintoretto, without explanation, while attributing the landscapes in these pictures to northern painters. He did not, however, include *Christ at the Sea of Galilee* among the group that he discussed. Robert Echols and Frederick Ilchman, “Toward a New Tintoretto Catalogue, with a Checklist of Revised Attributions and a New Chronology,” in *Jacopo Tintoretto: Actas del congreso internacional/Proceedings of the International Symposium, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, February 26–27, 2007* (Madrid, 2009), 149, no. C90, reaffirmed the Sustris attribution. They placed the picture in their “Circle of Tintoretto” checklist rather than considering it a studio work, stating, “Although it is possible that this picture was executed [by Sustris] in Tintoretto’s studio, it is far more distinctive than related works . . . which exemplify the Tintoretto studio ‘house style.’ Given its exceptionally high
quality and the individuality of its style, an attribution to ‘studio of Tintoretto’ as an alternative to Sustris would not be appropriate in this case, and therefore we do not include it with the related works in the studio category.” Guillaume Cassegrain, Tintoret (Paris, 2010), 45, cited the painting as an example of the complexities involved in the Tintoretto catalog, arguing that it might represent either an “exercise in style” on the part of Tintoretto, a departure from his usual manner, or the work of a northern painter in Tintoretto’s studio, such as Sustris.


[26] While early ascriptions of this latter subject to the present painting may have been based on the fact that it appears to show Christ with one foot on the surface of the water, Anna Pallucchini, followed by Pallucchini and Rossi, insisted on the stormy water as the defining element. The subject has been identified as Christ walking on the water by Tancred Borenius, “A Seascape by Tintoretto,” Apollo 2 (July–December 1925): 249; Lionello Venturi, Pitture italiane in America (Milan, 1931), no. 411 (“Christ saving Peter”); Harold Wethey, El Greco and His School (Princeton, NJ, 1962), 1:90 n. 113; Anna Pallucchini, National Gallery, Washington: Musei del Mondo (Milan, 1968), 5.
The support is formed of four irregularly sized pieces of similar, medium-weight, twill canvas that have been sewn together. A large piece in the center has been augmented with a thin strip to the right extending the entire height of the painting, ranging from 8.25 centimeters in width at the bottom to 10.5 centimeters at the top; a strip to the left of 37–37.5 centimeters in width extending the entire height of the primary fabric; and a narrow strip along the bottom spanning the left addition and the primary fabric, but ending before the addition on the right, which ranges from 2 centimeters in height on the left to 6.25 centimeters in height on the right. The entire composite has been lined to two pieces of plain-weave fabric.

All four pieces of canvas were prepared with a gesso ground followed by a layer of glue. [1] The paint was applied directly on this gesso and glue priming, with no imprimatura layer, though one cross section showed a layer consisting of a mixture of materials observed in paintings from the Tintoretto studio and identified as “palette scraping.” [2] The forms were outlined first in dry white paint. The paint films are generally thin and the structure is less complex than is usually found in Venetian paintings. Occasionally the outline of the figure was reemphasized after the form was painted. Christ’s red robe was painted over the white crest of a wave. Christ’s foot appears to be unfinished. The following pigments have been identified: azurite, smalt, red lake, vermilion, red lead, lead tin yellow, orpiment, green earth, iron earths, umber, lead white, and lamp black (possible, in sketch for underlying portrait, see below). [3] Beneath the current composition are two other unfinished paintings painted perpendicular to the current composition. The first is a landscape, which does not appear to have progressed past the initial painted sketch. On top of this is a portrait of a man, of which the initial sketch can be seen clearly with infrared reflectography at 1.5 to 1.8 microns [fig. 1]. [4] The flesh tones and highlights appear white in the x-radiographs.

The paint is abraded in many places, and discrete losses to paint and ground are scattered throughout, particularly along the seam joins and edges of the painting.


The painting was relined, cleaned, and restored by Stephen Pichetto in 1944. In 1993–1995, it was treated again to remove or reduce discolored varnish and extensive retouching and to inpaint the abrasion.

Robert Echols and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Paula De Cristofaro and the treatment report by Susanna Griswold

March 21, 2019

TECHNICAL COMPARATIVE FIGURES

fig. 1 Infrared reflectogram, Circle of Jacopo Tintoretto (Probably Lambert Sustris), Christ at the Sea of Galilee, c. 1570s, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] The materials of the painting were analyzed by the NGA Scientific Research department using cross sections in conjunction with scanning electron microscopy with energy dispersive x-ray microanalysis (SEM-EDS), x-ray fluorescence spectroscopy (XRF), x-ray powder diffraction (XRD), and polarized light microscopy. (See report dated September 27, 1995, in NGA conservation files.)

PROVENANCE


[1] This name appears on an undated prospectus for the painting in NGA curatorial files. The painting was not in the Gallotti sale at Hôtel Drouot, Paris, on 28 June 1905.

[2] There is no record of this painting in the extant Durlacher stockbooks at the Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles.


[4] The painting is recorded as being with the dealer Jacques Seligman in New York by Fern Rusk Shapley, Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection: Italian Schools, XVI–XVIII Century, London, 1973: 53, and in Germain Seligman, Merchants of Art: 1880-1960, Eighty Years of Professional Collecting, New York, 1961: pl. 87. However, according to Seligmann records, the firm did not own the picture but acted for Sachs in its sale (Seligmann Papers, Archives of American Art, Washington: Series 2.1, Collectors Files, Box 204, folder 1, copy in NGA curatorial files). The bill of sale to the Kress Foundation for two paintings, dated 25 March 1943 and including Tintoretto’s "Christ on Lake of Galilee," is on Moses & Singer letterhead and indicates that the sale is from "Mr. Arthur Sachs c/o Moses & Singer" (copy in NGA curatorial files).

Analysis also indicated the possible presence of copper resinate green. (See report dated September 27, 1995, in NGA conservation files.)

Infrared reflectography was performed using a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with an H astronomy filter.
EXHIBITION HISTORY

1927 Loan to display with permanent collection, Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1927.


1933 A Century of Progress Exhibition of Paintings and Sculpture, Art Institute of Chicago, 1933, no. 135, repro., as *Christ on the Lake of Galilee*.

1934 Landscape Paintings, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1934, no. 5, as *Christ Walking on the Water*.


1938 Exhibition of Venetian Painting From the Fifteenth Century through the Eighteenth Century, California Palace of the Legion of Honor, San Francisco, June-July 1938, no. 66, repro., as *Christ on the Sea at Galilee*.

1938 Religious Art, an exhibition of fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth-century paintings; sculpture, illuminated manuscripts, metalwork, rosaries, textiles, stained glass and prints, Baltimore Museum of Art, 1938-1939, no. 35, repro.

1938 Venetian Paintings of the 15th & 16th Centuries, M. Knoedler and Company, New York, April 1938, no. 16, repro., as *Christ on the Sea of Galilee*.

1939 A Loan Exhibition of Paintings by Jacopo Robusti, il Tintoretto, 1519-1594, Durlacher Brothers, New York, February-March 1939, no. 5, as *Christ on the Sea of Galilee*.

1939 Masterpieces of Art, European Paintings and Sculptures from 1300-1800, New York World's Fair, May-October 1939, no. 377, repro.

1942 Loan to display with permanent collection, Society of Liberal Arts, Joslyn Memorial (now Joslyn Art Museum), Omaha, 1942-1943.
1946 Recent Additions to the Kress Collection, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1946, no. 825.
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1954 Tietze, Hans. *Treasures of the Great National Galleries*. New York, 1954: 15, 125, pl. 205 (‘ascribed to Tintoretto, but may also be considered as a
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1984: 228, no. 287, color repro.


2010 Cassegrain, Guillaume. *Tintoret*. Paris, 2010: 45, fig. 21, as Tintoretto or Lambert Sustris.
The story of the beautiful and chaste Susanna is recounted in Daniel 13. Two elders of Babylon lusted for Susanna, the wife of the priest Joachim. They spied upon her as she bathed, then threatened to falsely accuse her of adultery with another man unless she submitted to their advances. Although the subject can be interpreted as a parable of justice—Susanna is ultimately vindicated—artists of the period clearly favored the image of the nude Susanna at the bath for its sensual appeal. [1]

Jacopo Tintoretto’s Susanna and the Elders (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), painted when the artist was still in his 30s, is justifiably considered one of his greatest works, for its incandescent nude, evocative background, complicated play of pictorial space, and witty juxtaposition of different ways of looking. [2] The Gallery’s Susanna is a much simpler conception, focusing on the nude figure, with only the barest allusion to narrative elements in the two sketchy figures of the elders in the background, and none of the sophisticated intellectual content of the earlier painting. [3]

Tintoretto’s 17th-century biographer Carlo Ridolfi reported that “Senator Lorenzo Delfino [Dolfin] has . . . six scenes from the Old Testament placed above doors; namely . . . Susanna in the garden, and the two old men, emerging in the distance from a pergola.” [4] The Gallery’s Susanna fits this description. The somewhat perfunctory nature of the picture’s composition and execution is consistent with an origin as part of a decorative ensemble rather than as a painting intended to be appreciated on its own. [5]
The Gallery’s Susanna has been accepted as an autograph work by Tintoretto by a number of scholars, among them Bernard Berenson, Rodolfo Pallucchini, and Paola Rossi, and, in early manuscript opinions, Roberto Longhi, Raimond van Marle, F. Mason Perkins, Giuseppe Fiocco, Wilhelm Suida, and Adolfo Venturi. [6] Dissenters, however, include Hans Tietze and Erica Tietze-Conrat, Fern Rusk Shapley, and Robert Echols and Frederick Ilchman, and the painting can best be deemed a studio work. [7] The nude figure is comparable to those in other paintings that can be identified as Tintoretto studio products of the 1570s and 1580s, such as the Concert (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden), Leda and the Swan (two versions, both Uffizi, Florence), and Hercules Ejecting the Faun from the Bed of Omphale (Szépmvészeti Múzeum, Budapest; probably by Jacopo Tintoretto’s son Domenico). [8] These nude figures can be distinguished from those by Jacopo Tintoretto himself, such as those in Tarquin and Lucretia (Art Institute of Chicago); in the allegories painted for the Atrio Quadrato in the Palazzo Ducale, Venice; and in the Origin of the Milky Way (National Gallery, London). [9] All of these show a more convincing sense of the figures’ underlying anatomy and dynamics, as well as more varied and dynamic compositions. [10] Similarly, as noted by Shapley, the shorthand rendering of the two elders under the arbor in the background, while resembling similarly sketchy figures in works by Tintoretto dating back to the Miracle of the Slave of 1548, lacks the virtuoso mastery of Tintoretto’s own hand. [11] The maid seems almost an afterthought, throwing the composition off-balance. Her facial type is one that appears regularly in paintings that can be associated with Domenico, such as the Budapest Hercules and Omphale. [12] The picture can thus provisionally be assigned to Domenico, working in his father’s studio. However, the identification of different hands in the Tintoretto shop remains a challenge. Moreover, this painting was probably produced during Jacopo Tintoretto’s lifetime and, as a product of his studio, would have been accepted as a work “by Tintoretto.”

Robert Echols
March 21, 2019

NOTES

[1] The story is omitted entirely from many editions of the Bible, including the King James version and later revisions.
Neither the Vienna, Paris, nor Washington paintings adhere strictly to the biblical text, in which Susanna is accosted by the lecherous elders as soon as she has sent her two maids away to fetch soap and oils; thus, she never receives the bathing accoutrements or has time to bathe.

"Il Signor Lorenzo Delfino Senator ha . . . sei historie del vecchio testamento collocate sopra poste; cioè . . . Susana nel giardino, & i due vecchi, che spuntano di lontano da un pergolato." ("Poste" is presumed to be an error for porte, or doors.) Carlo Ridolfi, *Vita di Giacopo Robusti detto il Tintoretto* (Venice, 1642), 72; Carlo Ridolfi, *Le maraviglie dell’arte, overo Le vite de gli illustri pittori veneti, e dello stato* (Venice, 1648), 2:45; Carlo Ridolfi, *Le maraviglie dell’arte, overo Le vite de gli illustri pittori veneti, e dello stato*, ed. Detlev von Hadeln (Berlin, 1924), 2:53–54. The passage was first linked to the Gallery’s painting by Wilhelm Suida (manuscript opinion in NGA curatorial files). The other subjects mentioned by Ridolfi as part of the ensemble were Adam and Eve, Hagar and the Angel, Lot and His Daughters, Abraham Sacrificing Isaac, and Ruth and Boaz. All seem to be lost.

The Gallery’s *Summer*, 1961.9.90, is an example of an autograph painting from a decorative cycle by Jacopo Tintoretto.
files, from Roberto Longhi, Raimond van Marle, F. Mason Perkins, Giuseppe Fiocco, Wilhelm Suida, and Adolfo Venturi, all praise it highly.


[11] In comparison, the similarly conceived little figures in the background of Tintoretto’s San Trovaso Last Supper are equally sketchy, but convincingly volumetric and dynamic, like Tintoretto’s drawings; see Miguel Falomir, ed., Tintoretto (Madrid, 2007), cat. no. 32, fig. 160 (detail).

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The painting was executed on a fabric support made up of two pieces of medium-weight, herringbone fabric sewn together. The vertical seam is located approximately one-quarter from the left edge. The painting has been lined, and the original support has been extended at the top and bottom by a total of approximately 14 centimeters. A strip of canvas of 6 to 7.5 centimeters has been sewn along the top. A strip of 8.5 to 9 centimeters has been added at the bottom; this strip is not sewn to the original canvas and was probably added at the time the painting was first lined. Light cusping evident along both sides indicates that the canvas has not been extended nor cut down horizontally.

Analysis of cracks with a stereo microscope indicates that the painting was built up with multiple layers, probably on a white ground followed by dark underlayers of different colors, with the additional paint layers built up from dark to light. Infrared reflectography at 1.2 to 5 microns [1] reveals rough preparatory sketches for the principal figure executed with a brush and dark paint, showing several changes in pose. The most significant of these is the change in the position of Susanna’s legs. An x-radiograph composite shows a full-face view of Susanna, as well as the change in the position of her legs visible in the infrared reflectogram, numerous small changes in her drapery, and major changes in the area to the left of the figure, which are difficult to interpret. Underlayers of unexpected colors can be detected under the final paint layers, such as a bright orange layer under the blue of the sky and a blackish layer under the orange drapery. These may be additional evidence that the composition was extensively reworked during its creation.

The paint surface is heavily abraded throughout, but especially in the orange drapery, and there are many small areas of paint loss, including some losses in Susanna’s face. There is an old tear in the background to the left of Susanna’s head. The painting was “relined, cleaned and restored” in 1936–1937 by Stephen Pichetto. By 1958 the varnish applied by Stephen Pichetto had darkened.

Modestini removed it and inpainted the losses and abrasion.

Joanna Dunn and Robert Echols based on the examination report by Susanna Griswold

March 21, 2019

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Kodak 310-21X Focal plane array PtSi camera.

PROVENANCE


[1] In a passage first linked to the NGA painting by Wilhelm Suida (manuscript opinion in NGA curatorial files), Tintoretto's biographer Carlo Ridolfi wrote “Il Signor Lorenzo Delfino Senator ha … sei historie del vecchio testamento collocate sopra poste [presumed to be an error for “porte,” doors]; cioè … Susana nel giardino, & i due vecchi, che spuntano di lontano da un pergolato…” (“Senator Lorenzo Delfino has. . .six scenes from the Old Testament placed above doors; namely. . . Susanna in the garden, and the two old men, emerging in the distance from a pergola. . . ”); Vita di Giacopo Robusti detto il Tintoretto, Venice, 1642: 72. The other subjects mentioned by Ridolfi as part of the ensemble were Adam and Eve, Hagar and the Angel, Lot and his Daughters, Abraham Sacrificing Isaac, and Ruth and Boaz. All seem to be lost. See also: Carlo Ridolfi, Le maraviglie dell’arte, o vero Le vite de gli illustri pittori veneti, e dello Stato, 2 vols., Venice, 1648: 2:45; Carlo Ridolfi, Le maraviglie dell’arte, o vero Le vite de gli illustri pittori veneti, e dello Stato (Venice, 1648), edited by Detlev von Hadeln, 2 vols., Berlin, 1914-1924: 2(1924):54.

If the painting described by Ridolfi is, as scholars believe, the NGA painting, it

[2] Fisher was a book collector and antiquarian; the NGA painting does not appear in the several sales of his collection held by his executors in London in 1934 (see NGA curatorial files).

[3] The bill of sale for a group of paintings, including the Tintoretto, is dated 1 June 1936 (copy in NGA curatorial files).

EXHIBITION HISTORY


BIBLIOGRAPHY


1957  Berenson, Bernard. *Italian Pictures of the Renaissance. Venetian*


BIOGRAPHY

Jacopo Tintoretto was, along with Titian (Venetian, 1488/1490 - 1576) and Veronese (Venetian, 1528 - 1588), one of the three giants of 16th-century Venetian painting. No one else came close to matching the sheer number of pictures he provided for Venice’s churches, confraternities, government buildings, and private palaces. His paintings are notable for their free, painterly technique (sometimes described as “drawing in paint”), their dynamism, and their unconventional approaches to the depiction of narrative scenes, particularly biblical events. His bold brushwork, which emphasizes strong contours as it exploits and energizes the canvas surface, provided inspiration to later artists from El Greco (Greek, 1541 - 1614) and Sir Peter Paul Rubens (Flemish, 1577 - 1640) to French painters of the romantic period to our own day. A great painter of religious subjects—and a great storyteller—he depicted the timeless narratives of Christian art with verve, drama, and touches of the unexpected. His approach was visionary, sometimes even hallucinatory, yet always grounded in everyday experience. A strong sympathy for the poor and downtrodden pervades his work, anticipating the sensibilities of painters such as Caravaggio (Roman, 1571 - 1610) and Diego Velázquez (Spanish, 1599 - 1660).

Throughout his career, Tintoretto was the subject of controversy. While he was praised for his power and inventiveness, detractors often complained that his paintings looked unfinished. Typical is the grudging admiration accorded him by Giorgio Vasari (Florentine, 1511 - 1574), who recognized his extraordinary talent and creative imagination but fundamentally disapproved of his failure to follow the rules, and in particular of his rapid technique: “In the matter of painting [Tintoretto is] swift, resolute, fantastic, and extravagant, and the most extraordinary brain that the art of painting has ever produced, as may be seen from all his works and from the fantastic compositions of his scenes, executed by him in a fashion of his own and contrary to the use of other painters. Indeed, he has surpassed even the limits of extravagance with the new and fanciful inventions and the strange vagaries of his intellect, working at haphazard and without design, as if to prove that art is but
a jest.”[1]

Born in Venice in 1518 or 1519, Jacopo Robusti took his professional name of Tintoretto, “the little dyer,” from his father’s occupation (tintore in Italian).[2] His 17th-century biographers Carlo Ridolfi and Marco Boschini recount that Tintoretto spent a brief period in Titian’s workshop, from which he was dismissed because of Titian’s jealousy or his own prickly personality. After leaving Titian’s workshop, the youth is said to have embarked alone upon an ambitious program of copying works by other artists, especially sculpture, drawing from life, and even dissecting corpses, guided by the motto “il disegno di Michelangelo e il colorito di Tiziano” (the draftsmanship of Michelangelo and the coloring of Titian). Whether or not the claim that Tintoretto was entirely self-taught is accurate, the story of his commitment to the “disegno of Michelangelo” retains a core of truth. Early on he forged connections with the circle of Rome-oriented patrons, artists, and critics who gravitated around Pietro Aretino, the Tuscan writer and arbiter of taste who had settled in Venice. In his youthful works Tintoretto strongly identified himself with Michelangelo and his followers, omnivorously exploring and recapitulating the themes and imagery that he found in prints, drawings, and the works produced by central Italian artists who visited or settled in Venice, among them Jacopo Sansovino (Florentine-Venetian, 1486 - 1570), Giorgio Vasari, and Francesco Salviati (Florentine, 1510 - 1563).

With the triumphantly successful Miracle of the Slave for the Scuola Grande di San Marco (1548), Tintoretto became the dominant force in Venetian painting. His mature style is characterized by an emphasis on human figures at once idealized and convincingly real; strong, sometimes violent chiaroscuro; an elastic and unstable treatment of space; free, strong brushwork, with an emphasis on line; dynamism of form and pictorial technique; juxtaposition of the spiritual and the mundane; and an emphasis on the surprising and the unexpected. In portraiture, by contrast, Tintoretto favored an understated model based upon prototypes developed by Titian. The sitters who most engaged him are men in their maturity and, in particular, in old age, depicted with unsparing but sympathetic candor—never more movingly than in his own late self-portrait (Musée du Louvre, Paris).

Tintoretto’s clientele was extremely varied. While he executed works for wealthy and powerful patricians, the Venetian state, and the city’s richest confraternities—and even a small number for princely patrons outside of Venice—he never abandoned the poorer confraternities and less prominent
churches that had been among his earliest patrons. His aggressive marketing techniques often rubbed his peers the wrong way; intensely ambitious, he regularly agreed to execute works for discounted prices or even at cost. In 1564, Tintoretto embarked on the project that was to become his best-known monument, the decoration of the Scuola Grande di San Rocco, a task that he completed only two and half decades later. Tintoretto's paintings for San Rocco represent the greatest concentration of works by a single artist anywhere in Venice, and are the most personal and intensely felt of his works.

Tintoretto employed workshop assistants throughout his mature career, but in the later 1570s his studio practice began to take on the character of a family firm, as several of his children joined him there. His daughter Marietta, born in 1554 (out of wedlock, possibly by a German woman), is reported to have had a lively talent, such that the Emperor Maximilian II, Archduke Ferdinand II of Austria, and Philip II of Spain all inquired about her availability as a court painter. His son Domenico, who was to become the key figure in the studio, taking it over after his father's death, was born around 1560. Another son, Marco, a year younger than Domenico, may have joined the studio as an apprentice, but it is not clear how long he was active there. The workshop also included other apprentices and assistants, among them a number of painters from beyond the Alps, some of them employed as landscape specialists. Jacopo himself remained at the helm until his death in 1594, although his role in the final years of his life was often limited: developing the overall conception, sketching in the principal forms and working out the relationship among the figures, and delegating and overseeing the final production. Even at San Rocco the handiwork of assistants is frequently evident and the quality of the execution is not always high. In what should have been the capstone of Jacopo's career, the enormous Paradiso standing at the head of the Sala del Maggior Consiglio in the Palazzo Ducale—the single most prominent painting in Venice—the contributions of Domenico and other assistants are all too apparent.

The collaborative nature of Tintoretto's studio practices, coupled with an astonishing productivity and a willingness to adapt his style to suit the site or occasion, combine to create extraordinarily difficult questions of attribution and chronology. Many paintings ascribed to Tintoretto in collections and catalogs (including the catalogue raisonné of Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi) are actually the productions of followers or imitators. Recent scholarship, however, has begun to clarify the scope of the artist's oeuvre.

[2] According to a family history, his father Battista Robusti was originally Brescian in origin and won his surname “Robusti” as a result of the vigor with which he and his brother fought in the siege of Padua in 1509. The brothers’ family name may originally have been “Comin,” but this name should not be used in reference to Tintoretto, since his father was always known in Venice as Battista Robusti and the artist himself always used “Robusti” or “Tintoretto.” Melania G. Mazzucco presented new biographical evidence concerning Tintoretto and his children in Jacomo Tintoretto e i suoi figli: Storia di una famiglia veneziana (Milan, 2009).

Robert Echols
March 21, 2019

BIBLIOGRAPHY


The first name of the primary sitter, Andreas Renerius or Andrea Renier, and the entire reference to his son Daniel or Daniele, is on the strip of canvas added to the left (probably during the 17th century) to replace a portion of the painting that had apparently been severely damaged. Nevertheless, the specificity of the information suggests that it repeats an inscription that was there originally, or at least has some factual basis. Indeed, the primary sitter can be securely identified.

The Reniers were a patrician Venetian family with many prominent members in the 16th and early 17th centuries. Andrea di Giacomo di Andrea Renier was born in 1514 and died in 1560. His son Daniele was born in 1535 and died in 1566. Andrea Renier held numerous positions in the Venetian government over the course of his career, most prominently as a member of the Minor Consiglio (or Consiglio dei Sei) from 1552 to 1553, 1555 to 1556, and 1558 to 1559. In this position, he would have been one of the six consiglieri to the doge who made up the group. The doge could open letters and hold audiences only in the presence of four of the six consiglieri. They were elected for eight-month terms and could be reelected only twice, after which they had to leave the office before they could be elected to it again. In 1559, the year before his death, Andrea was appointed to the important post of podesta (Venetian governor) of Brescia. He had previously held the same office in another of Venice’s other subject cities on the terraferma, Treviso, and
served as Venetian capitano at Verona. [1]

That this Andrea Renier is the subject of the Gallery’s painting is confirmed by the landscape, which represents Brescia, where he served in his last official position. The town is seen from the east or southeast, with the Ronchi hills in the background. Looming above it is the Castello, with its large towers at either end and the tall, round Mirabella tower at the center. Ascending diagonally up the hillside is the inner range of walls built by the Viscontis in the 14th century. Below the castle are the two towers of the broletto, the seat of government, and the old Duomo (cathedral), which collapsed in 1708. The other towers are generally consonant with Brescian topography at the time, although not every one can be identified with precision. The gate in the foreground is probably the Porta Torre lunga (now Porta Venezia). [2]

The identity of the boy in the painting is more problematic, since in the inscription he seems to be referred to as Andrea Renier’s son Daniele. This boy appears to be roughly ten to twelve years old, whereas Andrea did not assume his office at Brescia until 1559, when Daniele was well into his twenties. Moreover, the picture seems more likely to date from around 1560 (the year of Andrea’s death) rather than around 1545/1547, when Daniele would have been a boy. The careful, labored technique and the overall flatness of the result suggest that the painting was executed by a studio assistant or imitator. The format, with the view out the window to a landscape, is generally similar to one employed by Tintoretto (for example, Portrait of a Man with a Landscape View). However, Tintoretto first used this format in the Portrait of a Gentleman Aged Twenty-Eight (Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart), dated 1548; by 1560, the type was well established and much more likely to have been imitated as a matter of routine. [3]

The unusual profile view of the primary subject suggests that the portrait may have been posthumous, possibly commissioned by the adult Daniele Renier after his father’s death and before his own death in 1566. Although rare in easel paintings, profile portraits of officials often appeared on the frontispieces of official documents such as ducal commissioni. [4] The Gallery’s portrait may have been based on the image of Andrea Renier in such a document. According to Helena Szépe, who has studied portraiture on ducal commissioni, these documents occasionally portray the recipient of the post with a young boy. In some such cases, it is possible to identify the boy as the recipient’s son; in other cases, surviving records show no son of a corresponding age at the time of the recipient’s commission. [5] Thus, it is conceivable that the painting is based on a
commissione depicting Andrea Renier with a page or some other anonymous youth, and that the phrase Daniel.filius was added at the time of the repair and repainting of the left side. The painting has never been included in the Tintoretto literature. Fern Rusk Shapley assigned it to a Tintoretto follower, the most appropriate attribution. [6]

Robert Echols
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NOTES

[1] For a description of the Venetian system of government, with its various councils, see David Chambers, The Imperial Age of Venice, 1380–1580 (London, 1970), 73–107; and Robert Finlay, Politics in Renaissance Venice (Brunswick, NJ, 1980), 37–43. Paola Benussi of the Archivio di Stato, Venice, has located documentation of Andrea Renier’s appointment as consigliere and podesta of Brescia, along with many other positions, beginning in 1532, in the Segretario alle Voci election registers in the Archivio di Stato di Venezia (email correspondence with author, April 2011, copies in NGA curatorial files). His appointment as podesta of Brescia in 1559 is also documented in Amelio Tagliaferri, ed., Podestaria e capitano di Brescia, Vol. 11: Relazioni dei rettori veneti in terraferma (Milan, 1978), LII (information provided by Stephen Bowd). His appointment as podesta of Treviso in 1543 is at Biblioteca del Museo Correr, MS Classe III, 154 (information provided by Helena Szépe). His life dates and his appointment as podesta of Brescia, as well as the life dates of his son Daniele, are reported in Marco Barbaro, with additions by A. M. Tasca (1743), Arbori de’ patritii veneti, Archivio di Stato, Venice, Miscellanea codici, serie I, reg. 22: vol. 6, 417 (information provided by Linda Borean). The 18th-century genealogist Girolamo Alessandro Cappellari-Vivaro, in Famiglie venete (Campidoglio Veneto), Archivio di Stato, Venice, Miscellanea codici, serie III, reg. 34, c. 40v, adds that Andrea was senator and consigliere (information provided by Paola Benussi of the Archivio di Stato, Venice).


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The picture support is a composite of several pieces of canvas with varying shapes and weaves: one large piece, 79.5 centimeters wide, extending the full height of the picture, to the right; at the left, two pieces joined together to form a strip 14.8 centimeters wide, extending along the left side of the painting; and two triangular inserts at the top corners. The entire composite of fabrics has been lined. All the fabrics are coarse and plain-woven, although there are variations in the thread diameter and density of the weave. Cusping is evident at the top and bottom edges, indicating that the vertical dimensions of the painting must be close to the original, but not at the right or left edge or at the seam where the large piece of canvas was extended. The ground on the larger piece of fabric is white; the strip to the left either has no ground or has a dark ground that does not appear in the x-radiographs, strongly suggesting that this part of the painting is an addition, probably to replace parts of the original painting that had suffered damage. The addition was sewn to the main canvas, indicating that the addition is an old one.
The pictorial technique on the addition also differs from that on the main canvas. Overall, the paint is applied in flat, rather straight strokes, with no buildup of paint. The colors are opaque, with the exception of the red glazes in the man’s coat. The rendering is clumsy and stiff in the main body of the painting; the modeling in the added strip is even more flat and maladroit, showing little understanding of the modeling of forms. The difference in pictorial technique and type of paint between the main canvas and the strip on the left is particularly noticeable in the face of the boy, which extends over both areas; the paint in the former has greater body, whereas in the latter it is soft and very liquid. Differences in the technique of the landscape across the seam are less apparent. However, the greater craquelure to the right of the seam indicates that this part of the landscape dates from the original painting campaign and was successfully matched by the painter of the added strip. The portion of the inscription to the right of the seam was originally worked in yellow paint, later gone over with a dull orange that has occasionally filled in cracks and losses in the yellow layer. The inscription to the left of the seam is similarly executed in yellow paint with an orange-brown overlayer.

Infrared reflectography at 1.1 to 2.4 microns [1] and x-radiographs show that the man was first positioned in the center of the composition. In the lower right corner, x-radiographs reveal a three-quarter-view frontal portrait, facing to the left, underneath and upside-down to the present portrait. The facial features of the sitter resemble those of the sitter in the present portrait. The face in the underlying portrait seems to have been brought to a high degree of finish, but there are only slight indications of his garments.

Numerous areas of loss in the ground and paint layer are evident, notably in the eyebrow of the man, his beard along the jawbone, his collar, and the forehead of the boy. The upper left corner has suffered major losses. The paint is badly abraded in the main body of the painting and somewhat abraded in the added strip. It is covered with a very thick and heavy layer of what appears to be a natural resin varnish, toned with black and significantly discolored; retouching is present both over and under this varnish. A 1922 photograph in NGA curatorial files shows the painting with the figure of the boy painted over with a table bearing a large vase. The sitter was holding a handkerchief in his hand, and the inscription—except for the name ANDREAS.RENERIVS—was painted over. The painting was in its present condition when it entered the Gallery’s collection in 1951.

Robert Echols and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Catherine Metzger
March 21, 2019

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with H, J, and K astronomy filters.

PROVENANCE

Samuel L. Fuller (1875-1963), New York; gift 1951 to NGA.
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The conversion of Saint Paul, known as Saul in his earlier life, is described in Acts 9:3–7. Saul, a persecutor of Christians, was sent from Jerusalem to Damascus to stamp out the churches there. As he neared the city with his troops, a great light flashed around him; he fell to the ground and heard a voice speak, “Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?” The theme was a popular subject for artists in the 16th century. From a religious perspective, the image of Christ winning over Saul represented divine power and specifically the victory of the Church over its enemies. For artists, the story provided an opportunity to show off their skills in what often came to be treated as a battle scene, although the biblical text states only that Saul’s companions heard the sound but saw nothing. [1]

In the Gallery’s painting, the high drama of the episode is raised to the level of pandemonium. In the moment immediately after the thunderous voice of the divinity has sounded, shock waves still reverberate through the scene. A mighty wind whips banners, sails, and trees; the waves roll; clouds roll down from the sky to hide the distant mountains. Horses plunge in terror, throwing their riders and...
trampling men underfoot. Three horses fall down a fantastic outdoor stairway, one upside down, his rider beneath him. On the far shore a riderless group gallops away in panic. A soldier holds his hands to his head. A ruptured drum lies on the ground. [2]

The picture is unmistakably an early work by Jacopo Tintoretto and has been accepted as a key document of the artist’s youthful career for the past half century. [3] As in other works from this phase, such as the Supper at Emmaus (Szépmúvészeti Múzeum, Budapest) and Christ among the Doctors (Museo del Duomo, Milan), the extreme dynamism seems intended to challenge and even shock, as does the unconventional pictorial technique. [4] The brushwork in some passages is strikingly varied, bold, and free—for example, in the horses galloping in the background and the sailboat just beneath them, painted so gauzily that only a ghost of the original image remains today. Other parts of the picture are unfinished in a conventional sense: the head of the mounted soldier on the bridge silhouetted against the banner is represented with a single circular brushstroke; the waves in the water are rendered with a few quick strokes of dry white paint, clearly showing the mark of the individual brush hairs. Tintoretto’s familiar early palette of isolated, high-keyed colors—bold greens, yellows, blues, pinks, and reds—is set off here against areas of brown and gray, which have darkened over the centuries, making the bright colors appear out of key. The increased transparency of the paint layers over the centuries has made it evident that Tintoretto painted the figure of Saint Paul first in the nude, then added the garment on top of the nude figure (see Technical Summary). The same is true of the figure of Apollo in the Contest of Apollo and Marsyas (Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford), which shows a similar palette and figure types. Although any chronology of Tintoretto’s early works must remain somewhat speculative, the Gallery’s picture might reasonably be placed shortly before the Hartford painting, which is the subject of a letter by Pietro Aretino of January 1545. [5]

As in other early paintings, the ambitious young artist sets up an implicit challenge to the great masters of the present and recent past through references to some of their most celebrated works. [6] His Saul is based on the same figure in what would have been the most famous depiction of the scene at that time, Raphael’s design for the Sistine Chapel tapestry of the subject [fig. 1], the cartoon for which was then in Venice in the collection of the patricians Giovanni and Vettor Grimani. Also, a version of the tapestry was in the collection of Zuanantonio Venier. [7] The setting and battle imagery are derived from one of the most prominent paintings in
Venice, Titian’s *Battle of Spoleto* in the Sala del Maggior Consiglio in the Palazzo Ducale, completed in 1538, and now known only from a compositional drawing (Département des Arts Graphiques, Musée du Louvre, Paris) [fig. 2], copies, and prints (the painting was destroyed by fire in 1577). From Titian’s lost masterpiece Tintoretto took his arrangement of water, bridge, hillside, and distant panorama, as well as his vision of nature echoing the maelstrom of men and horses. The white horse plunging out of the picture space at left evokes another much praised Venetian work, Pordenone’s facade fresco for the Palazzo Talenti (later d’Anna), depicting Martius Curtius leaping on horseback into the void, known today only from prints [fig. 3] and a compositional drawing. Pordenone had been Titian’s chief rival up until his death in 1539, and the young Tintoretto seems to have sought to set himself up as the inheritor of that mantle. Tintoretto’s painting is also similar to a drawing by Pordenone of the *Conversion of Saint Paul* (Morgan Library and Museum, New York). [8] Indeed, the whole atmosphere of explosive violence and chaotic action in Tintoretto’s picture embodies the characteristics that Pordenone brought to Venetian painting during the brief period of his ascendancy in the mid- to late 1530s. In addition, the figure in the water in the lower right seems to echo one of the fallen giants in Giulio Romano’s Sala dei Giganti, which Tintoretto probably saw on a visit to Mantua in the early 1540s. [9]

Tintoretto’s picture also documents the relationship of his early works to the art of Andrea Schiavone, who is mentioned by Carlo Ridolfi and others as a painter whom Tintoretto especially admired and emulated. Although Schiavone’s *The Conversion of Saint Paul* (Pinacoteca Querini-Stampalia, Venice) [fig. 4] cannot be dated firmly, it was probably executed at roughly the same time as Tintoretto’s version. [10] By this point in their respective careers, Schiavone may have taken as much inspiration from Tintoretto as the younger artist did from the elder. While Tintoretto’s waving banners show something of the cursive elegance and free brushwork of Schiavone’s, the latter’s treatment is more dynamic than is usual for him, and may reflect an earlier version by Tintoretto, such as the one painted in fresco on the facade of the Palazzo Zen ai Crociferi, where, according to Ridolfi, Tintoretto had assisted Schiavone in order to learn his techniques. [11]

Although the Gallery’s *Conversion of Saint Paul* is the only known surviving example of the subject by Tintoretto, he painted it a number of times: as a fresco on a Venetian palace facade (Palazzo Zen ai Crociferi, mentioned previously); on the outer doors of the organ shutters for Santa Maria del Giglio; [12] in a version purchased by Diego Velázquez for King Philip IV; [13] and in several works...
documented in Venetian private collections. Descriptions of the latter suggest that they shared the large cast, explosive drama, and panoramic vista of the Washington picture. The Gallery’s picture was probably painted for the central hall of a private Venetian palace, which were frequently adorned with large pictures in a horizontal format, many with a martial cast. [14] A 1632 inventory of the collection of Roberto Canonici lists a “Saint Paul by Giacomo Tintoretto, who falls from his horse, accompanied by many others also on horseback, who from fear are driven to flight and rush away precipitously in different directions.” [15] (This version is presumed to have been lost in a fire that destroyed the collection in 1638.) Ridolfi describes in the collection of Senator Gussoni a “Saint Paul being converted by the voice of Christ, and as he falls from his horse we see his followers fleeing in terror in many directions.” [16] (This is unlikely to be the Washington picture because Ridolfi describes it as one of two “piccole historiette.”) A version in the collection of Nicolo Cornaro was described as “beautifully large, with many horsemen.” [17] The Washington picture’s early provenance seems most likely to be related to a version of almost exactly the same dimensions in the picture gallery of the Palazzo Pisani a Santo Stefano, inventoried by Pietro Edwards in 1809. [18] However, no link can be established between the Pisani painting and the first documented appearance of the Gallery’s painting in the Kinnaird collection in 1857.

Robert Echols
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**fig. 2** Titian, Preparatory drawing for the *Battle of Spoleto*, c. 1538, charcoal and black chalk, brown wash, heightened with white, squared for transfer, on blue paper, Musée du Louvre, Paris. © RMN-Grand Palais / Michèle Bellot / Art Resource, NY
fig. 3 Niccolò Vicentino, after Pordenone, Marcus Curtius, 1530/1560, chiaroscuro woodcut from three blocks in green, British Museum, London. © Trustees of the British Museum

fig. 4 Andrea Schiavone, The Conversion of Saint Paul, 1540/1545, oil on canvas, Museo Querini-Stampalia, Venice. De Agostini Picture Library / A. Dagli Orti / Bridgeman Images

NOTES


diss., New York University, 1978; New York, 1985), 214–215, related the staircases in the painting to Jacob’s ladder, citing associations between Saint Paul and Jacob’s dream made in sermons by Saint Jerome, where the rock that serves as Jacob’s pillow is seen as a prefiguration of Christ, the foundation rock of the Church, and the ladder arising from it embodies an image of descent from and ascent to heaven. Martone pointed out that in Tintoretto’s painting, the rock upon which Paul lies is shaped as a stairway, while behind him another stairway leads up to the vision of Christ. Guillaume Cassegrain, “‘Ces choses ont été des figures de ce qui nous concerne’: Une lecture de la ‘Conversion de Saint Paul’ du Tintoret,” Venezia Cinquecento 6 (1996): 55–84, building in part on this argument, offered a detailed interpretation that defines the painting as providing a moral lesson that goes beyond the narrative limits of the theme, invoking but standing apart from two traditions of representation of the conversion of Paul: one portraying Saul overcome by the violence of the divine light and word, and the other emphasizing the moment of revelation and the ecstatic quality of the conversion experience. For Cassegrain, the falling and drowning figures represent false paths to God, and Paul’s conversion becomes an act of divine grace. Jonathan Goldberg, The Seeds of Things: Theorizing Sexuality and Materiality in Renaissance Representations (New York, 2009), 17–30, discusses the painting as the starting point for an interpretation of the Lucretian strain in early modern painting and poetry, as well as contemporary theory.

[3] Recent scholars have uniformly accepted the painting as an autograph work by Tintoretto dating from somewhere in the years before 1545: Pierluigi De Vecchi, L’opera completa del Tintoretto (Milan, 1970), 89, no. 27 (c. 1544/1545); Fern Rusk Shapley, Catalogue of the Italian Paintings (Washington, DC, 1979), 1:468 (c. 1545); Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi, Tintoretto: Le opere sacre e profane (Venice, 1982), 1:142–143 (c. 1544); Francesco Valcanover and Terisio Pignatti, Tintoretto (New York, 1985), 72 (c. 1545); Roland Kirschel, Tintoretto (Reinbek, 1994), 18 (c. 1539); Guillaume Cassegrain, “‘Ces choses ont été des figures de ce qui nous concerne’: Une lecture de la ‘Conversion de Saint Paul’ du Tintoret,” Venezia Cinquecento 6 (1996): 55 (1543/1545); Tom Nichols, Tintoretto: Tradition and Identity (London, 1999), 28 (1540/1542); W. R. Rearick, Il disegno veneziano del Cinquecento (Milan, 2001), 118, 219 (c. 1542); Robert Echols, in Tintoretto, ed. Miguel Falomir (Madrid, 2007), 192–195 (c. 1544); Robert Echols and Frederick Ilchman, “Toward a New Tintoretto Catalogue, with a Checklist of Revised Attributions and a New Chronology,” in Jacopo Tintoretto: Actas del congreso internacional/Proceedings of the International Symposium, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, February 26–27, 2007 (Madrid, 2009), 121, no. 32 (c. 1544); Guillaume Cassegrain, Tintoret (Paris, 2010), 12 (1539/1544). Among the earlier scholars listed in the references, the only ones assigning the picture a post-1545 date are Erich von der Bercken, Die

[4] Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi, Tintoretto: Le opere sacre e profane (Venice, 1982), 1: cat. nos. 41 and 42; 2: figs. 48–49 and 50; Miguel Falomir, ed., Tintoretto (Madrid, 2007), 189–191, cat. no. 2. (Christ among the Doctors); Frederick Ilchman et al., Titian, Tintoretto, Veronese: Rivals in Renaissance Venice (Boston, 2009), 150–152, cat. no. 22 (Supper at Emmaus).


[6] For example, Christ among the Doctors (Museo del Duomo, Milan) is obviously modeled upon Raphael’s School of Athens; indeed, Paul Hills, “Decorum and Desire in Some Works by Tintoretto,” in Decorum in Renaissance Narrative Art, ed. Francis Ames-Lewis (London, 1992), 109, saw it as a parody of Raphael’s famous work.


[8] The influence of Raphael’s cartoon for the Conversion of Saint Paul, Titian’s Battle of Spoletto (or Battle of Cadore, as it is sometimes called), and Pordenone’s compositions was noted by Wilhelm Suida, “Zwei unbekannte Werke Tintorettos,” Pantheon 23 (1939): 122, and Rodolfo Pallucchini, La giovinezza del Tintoretto (Milan, 1950), 86, and has been discussed by many subsequent scholars. For a detailed analysis of how Tintoretto’s painting reflects these and related sources, see Robert Echols, “Jacopo Tintoretto and Venetian Painting 1538–1548” (PhD diss., University of Maryland, 1993), 130–143. On the Louvre drawing for the Battle of Spoletto, see Le Siècle de Titien. L’Âge d’Or de la Peinture à Venise (Paris, 1993), 574–575, cat. no. 225. Roland Krischel, Jacopo Tintoretto, 1519–1594 (Cologne, 2000), 10, pointed out that Tintoretto’s painting seems closer in some details to the drawing than to the painting as known from copies and prints. On the print after Pordenone’s Marcus Curtius, see David Rosand and Michelangelo Muraro, Titian and the Venetian Woodcut (Washington, DC, 1976), 248, cat. 74. The compositional drawing of the entire facade is in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (inv. no. 2306 PD 114); see Miguel Falomir, ed., Tintoretto (Madrid, 2007), fig. 97. A very similar figure of a horse also appears in a drawing by Pordenone of the Conversion of Saint Paul (Morgan Library and Museum, New York); see Tom Nichols, Tintoretto: Tradition and Identity (London, 1999), 30, fig. 9. As Krischel in Tintoretto: A Star Was Born


[11] Carlo Ridolfi, *Le maraviglie dell’arte, overo Le vite de gl’illustri pittori veneti, e dello stato* (Venice, 1648), 2:7; Carlo Ridolfi, *Le maraviglie dell’arte, overo Le vite de gl’illustri pittori veneti, e dello stato*, ed. Detlev von Hadeln (Berlin, 1924), 2:15. Schiavone’s and Tintoretto’s paintings may both reflect a design by Francesco Salvati, preserved in an engraving by Enea Vico dated 1545 (*The Illustrated Bartsch*, ed. Walter L. Strauss, 166+ vols. [New York, 1978–1995], 30: no. 13). According to Giorgio Vasari, the drawing on which it was based was executed “much earlier, in Rome” (molto prima in Roma), and so could well have been known in Venice during his visit there. For additional analysis of the relationship between the print and the two paintings, see Robert Echols, “Jacopo Tintoretto and Venetian Painting 1538–1548” (PhD diss., University of Maryland, 1993), 138–140.


Wilhelm Suida, “Zwei unbekannte Werke Tintorettos,” *Pantheon* 23 (1939): 122 n. 1, reported that he took this reference to the Cornaro version from a list of Tintoretto’s lost pictures in an unpublished manuscript by Hans Thode in the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz. Suida suggested that the Cornaro picture and the Canonici picture may be the same. The Pisani version (below) could also conceivably be the same as the Cornaro painting.

As proposed by Lino Moretti, “I Pisani di Santo Stefano e le opere d’arte del loro palazzo,” in *Il Conservatorio di musica Benedetto Marcello a Venezia: 1876–1976: Centenario della fondazione*, ed. Pietro Verardo (Venice, 1977), 170. The 1809 inventory by Pietro Edwards of the painting gallery of the Palazzo Pisani a Santo Stefano lists a *Conversion of Saint Paul* attributed to Andrea Schiavone, measuring 157 × 235 cm. Tintoretto’s early paintings have often been attributed to Schiavone. In addition, the collection included one other major early painting by Tintoretto (the *Visit of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba*, now Château de Chenonceaux) as well as a *Crucifixion* from Tintoretto’s studio in the mid-1550s (now Museo Civico, Padua). The origin of the paintings in the Pisani gallery, a large majority of which date from the cinquecento, is unknown. The palace itself dates from the first two decades of the 17th century. In 1679 Almorò Pisani (1615–1682) bound the paintings along with the palazzo and the rest of its contents to pass by inheritance without division according to male primogeniture. In the late 18th century, the palace was restored and decorated by Almorò Alvise Pisani (1754–1808) after his marriage to Giustiniana Pisani di Santa Maria del Giglio, who brought as her dowry the possessions of that line, which was extinguished with her. Almorò Alvise and his brother Almorò Francesco (1759–1836) fell into debt and in 1781 divided up all the family property not bound by the trust. They were forced to sell their villa on the *terraferma* to Napoleon in 1807. In 1809, after Almorò Alvise’s death, his son, also named Almorò Francesco, and Almorò Francesco (the brother of Almorò Alvise) divided up the remaining assets, the trust having been invalidated by Napoleonic law. The inventory was prepared at this time. The paintings were sold and dispersed, along with many of the other treasures of the...
Technical Summary

The support appears to be formed of at least two pieces of open, plain-weave fabric, joined with a horizontal seam. The seam is located approximately one-third from the bottom of the painting and stands slightly proud of the surface. The cusping along all four sides indicates that the picture probably retains its original dimensions. The x-radiographs indicate that the warm, off-white ground may have been applied with a spatula or knife in sweeping, arched lines. On top of this, the artist applied a dark layer, which he left visible in some areas. The lighter areas of the composition were then blocked in with light-colored paint. Fluid drawing is visible with the naked eye both on top of and under the paint. The increasing transparency of the paint allows us to see that the artist painted the figure of Paul first in the nude, then adding his armor, a technique that Tintoretto used throughout his career.

In places, the dark colors have deteriorated and darkened, making the highlights appear out of key. The paint surface is abraded, especially in the clouds and vegetation in the upper section and in the white horse on the left. There are numerous complex tears and areas of retouching, many of which have become discolored and have developed a glossier sheen than the surrounding areas. In 1955 Mario Modestini removed a discolored varnish, inpainted, and relined the picture.

Robert Echols and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Ann Hoenigswald
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[1] As proposed by Lino Moretti, “I Pisani di Santo Stefano e le opere d’arte del loro palazzo,” in Il Conservatorio di musica Benedetto Marcello a Venezia: 1876–1976: Centenario della fondazione, edited by Pietro Verardo, Venice, 1977: 170. The 1809 inventory by Pietro Edwards of the painting gallery of the Palazzo Pisani a Santo Stefano lists a Conversion of Saint Paul attributed to Andrea Schiavone, measuring 157 x 235 cm. Tintoretto’s early paintings have often been attributed to Schiavone. In addition, the collection included one other major early painting by Tintoretto (the Visit of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, now Château, Chenonceaux) as well as a Crucifixion from Tintoretto’s studio in the mid-1550s (now Museo Civico, Padua).

The origin of the paintings in the Pisani galleria, a large majority of which date from the Cinquecento, is unknown. The palace itself dates from the first two decades of the 17th century. In 1679 Almorò Pisani (1615-1682) bound the paintings along with the palazzo and the rest of its contents to pass by inheritance without division according to male primogeniture. In the late 18th century, the palace was restored and decorated by Almorò Alvise Pisani (1754-1808) after his marriage to Giustiniana Pisani di Santa Maria del Giglio, who brought as her dowry the possessions of that line, which was extinguished with her. Almorò Alvise and his brother Almorò Francesco (1759-1836) fell into debt and in 1781 divided up all the family property not bound by the trust. They were forced to sell their villa on the terra ferma to Napoleon in 1807. In 1809, after Almorò Alvise’s death, his son, also named Almorò Francesco, and Almorò Francesco (the brother of Almorò Alvise) divided up the remaining undivided assets, the trust having been invalidated by Napoleonic law.

The inventory was prepared at this time. The paintings were sold and dispersed, along with many of the other treasures of the palace, much of which was also sold off over the following decades. See Moretti 1977, 138-139, 166, 170. The fact that the Pisani galleria contained at least two early paintings by Tintoretto, along with one from the mid-1550s, raises the possibility that these three pictures were originally purchased by the same early patron of Tintoretto, either a member of the Pisani family or someone from whom the Pisani eventually acquired them. However, no link can be established between the Pisani painting and the first...
documented appearance of the NGA's painting in the Kinnaird collection in 1857.


[4] On 7 June 1954 the Kress Foundation made an offer to Contini-Bonacossi for sixteen paintings, including the NGA painting. In a draft of one of the documents prepared for the Count's signature in connection with the offer this painting is described as one "which came from my personal collection in Florence." The Count accepted the offer on 30 June 1954; the final payment for the purchase was ultimately made in early 1957, after the Count's death in 1955. (See copies of correspondence in NGA curatorial files.)

**EXHIBITION HISTORY**


**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


no. 32.


ENTRY

Alvise I di Tommaso Mocenigo (1507–1577) was the fourth member of the Mocenigo family to become doge of Venice. His tenure in office (1570–1577) was notable for a number of historic events: the victory of the Holy League (Venice, Spain, and the Papacy) over the Turks in the sea battle of Lepanto in 1571; Venice’s controversial conclusion of a separate peace with the Turks in 1573; the visit of Henry III of France to Venice in 1574; a disastrous fire in the Palazzo Ducale in 1574; and the devastating plague of 1575–1577, which prompted the doge to take a vow to build the votive church that became Santa Maria della Salute. His ducal iconography includes his official portrait by Jacopo Tintoretto (versions of which are now in the Accademia, Venice, and Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen, Berlin); his votive painting in the Palazzo Ducale, executed by Tintoretto and his studio around 1582; an incomplete compositional sketch for that work, painted during Mocenigo’s lifetime and showing a somewhat different composition (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York); and a poliotto (altar cloth) for the high altar of the

Doge Alvise Mocenigo and Family before the Madonna and Child

Jacopo Tintoretto
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Doge Alvise Mocenigo and Family before the Madonna and Child

c. 1575

oil on canvas
overall: 216 × 416 cm (85 1/16 × 163 3/4 in.)
framed: 252.8 x 452.2 x 12.7 cm (99 1/2 x 178 x 5 in.)
gross weight: 154.223 kg (340 lb.)
Samuel H. Kress Collection 1961.9.44
basilica of San Marco, traditionally commissioned by each doge, of 1571, the design of which has been attributed to Tintoretto. The commissions of Alvise Mocenigo and his family suggest ambitions to create a ducal dynasty; for example, his votive painting in the Palazzo Ducale is unique in that it includes portraits of the late doge’s two brothers [fig. 1]. [1]

According to Tintoretto’s 17th-century biographer Carlo Ridolfi, “in the house of Signor Toma Mocenigo . . . in a long canvas is the same [Doge Alvise Mocenigo] with his wife adoring the Queen of Heaven, with other portraits of senators and children of the same family, shown as angels at the feet of Our Lady, who play on instruments.” [2] This is unmistakably the Gallery’s painting, in which the kneeling figure of Doge Alvise Mocenigo is identifiable by comparison to his official portraits. Opposite him is his wife, Loredana. [3] The standing older man to the left is the doge’s brother Giovanni (1508–1580), who is also the subject of one of Tintoretto’s finest portraits, probably painted shortly before the subject’s death (Gemäldegalerie, Staatliche Museen, Berlin) [fig. 2]. [4] The two young men at far right are Giovanni’s sons Tommaso (1551–1592) and Alvise (1554–1591), known as “Alvisetto” to distinguish him from his uncle. These identifications, first proposed by Rodolfo Pallucchini in 1954 and generally accepted, have been confirmed and expanded upon by Tracy E. Cooper, who has explained the painting as a dynastic celebration of the ramo (branch) of the Mocenigo associated with the family’s ancient properties by the church of San Samuele. The doge and Giovanni lived there together with their families in a fraterna, a financial partnership designed to keep the family patrimony from being diluted. After the death of Giovanni’s eldest son Leonardo (1547–1572), according to a codicil of 1574 to the doge’s will, Giovanni’s two surviving sons became the heirs of the two brothers: Tommaso, as Giovanni’s oldest surviving son, became his father’s heir, while Alvisetto was designated as the beneficiary of the childless doge. The painting thus depicts the family dynasty headed by the doge and reflects the disposition of the property he shared with Giovanni. This explains the absence of the doge’s other surviving brother, Nicolò (1512–1588), who had initiated a new ramo of the family at San Stae. [5]

Ridolfi’s statement that the angel musicians represent children of the Mocenigo family was presumably based on family tradition. The youth at the right appears in a separate portrait by Tintoretto or an associate (private collection) [fig. 3], possibly a few years older. [6] The younger child to the left seems to depict a real individual as well: he is represented with considerable specificity, in contrast, for example, to
the generic features of the Christ Child. At the time of Alvise Mocenigo’s death, none of Giovanni’s sons had children. [7] Pallucchini suggested that the musicians are sons of Giovanni’s daughters, but as Cooper noted, this seems unlikely because these grandchildren would not have borne the Mocenigo name.

The Gallery’s painting must have been executed after Leonardo’s death in 1572. (Otherwise, he would certainly have appeared in it.) Pallucchini and others, assuming that the portrait of Loredana was taken from life, have seen her death in December 1572 as a terminus ante quem, and thus dated the painting precisely to that year, during the short period between the death of Leonardo and that of the dogaressa. [8] However, this analysis fails to take into consideration the fact that four of the portraits (Giovanni, Tommaso, the young Alvise, and Loredana) probably came from an earlier painting, which may not have included exactly the same cast of characters. Earlier scholars have assumed that these portraits were painted from life on smaller pieces of canvas and subsequently sewn into the large canvas purely for the convenience of the artist or to speed up production. However, the inserted pieces are extremely irregular, and two of them show significant damage from having been folded. It therefore seems much more likely that they were taken from a preexisting painting, probably one that had somehow been badly damaged. [9] (The face of the doge was probably copied from a studio ricordo executed at the time of his official portrait in 1570.) [10]

The current painting may thus have been executed after Loredana’s death. A plausible date would be circa 1575, based on the likelihood that it was commissioned in 1574, at the time Alvise made the codicil to his will, when dynastic concerns were clearly on the minds of the two brothers. Indeed, Giovanni may have been a joint or even the sole patron. The painting was undoubtedly intended to hang in the grand central hall (portego or sala) of the palace at San Samuele, where Giovanni and his sons lived and where Ridolfi saw it some seven decades later. [11]

The landscape background may be intended to represent the Mocenigo family’s holdings at Villabona on the Venetian terraferma. [12] The roses at the Virgin’s feet, while a standard attribute of the Virgin, may also have a further meaning here. The Mocenigo ramo at San Samuele was known as “dalle rose,” and the rose appeared on their family scudo, or escutcheon. Moreover, roses were regularly associated with the battle of Lepanto: roses had bloomed in Venice in October 1571, the month of the battle, seemingly miraculously, and Pope Pius V subsequently dedicated the victory to the Madonna of the Rosary. [13]
The picture is a variant of the official votive paintings that decorated the Palazzo Ducale and other government buildings in Venice. These are part of a long tradition of Venetian paintings that show the patrons venerating or being presented to the Virgin and Child by their patron saints. Tintoretto's finest votive painting is the *Madonna of the Treasurers* of circa 1567 (originally in the Palazzo dei Camerlenghi; now Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice); he and his studio assistants were also responsible for many of the doges' votive paintings executed for the Palazzo Ducale in the early 1580s to replace those lost in the fires of 1574 and 1577. Although less common than official votive paintings, other examples of domestic family votive paintings exist, including Titian's *Vendramin Family Venerating a Relic of the True Cross* (National Gallery, London) and Veronese's *Presentation of the Cuccina Family to the Madonna* of circa 1571 (Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Dresden), similar to Tintoretto's Mocenigo picture in its monumental scale and once part of an ensemble in the portego of the family's palace. [14] The Gallery's painting is unusually static for Tintoretto and lacks the complex interaction of pose, gesture, and gaze of his characteristic compositions. [15] (The *Madonna of the Treasurers* provides an example of what he could accomplish in this genre.) Its symmetrical arrangement is rare for the period, not only for Tintoretto but for his major contemporaries as well. Wolfgang Wolters suggested the picture may have been designed to match an older ancestral votive painting in the room for which it was painted. [16]

While there is no question of the attribution to Tintoretto, scholars have disagreed as to the level of studio intervention in the picture. Pallucchini and Paola Rossi affirmed it as autograph, as a number of other writers seemed to assume; in contrast, Bernard Berenson called it “studio work”; Fern Rusk Shapley noted that some areas, including the Virgin and Child, are less inspired and well modeled than other parts of the picture, and suggested that they reveal studio participation; W. R. Rearick saw the entire picture as a “workshop assemblage” with a few portraits by Jacopo himself; Robert Echols and Frederick Ilchman assigned it to “Jacopo and studio.” [17] It seems likely that more than one hand was involved in the painting, particularly given its scale and date, though it is difficult to be more specific. The mid-1570s was a time of transition for the Tintoretto studio, when Jacopo's children Marietta and Domenico were coming of age. Although Domenico had not yet assumed a major role, Marietta was noted for portraiture, and numerous other assistants seem to have been present in the shop, including landscape and probably other portrait specialists as well. [18] Here the Virgin and Child seem
crude and perfunctory (although Tintoretto himself could be perfunctory at times). The portraits, by contrast, are strong and expressive; the forms of the family members have a sense of weight and presence, and include passages of virtuoso brushwork, such as the representation of the ermine sleeves of the two older men. The beautiful background may be by a landscape specialist.

Robert Echols
March 21, 2019

COMPARATIVE FIGURES

fig. 1 Jacopo Tintoretto and Workshop, *Doge Alvise Mocenigo Attended by Saint Mark and Other Saints before the Redeemer*, c. 1582, oil on canvas, Palazzo Ducale, Venice. Cameraphoto © Photo Archive - Fondazione Musei Civici di Venezia

fig. 2 Jacopo Tintoretto, *Giovanni Mocenigo*, late 1570s, oil on canvas, Staatliche Museen, Berlin. bpk Bildagentur / Staatliche Museen, Berlin / Joerg P. Anders / Art Resource, NY
NOTES


Cecilia Gibellini, *L’immagine di Lepanto: La celebrazione della vittoria nella letteratura e nell’arte veneziana* (Venice, 2008), 52–53, argued convincingly that the dogaressa is also pictured in the painting by Jacopo Palma il Giovane of the *Doge Alvise Mocenigo Thanking the Virgin for the Victory at Lepanto* in the church of San Fantin, Venice.


[9] Technical evidence cannot explain the reason that the four portraits were added to the painting. However, it is consistent with the hypothesis that the portraits came from a damaged preexisting painting and were reused in the current painting. The earlier version might well have included Leonardo, but if the family had simply wanted a new picture without him, it seems more likely that changes would have been made on the original canvas rather than dismembering it. For another example of a Tintoretto work in which a preexisting, apparently damaged painting was reused, see the Nativity (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) in Frederick Ilchman et al., *Titian, Tintoretto, Veronese: Rivals in Renaissance Venice* (Boston, 2009), 164–172, cat. no. 26. For examples of other paintings from the Tintoretto studio in which portraits were inserted into larger canvases, see Miguel Falomir, in *Tintoretto*, ed. Miguel Falomir (Madrid, 2007), 110, suggesting that the purpose of the practice was primarily for efficiency. See also Fern Rusk Shapley, *Catalogue of the Italian Paintings* (Washington, DC, 1979), 1:474 n. 7.


[14] On the Cuccina pictures, see Blake de Maria, *Becoming Venetian*.
**TECHNICAL SUMMARY**

The painting is on moderate- to heavy-weight fabric with a herringbone weave. Seven pieces of canvas were combined to create the painting’s primary support. The top piece is approximately half the height of the painting and runs the entire width of the support. Below are two pieces, joined together vertically at

---


approximately the center of the support. A narrow horizontal strip along the bottom is made up of four pieces of varying width. Four of the portrait heads, the standing elderly man to the left (identified here as Giovanni Mocenigo), the two younger men to the right (identified as Giovanni’s sons Tommaso and Alvise), and the woman (identified as the Dogaressa Loredana Marcello), are painted on separate, irregularly shaped pieces of canvas of a relatively fine weave and have been pasted onto the main canvas. X-radiographs reveal damages to two of the pieces, those with the portrait of Tommaso (the young man to the left of the pair) and the dogaressa, consistent with their having been folded in half after the paint and ground were dry. The weave and weight of the canvas, as well as weave irregularities visible in x-radiographs, seem to be similar in all four of these added heads, suggesting that they originated in one painting. X-radiographs show that the herringbone canvas continues underneath the additions, though it is obscured in some areas, making it difficult to determine if there is any damage to it under these additions. The technical evidence cannot explain the reason that the four portraits were added to the painting. However, it is consistent with the hypothesis that the portraits came from a preexisting painting and were reused in the current painting (see the discussion in the Entry). The damage done to two of the additions by folding strongly suggests that they were not painted separately especially for incorporation into this painting.

The technique of the painting is generally consistent throughout the main canvas and the additions. There is a warm red-brown ground, which has become visible in abraded areas. There is some wet-into-wet brushwork and some detailing with dry brushes onto a paint film that has been allowed to dry. There is some use of impasto, although its effect has probably been reduced as a result of the lining process. The background was painted before the figures. The aura around the Virgin and Child was painted after the figures were completed. X-radiographs and infrared reflectography at 1.1 to 1.4 microns [1] show numerous artist’s changes. On the left side of the composition, the balustrade originally angled toward the viewer in the area where Giovanni Mocenigo now stands. A checkered floor was painted on the right side of the painting under the dogaressa, and angled lines under the doge indicate the floor was planned for the left side of composition as well. The columns on the right were painted under the figures of Tommaso and Alvise. Subtler changes were made to the figures. The Virgin’s nose and chin were originally shorter, her head was moved to the right, and Christ’s eyes were shifted down. The lute held by the angel on the right was originally smaller and the angel’s body was either enlarged or shifted to the right. Several changes seem to have

*Doge Alvise Mocenigo and Family before the Madonna and Child*

© National Gallery of Art, Washington
been made when the four portraits were added to the larger canvas. The heads of Tommaso and Alvise Mocenigo have been reworked, particularly their ears. The neckline of the dogaressa has been altered from a high ruff to an open collar trimmed with lace, and the underdrawing for her dress continues from the main canvas onto the added portion, suggesting her head was pasted on before her dress and body were drawn. Her lace head covering also appears to be an addition. The shoulders of the young men have been adjusted to make the heads sit more realistically upon them and reserves were not left for their hands. Small adjustments are also apparent in the Virgin’s robe and the tall tree in the background.

The painting appears to have large areas of overpaint and abrasion in the sky and the dark brown areas, as well as scattered smaller losses throughout. What appears to be modern, discolored inpainting is apparent in areas around the head inserts and along the seam lines. The varnish layer is glossy, uneven, and discolored. A few areas of roughened varnish from an older varnish layer also remain. The canvas has been lined. The painting was restored by William Suhr, possibly in the late 1930s. [2] In 1955 Mario Modestini inpainted Suhr’s retouching, which had discolored.

Robert Echols and Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Kate Russell and Joanna Dunn

March 21, 2019

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with a J astronomy filter.

[2] Photographs in the William Suhr Archives, Research Library, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, state that they were taken after restoration.

PROVENANCE

Probably originally at the Palazzo Mocenigo at San Samuele, Venice. Alvise I Mocenigo, called "Toma" [b. 1608], Palazzo Mocenigo at San Samuele, Venice, by
Possibly acquired in Italy in the early 19th century by a member of the Gouvello family, France; by inheritance to Pierre-Armand-Jean-Vincent-Hippolyte, marquis de Gouvello de Keriaval (1782-1870), Château de Kerlévan, Sarzeau (department Morbihan in Brittany), France; by inheritance in his family; sold 1952 through (Landry and de Somylo) to (M. Knoedler and Co., London, New York and Paris) on joint account with (Pinakos, Inc., New York); sold 1953 to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York;[2] gift 1961 to NGA.


EXHIBITION HISTORY


BIBLIOGRAPHY


Madrid, 2007: 111, 328 fig. 170, 329 (the figure caption incorrectly gives the NGA accession number as 1491.9.44).


ENTRY

The Gallery's *Madonna of the Stars* is one of a small group of loosely related paintings of the Madonna and Child, of varying degrees of quality, that have been linked to Jacopo Tintoretto. Although the entire group was attributed to Tintoretto himself by Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi (who acknowledged the possibility of studio participation only in the Gallery painting), it is evident that several different hands were involved in the production of these pictures. Some were undoubtedly painted in Tintoretto's studio, while others may be by followers outside the shop. [1]

Of the group, the Gallery's picture is the only one with a plausible claim to be at least in part by Jacopo Tintoretto, although opinions on this point have varied over the years. [2] The facial type of the Virgin, with its prominent nose, is one that appears regularly in Tintoretto's paintings, although not usually in depictions of the Virgin; for example, it appears in the angel of the Annunciation in the organ shutters in the church of San Rocco, not firmly dated but probably from the late 1570s [fig. 1], and in a female onlooker to the right in the *Adoration of the Magi* at the Scuola Grande di San Rocco, datable to 1581–1582 [fig. 2]. [3] The faces of the Virgin in the *Annunciation* and the *Adoration of the Magi* are modeled similarly to their counterpart in the Gallery picture; their features, however, are more delicate. As noted by Adolfo Venturi, the Virgin in the *Madonna of the Stars* also resembles the women in the background in *Saint Agnes Cures Licinius* (datable before 1582, probably mid- to late 1570s). [4] All of these date from the period in which
Tintoretto employed many workshop assistants, including his son Domenico and his daughter Marietta; although the paintings cited as comparisons were undoubtedly designed by Jacopo and produced under his supervision and with his participation, other hands were almost certainly involved in all three.

Although the overall composition is conventional and the bodies of the Virgin and Christ Child are awkward and anatomically distorted, the face of the Virgin is confidently rendered and convincingly three-dimensional. In contrast, the hands, an important compositional element, are crude and inexpressive. While it is highly unlikely that Jacopo himself was responsible for the painting as a whole, it is possible that he participated in its execution to some extent, either leaving the peripheral areas to an assistant, or perhaps correcting and completing the assistant’s work after the latter had worked up the figures. Alternatively, the entire painting may have been executed by a member of the studio skilled at mimicking Tintoretto’s types and technique. [5] The Virgin could have been copied from an angel or similar figure by Jacopo in another painting. Domenico Tintoretto remains a possible author, although the picture shows no definitive characteristics linking it to his established works.

The cherubim and stars in the background were uncovered when the painting was acquired by the National Gallery of Art. The present title was adopted in 1948. [6] Similar cherubim appear at the top of Tintoretto’s Baptism of Christ in the church of San Silvestro, Venice (datable before 1582, probably circa 1580). [7] Since the canvas may have been cut down, it is not possible to determine whether the original composition was significantly different. The existence of several other very similar paintings suggests that it might have been only slightly larger, standing in the long Venetian tradition of half-length Madonnas. [8] However, the presence of the heavenly light and cherubim raises the possibility that the Virgin was originally seated on a crescent moon, as seen in several other versions by Tintoretto and his followers. The motif is associated with the Woman of the Apocalypse (Revelations 12:1), “clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and on her head twelve stars.” [9]

The links to paintings by Jacopo Tintoretto from the mid-1570s and early 1580s suggest a date of circa 1575/1585.

Robert Echols
March 21, 2019
COMPARATIVE FIGURES

fig. 1 Jacopo Tintoretto, _The Annunciation_, late 1570s, oil on canvas, Scuola Grande Arciconfraternita di San Rocco, Venice

fig. 2 Jacopo Tintoretto, _The Adoration of the Magi_, 1581–1582, oil on canvas, Scuola Grande Arciconfraternita di San Rocco, Venice. © Cameraphoto Arte snc

NOTES


[2] The attribution to Jacopo Tintoretto of _Madonna of the Stars_ has been
accepted by Georg Gronau (1921, dating it to c. 1565), Detlev von Hadeln (1922 and 1924, dating it c. 1560/1565), Wilhelm R. Valentiner (who saw in it a tender reflection of Tintoretto’s own domestic bliss), Erich von der Bercken and August L. Meyer (1923), Bernard Berenson (1932 and 1957), and Lionello Venturi; the latter two considered it a late work. Adolfo Venturi, seeing feminine grace rather than Tintoretto’s characteristic energy in the pictorial technique, ascribed it to Jacopo’s daughter Marietta, along with several related versions of the theme, while Rodolfo Pallucchini originally assigned it to Jacopo’s son Domenico. Luigi Coletti (1940) and von der Bercken (1942) attributed it to Jacopo with assistance. All these scholars based their judgments on the picture’s pre-restoration state, before the removal of overpainting that had softened the texture and hidden the cherubim and stars. More recently, Pierluigi De Vecchi (1970) and Pallucchini and Paola Rossi (1982) judged it to be a work by Jacopo with collaboration, dating from the early 1570s; Fern Rusk Shapley (1979) and Federico Zeri attributed it to Domenico; and Echols and Ilichman (2009) listed it as a studio production, possibly by Domenico, of the 1580s. Georg Gronau, The Bachstitz Gallery Collection, vol. 3, Objects of Art and Paintings (Berlin, 1921), pl. 92; Detlev von Hadeln, Zeichnungen des Giacomo Tintoretto (Berlin, 1922), 95; and Detlev von Hadeln, “Two Works in the Detroit Museum,” Art in America 12 (1924): 32–37, repro.; Wilhelm R. Valentiner, “The Ralph H. Booth Loan Collection,” Bulletin of the Detroit Institute of Arts 4 (1923): 54; Erich von der Bercken and August L. Mayer, Jacopo Tintoretto (Munich, 1923), 1:226; Bernard Berenson, Italian Pictures of the Renaissance: Venetian School (London, 1957), 1:183; Lionello Venturi, Pitture italiane in America (Milan, 1931), no. 406; Adolfo Venturi, Storia dell’arte italiana, vol. 9, pt. 4, La pittura del Cinquecento (Milan, 1929), 684; Luigi Coletti, Il Tintoretto (Bergamo, 1940), 31; Erich von der Bercken, Die Gemälde des Jacopo Tintoretto (Munich, 1942), 108; Pierluigi De Vecchi, L’opera completa del Tintoretto (Milan, 1970), 113; Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi, Tintoretto: Le opere sacre e profane (Venice, 1982), 1:195; Fern Rusk Shapley, Catalogue of the Italian Paintings (Washington, DC, 1979), 1:461–462; Robert Echols and Frederick Ilichman, “Toward a New Tintoretto Catalogue, with a Checklist of Revised Attributions and a New Chronology,” in Jacopo Tintoretto: Actas del congreso internacional/Proceedings of the International Symposium, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, February 26–27, 2007 (Madrid, 2009), 142, no. S31. Zeri’s attribution to Domenico, rendered orally to NGA curator David Alan Brown, is recorded in NGA curatorial files (memorandum of October 17, 1975). Pallucchini’s attribution to Domenico was made in a manuscript opinion of October 15, 1940, a copy of which is in NGA curatorial files.

[3] Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi, Tintoretto: Le opere sacre e profane (Venice, 1982), 1: nos. 434 and 436; 2: figs. 552 and 554; Robert Echols and


[5] X-radiographs of the painting show that the figures were initially rendered in a broad, sketchy technique, generally similar to that which appears in the Virgin and Child in the Gallery’s Doge Alvise Mocenigo and Family before the Madonna and Child, 1961.9.44, of c. 1575.


[7] See Frederick Ilchman et al., Titian, Tintoretto, Veronese: Rivals in Renaissance Venice (Boston, 2009), 246–251, cat. no. 53, repro. (The cherubim were revealed in a restoration in 2003–2004 and do not appear in earlier reproductions.) Cherubim also appear in a Madonna and Child attributed to Tintoretto in the Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, Naples; however, the cherubim and principal figures appear to be by a different hand from the Gallery painting. See Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi, Tintoretto: Le opere sacre e profane (Venice, 1982), 1: cat. 311; 2: fig. 404; cataloged by Robert Echols and Frederick Ilchman, “Toward a New Tintoretto Catalogue, with a Checklist of Revised Attributions and a New Chronology,” in Jacopo Tintoretto: Actas del congreso internacional/Proceedings of the International Symposium, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, February 26–27, 2007 (Madrid, 2009), no. C93 as “Circle of Tintoretto.” The Madonna of the Misericordia (Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice; attributed there to Studio of Tintoretto), with a similar glory and cherubim, cited by Fern Rusk Shapley, Catalogue of the Italian Paintings (Washington, DC, 1979), 1:462, as a comparison, also appears to be by another hand; see Sandra Moschini Marconi, Gallerie dell’Accademia di Venezia, vol. 2, Opere d’arte del secolo XVI (Venice, 1962), 250, fig. 433.

[8] As argued by Detlev von Hadeln, Zeichnungen des Giacomo Tintoretto (Berlin, 1922), 95. In contrast, Erich von der Bercken and August L. Mayer, Jacopo Tintoretto (Munich, 1923), 226, thought that the canvas had been cut down from a full-length figure. Melania G. Mazzucco, Jacomo Tintoretto
TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The painting was executed on a piece of medium-weight, plain-weave canvas that has been expanded at the very top with a narrow strip (now 3.75 centimeters) of slightly finer weight canvas. The painting has been lined to two pieces of additional fabric and the tacking margins have been removed. No cusping is evident, suggesting that the picture may have been cut down.

Microscopic examination suggests the presence of an overall thin, reddish-brown ground. The paint is thinly applied, in both a very dry and a fluid, liquid technique. Many glazes are broken through or missing, notably on the Madonna’s mantle and hands and on the Christ Child. Some fading is apparent on the Madonna’s red dress and on her mantle, which now appears brown, but originally would have been blue or purple. [1] The paint has been flattened and the canvas weave emphasized, probably due to the use of excessive pressure during the lining process. The entire surface is abraded and there are many minute areas of retouching, now moderately discolored, all over the painting. The Madonna’s eyes, eyebrows, and hair were heavily retouched and there is also retouching in the lower part of her nose and mouth. The varnish is matte and slightly discolored. Residues of natural varnish are evident in the interstitial areas of the canvas. The painting was relined, cleaned, and inpainted in 1947–1948 by Stephen Pichetto. At that time, the stars and the cherubim in the background were revealed.

Joanna Dunn and Robert Echols based on the examination report by Julie Caverne.

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] The paint in the area of the mantle was analyzed by the NGA Scientific Research department using x-ray fluorescence spectroscopy (XRF) and found to contain the elements for smalt, a blue pigment that often fades (see report in NGA conservation files).
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EXHIBITION HISTORY

1923 Ralph H. Booth Loan Collection, Detroit Institute of Arts, 1923, no catalogue.

1926 Loan Exhibition from Detroit Private Collections. Third Loan Exhibition of Old Masters, Detroit Institute of Arts, 1926, no. 12, as Madonna and Child.

1927 Fifth Loan Exhibition of Old and Modern Masters, Detroit Institute of Arts, 1927, no. 20, as Madonna and Child.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


1984: 230, no. 293, color repro.


Although Jacopo Tintoretto, early in his career, often seemed to define himself in opposition to Titian, in his portraiture he was more conservative, and followed Titian’s models closely. [1] The Gallery’s painting belongs to a group of portraits by Tintoretto and his studio that adhere to a similar compositional formula derived primarily from Titian: a three-quarter-length, standing figure, with the body turned facing the viewer, with drapery and architectural forms in the background, often before a window with a distant view. These include the earliest dated example, the Gentleman Aged Twenty-Eight (Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart), inscribed with a date of 1548, in which the pose is virtually identical; and the Portrait of a Gentleman (Musée des Beaux-Arts et d’Archéologie, Besançon), undated [fig. 1]. The sitter in the Gallery’s portrait holds gloves, as in the Besançon painting. [2] His fur-trimmed robe is almost identical to the one worn by the subject in the portrait of Lorenzo Soranzo (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), dated 1553, which is also extremely similar in pose, although the background there is much simpler. [3]

If, in contrast to these other portraits, the Gallery’s painting seems rather flat, the face lacking a sense of underlying facial structure and the brushwork lifeless, a possible explanation may be that Tintoretto’s distinctive hand has been obscured by the painting’s condition over the centuries. X-radiography [fig. 2] reveals strong, free brushwork that creates a sense of the skull beneath the skin, typical of
Tintoretto (and very similar to that revealed in the x-radiograph of his *A Procurator of Saint Mark’s*). The loss of shadows and glazes, coupled with overpainting in the forehead, cheeks, nose, and mustache, could have disguised spontaneity in the brushwork and flattened out contours that would have been more strongly conveyed in light and shadow. The darkened varnish obscures the folds of the cloak and the definition of forms, and it hides the manner in which the weave of the canvas catches the paint unevenly, a technique that Tintoretto often exploited to create effects of light and texture. If one imagines the painting with a blush of red glaze on the cheeks, a reflection of light on the forehead, and shadows under the eye and on the cheeks to define the forms, a potentially autograph portrait by Tintoretto begins to emerge. The painting has been accepted as such by most major scholars. [4] The picture’s present state makes it impossible to affirm that judgment with certainty, however, and the possibility of studio involvement in the face and figure must be entertained.

The landscape visible through the window in the upper left is much more detailed than the generic views in the Stuttgart and Besançon pictures. It may represent a specific location on the Venetian *terraferma* with which the sitter had associations, although even if this is the case it may not be topographically accurate. In any case, it has not been identified, and without other clues about the sitter, it may not be possible to do so.

Nevertheless, the landscape provides important clues about the creation of the painting. Its style and pictorial technique differ from those in the landscapes in other Tintoretto portraits, but resemble the background of the *Crucifixion* [fig. 3] now in the Museo Civico, Padua, which shows a similar approach to the definition of natural and architectural forms and is also rendered with a mixture of red and green tonalities. The landscape in the *Crucifixion* has been identified by the present author as the work of the Flemish painter Marten de Vos (1532–1603), who was in Venice at the very beginning of his career, from 1552 to 1556. According to Carlo Ridolfi, Marten insinuated himself into Tintoretto’s studio in order to learn the master’s methods and occasionally painted landscapes for him. (Although the *Crucifixion* is usually attributed to Tintoretto, the foreground figures have been identified by the present author as the work of Tintoretto’s associate Giovanni Galizzi.) [5] The landscape in the Gallery’s painting also shows similarities to those in paintings executed by Marten after his return to Antwerp, such as *Laban Departs to Seek Eliezer* (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rouen), dated 1569, and the *Crucifixion* [fig. 4] and *Baptism of Christ* in the chapel at the castle of Celle,
Hannover, of 1569. [6] The landscape in the Gallery’s portrait can be attributed on this basis to Marten, during his years in Venice, 1552–1556. Given the closeness of the portrait to Tintoretto’s dated Stuttgart (1548) and Vienna (Lorenzo Soranzo, 1553) portraits, the earlier years of the period seem most likely. [7]

The current title was adopted by the National Gallery of Art in 2018. There is no basis for the previous title identifying the sitter as a Venetian senator, for he is not depicted wearing the robes associated with that office. [8]

Robert Echols
March 21, 2019

COMPARATIVE FIGURES

fig. 1 Jacopo Tintoretto, Portrait of a Gentleman, undated, oil on canvas, Musée des Beaux-Arts et d’Archéologie, Besançon. © Besançon, Musée des Beaux-Arts et d’Archéologie – Photo Charles Choffet

fig. 2 X-radiograph, Jacopo Tintoretto, with landscape by Marten de Vos, Portrait of a Man with a Landscape View, 1552/1556, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Chester Dale Collection
fig. 3 Attributed to Jacopo Tintoretto, with landscape by Marten de Vos, *Crucifixion*, 1552/1557, oil on canvas, Museo Civico, Padua

fig. 4 Marten de Vos, *Crucifixion*, 1569, oil on panel, Celle Castle Museum. © Residenzmuseum im Celler Schloss, Celle / Foto: Fotostudio Loeper, Celle

NOTES


[2] Paola Rossi, *Jacopo Tintoretto: I ritratti* (Venice, 1974), cat. nos. 17, 65. On the Stuttgart painting, see also Miguel Falomir, ed., *Tintoretto* (Madrid, 2007), 226–228, cat. no. 10. On the Besançon painting, see also *Le Tintoret: Une leçon de peinture* (Milan, 1998), 118, 119, repro. The pose of the sitter in the NGA painting is also extremely close to a supposed portrait of Jacopo Sansovino by Tintoretto, probably a studio work (Uffizi, Florence); Rossi, *Jacopo Tintoretto*, cat. no. 1; see also *Titien, Tintoret, Véronèse: Rivalités à Venise* (Paris, 2009), fig. 98. (Despite its inscription, this painting is unlikely to represent Sansovino, who was born in 1486, and would have been 60 in 1546, the earliest likely date for the painting. This painting clearly shows a much younger man and the features of the subject do not resemble those of
Sansovino as depicted by Tintoretto late in life. The inscription was probably added at some later date, reflecting the presence of architecture and sculpture in the portrait.)

[3] Paola Rossi, Jacopo Tintoretto: I ritratti (Venice, 1974), cat. no. 139; see also Miguel Falomir, in Tintoretto, ed., Miguel Falomir (Madrid, 2007), 266–269, cat. no. 25. X-radiography reveals that the Soranzo portrait was originally a portrait of a different sitter, inscribed MDLII/ANLXXV (1552/age 75 years). The face, but not the body and costume, was changed to represent Soranzo, the inscription altered to read MDLIII/AN.XXXV (1553/age 35 years), and the monogram of Soranzo, LS, added. The fact that Tintoretto could paint the young Lorenzo Soranzo in the same costume he had used for an elderly man raises the possibility that the almost identical costume in the Gallery painting is not particular to this sitter but was either painted from a studio prop or adapted from a sketch used in the Soranzo portrait (or even from the Soranzo portrait itself, possibly still in the studio).

[4] The only apparent dissent in the literature comes from Bernard Berenson, Italian Pictures of the Renaissance: Venetian School (London, 1957), 1:183. However, his assistant Nicky Mariano reported in a letter to NGA curator Michael Mahoney dated May 18, 1964, in NGA curatorial files, that the ascription of the picture to Tintoretto’s workshop was based on an error and that the painting “looks very fine.”


[8] Indeed, despite the Gallery’s previous title, most authors continued to use

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The picture is on a single piece of medium-weight, plain-weave fabric. The painting has been lined, and truncated cusping along the margins implies that the picture has been trimmed slightly at the top and bottom and possibly at the right. The full proper left hand may originally have appeared in the painting. Microscopic examination indicates that there is a thin white ground overall, covered by imprimatura layers of various tones, varying from black under the sky and gray in the landscape to ocher under the head. X-radiographs show that the folds of the draped fabric at the right were originally in a somewhat different configuration. They also show an unexplained area of lead white extending from the top of the sitter’s head out to the left, descending across the wall and window casing and ending roughly at the edge of the fur collar, which may indicate that the head was reworked. A thicker area of lead white outlines the sitter’s head at the right and the structure of the sitter’s head was sketched in with bold strokes of lead white [fig. 1]. A pentimento of the sitter’s ear is visible with the naked eye. The paint is built up in layers, with wet-into-wet brushwork in many passages. The brushwork is free and employs mixtures ranging from dilute scumbles to pastose strokes to thin glazes.

The picture has suffered a large amount of flake loss along the right margin, as much as 6 inches into the picture, and a lesser amount at the top. There are smaller flake losses all around the picture, mostly in the lower half. The paint film overall is abraded, most visibly in the sky, landscape, and drapery highlights, where the dark underlayers are exposed, as well as in the cheeks, nose, and forehead of the sitter. These areas have been retouched and the sitter’s mustache has been thickened. Excessive pressure during the lining process has led to some weave enhancement. The thick varnish has become milky and discolored and obscures the reading of the costume. Numerous deeply discolored residues of earlier coatings are also evident.

A photograph from the 1927 sale catalog in NGA curatorial files shows that at that time the curtain was painted over as a dark, flat surface. Evidently the painting was
restored between 1927 and 1934, because the curtain is visible in a photograph in the 1934 auction catalog, [1] indicating that the painting had been treated to reveal it. The painting has not been treated since acquisition.

Robert Echols and Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Catherine Metzger and Joanna Dunn

March 21, 2019

TECHNICAL COMPARATIVE FIGURES

fig. 1 X-radiograph, Jacopo Tintoretto, with landscape by Marten de Vos, Portrait of a Man with a Landscape View, 1552/1556, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Chester Dale Collection
PROVENANCE


[2] The painting was lent by Nichols to the 1868 National Exhibition of Works of Art at Leeds.

[3] The painting was lent by Holford to the Royal Academy’s Winter Exhibition in 1887.

EXHIBITION HISTORY

1868 National Exhibition of Works of Art, Leeds, 1868, no. 136a, as A Venetian Senator.[1]

1887 Exhibition of Works by the Old Masters. Winter Exhibition, Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1887, no. 139, as Portrait of a Man.
1894 Exhibition of Venetian Art, New Gallery, London, 1894-1895, no. 162, as Portrait of a Man.


EXHIBITION HISTORY NOTES

[1] Algernon Graves, A Century of Loan Exhibitions 1813-1912, 5 vols., London, 1913-1915: 3:1312, 1313, lists two additional loans of Tintoretto portraits made by R.S. Holford: 1867, lent to the British Institution, A Gentleman, no. 129; 1870, lent to the Royal Academy, A Portrait, 44 1/2 x 35 1/2 in., no. 50. Because of the ambiguity of the title and the similarity of dimensions between the NGA painting and Tintoretto’s Gentleman aged Twenty-Eight (Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart), which was also in the Holford collection at that time, it is not possible to determine which was lent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1968 European Paintings and Sculpture, Illustrations. National Gallery of Art,


A Procurator of Saint Mark's is one of Jacopo Tintoretto's largest portraits and has increasingly come to be recognized as one of the most distinctive and imposing of his later career. [1] Especially in his official portraits, Tintoretto tended to paint his subjects in three-quarter view and roughly half-length. Here, in contrast, the subject is presented frontally and almost full-length. Although seated, he is seen from a lowered point of view, the folds of his garment sweeping upward in an unbroken line, suggesting that the picture was intended to hang fairly high on a wall. Typically for Tintoretto, the face and hands are rendered with care, while the drapery is conveyed more broadly. X-radiography reveals how the artist began the portrait by sketching in the basic structural forms of the head, including the eye sockets. The costume is disproportionately bulky in relation to the head, emphasizing the sense of authority and grandeur. The summary execution and flowing rhythms of the garment, however, keep the forms from appearing ponderous and, as Miguel Falomir has noted, the vibrancy of the illumination on the subject's head and the foreshortening of the right arm and hand projecting toward the viewer give the painting a dynamism that is usually absent in Tintoretto's institutional portraits. [2] Given the Venetian penchant for conformity in official portraiture, which reflected a system of government in which the cult of personality was rigidly suppressed, this portrait was almost certainly created for a private setting. Some critics, among them Peter Humfrey and Falomir, have found that the sense of majesty conveyed by the painting comes at the cost of psychological penetration. [3] It is true that the subject here lacks the poignant
combination of dignity and frailty that characterizes Tintoretto’s greatest portraits of old men, the category in which his genius as a portraitist was most fully realized. But the Gallery’s portrait presents a somewhat different personality: careworn and pensive, but stoical and still vigorous.

As is typical for Tintoretto’s finest portraits, the format is minimalist. The shadowy background shows only a simple architectural form—perhaps the high plinth of a column or pier—barely sketched in. Aside from the sitter’s robe of office and the chair on which he sits, there are no further accoutrements. Nothing distracts from the emphasis on the sitter’s face, and in particular on his gaze, directed out at the viewer.

Since the portrait entered the Gallery’s collection, the subject has been identified as a procurator of Saint Mark, one of the most prestigious offices in Venice. [4] This was based on the understanding that the costume he wears—specifically the robe with voluminous manoge dogali (ducal sleeves), open at the wrist, rather than tapered, to reveal the rich ermine lining, and the becho or stole—was limited to procurators and a few other high-ranking officials. [5] However, David S. Chambers argued that procurators wore no special garments, but dressed like all other Venetian nobles holding high office; he noted that Cesare Vecellio, in his Degli habitj antichi et moderni di diverse parti del mondo (Venice, 1590) did not illustrate a procurator, as he would have been likely to do if they had worn a distinctive costume; rather, Vecellio simply stated that procurators and a few other high officials could wear the grand robes of high office for life, not just during their period of job tenure. [6] Visual evidence from the paintings of the period suggests that the use of costumes like that of the sitter here by Venetian officials may have been somewhat broader than has previously been supposed. Numerous official group portraits by Tintoretto and his studio show officials who are not procurators wearing similar garments. For example, in Tintoretto’s Saint Giustina and Treasurers and Three Secretaries of 1580 (Museo Correr, Venice), all three treasurers have robes with open, ermine-lined sleeves and wear embroidered stoles the same color as their robe, like the subject in the Gallery’s painting. [7] Thus the sitter here may not in fact be a procurator, but rather some other official or simply a senator.

Attempts to identify the sitter by name have not been successful. In 1930, Wilhelm R. Valentiner suggested that the sitter was Francesco Duodo (1518–1592), an important commander of the Venetian fleet in the battle of Lepanto (1571). His hypothesis was based on a supposed resemblance to a bust by Alessandro Vittoria...
that originally decorated the Duodo tomb (now Ca’ d’Oro, Venice). However, as Falomir and Frederick Ilchman have noted, the sitter’s nose, eyebrows, and cranium are different from those of Duodo as represented in that bust and other secure likenesses. [8]

Another identification has been proposed on the basis of a weaker replica of the Gallery’s portrait, first noted by Lionello Venturi in 1931 (once in the Kende collection, Vienna; now private collection, Austria), bearing the inscription “Gio. Donato padre del Ser.mo Nic.o 1560” (Giovanni Donato, father of the Serenissimo Nicolò). [9] Nicolò Donato was doge for only 35 days in 1618. His father, Giovanni Donato, or Donà, was born around 1487 and died in 1571. He was never a procurator. In the 1520s and 1530s, he held several positions that would have entitled him to wear the robes of a high official, but no mention of his having held office after 1531 has been located in the archives. [10] It seems unlikely that he would be depicted wearing official robes in a portrait of some four decades later. Moreover, the painting seems to depict a man in his fifties or sixties, not his eighties, as Giovanni Donato would have been around 1570 (a date of 1560 is certainly too early for the Gallery’s picture). [11]

The attribution of the painting to Tintoretto is uniformly accepted, with a dating to the later decades of his career. While there are no directly comparable portraits in Tintoretto’s oeuvre, it is generally analogous to the portrait of Marco Grimani of 1576–1583 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) in the treatment of the face, hands, and garment. Given the absence of any clear year-by-year progression in the chronology of Tintoretto’s portraits, as well as the unique characteristics of the Gallery’s painting and the absence of information about the sitter, a date somewhere in the later 1570s or early 1580s seems best. [12]

Robert Echols
March 21, 2019

NOTES

Scholars since 1952 have generally referred to the painting by the Gallery’s title. An exception is Paola Rossi, *Jacopo Tintoretto: I ritratti* (Venice, 1974), 132–133, no. 154, who calls it *Ritratto di senator veneziano*. Procurators were the only officials in Venice other than the doge to hold office for life, and doges were almost invariably elected from among their ranks. Originally responsible for administering the basilica of San Marco, they gradually assumed other charitable and administrative duties, and served as advisors on the most sensitive affairs of state. See generally David S. Chambers, “Merit and Money: The Procurators of Saint Mark and Their *Commissioni,*” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 60 (1997): 23–30.

Fern Rusk Shapley, in *Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection: Italian Schools, XVI–XVIII Century* (London, 1973), 52–53; and *Catalogue of the Italian Paintings* (Washington, DC, 1979), 1:467, identified the stole as the golden *stola d’oro*, worn by Vincenzo Morosini in his portrait by Tintoretto in the National Gallery, London, and indicating that the subject here was a member of the knighthood of that name; however, technical examination reveals no evidence that the stole was ever gold in color.


of Tintoretto in the Museo Storico Navale, Venice). Duodo became a procurator in 1587.


[10] His life dates are reported in Marco Barbaro, with additions by A. M. Tasca (1743), * Arbori de′ patritii veneti*, Archivio di Stato, Venice, Miscellanea codici, serie I, reg. 19: vol. III, 313; information provided by Paola Benussi of the Archivio di Stato, Venice, who has also located documentation of his election to the offices of *camerlengho del commun* (1523), *ufficale alle cazude* (1528), and *provveditore sopra camere* (1531) in the election registers of the Segretario alle Voci and other archives in the Archivio di Stato, Venice (email correspondence with author, April and May 2011, copy in NGA curatorial files).

[11] Recent scholars have rejected the identification of the subject as Giovanni Donato on the grounds that he was not a procurator, an argument which carries equal force because of his lack of other high office in his later years; see Peter Humfrey, in *The Age of Titian: Venetian Renaissance Art from Scottish Collections*, ed. Aidan Weston-Lewis (Edinburgh, 2004), 186; Miguel Falomir, in *Tintoretto*, ed. Miguel Falomir (Madrid, 2007), 316; Frederick Ilchman, in *Botticelli to Titian: Two Centuries of Italian Masterpieces*, ed. Dóra Sallay, Vilmós Tátrai, and Axel Vécsey, trans. Nicholas Bodoczky (Budapest, 2009), 362.

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The support is two pieces of fine, twill-weave fabric sewn together with a horizontal seam located 30.5 centimeters from the bottom. It has been lined and the tacking margins have been removed. Light cusping is evident along the top edge but not along the others, indicating that the painting has been cut down at least to some degree at the sides and bottom.

There is a very thin white ground layer. Infrared reflectography at 1.1 to 1.4 microns reveals very casual, straight, black brushstrokes indicating the contours of the hands, neck, and chin, as well as several lines below the sitter’s shoulders that do not appear to relate to the visible design. X-radiographs reveal several shapes that do not relate to the present composition in the background to the left of the sitter’s head. They also show that the basic structural forms of the head, including the eye sockets, were defined with broad strokes of lead white. Both x-radiography and infrared reflectography show that the sitter’s hands were adjusted slightly.

The paint has been applied in a variety of techniques, ranging from stiff pastes to transparent glazes. In the drapery, the highlights of the folds are marked with stiffly brushed, free angular strokes of white paint, covered with a glaze of crimson red. The glaze is built up more thickly in the shadows, so that it appears almost black. Several pentimenti in the folds of both sleeves are visible to the naked eye as faint white strokes, covered with red glaze.

The paint layer is heavily abraded, revealing the white ground and underlayers in the pattern of the fabric weave. The worst areas of abrasion are in the beard and the right side of the head and hair. There are many small areas of loss in the face, as well as a larger loss over the bridge of the nose. There is a small vertical line of loss in the upper folds of the sleeve at left. The painting was treated in 1950 by Mario Modestini, at which time a discolored varnish was removed and the painting was inpainted. The varnish applied by him in 1950 had discolored by 2018; thus, the painting was treated again at that time.

Robert Echols and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Sarah Fisher

March 21, 2019
PROVENANCE


[1] The Gosford House collection was largely gathered by the 7th and 10th earls of Wemyss, so it is possible the painting was brought to Scotland by Francis Charteris, 7th earl (1723-1808) and great-great-grandfather to the 10th earl (see David Carritt, "Pictures from Gosford House," The Burlington Magazine 99, no. 655 [October 1957]: 343). However, the painting does not appear in a 1771 inventory of Amisfield House (transcribed and published in Transactions of the Society of the Antiquaries of Scotland [Archaeologia Scotica], vol. 1 [1792]: 77-84). Waagen records visits to the collection of Lord Elcho, the future 10th earl, at Amisfield House, and to Gosford House (Gustav Friedrich Waagen, Treasures of Art in Great Britain, London, 1854: 2:82, and Galleries and Cabinets of Art in Great Britain, London, 1857: 437-441), and although this painting is not mentioned by him, he was not given access to the entire collection and so does not describe it completely. The first certain reference to the painting came when it was included in the winter exhibition of the Royal Academy in London in 1886, and was described as belonging to the collection of the earl of Wemyss. References through at least 1923 continue to place the painting at Gosford Hall, and the previous collection given in the Wildenstein invoice (see note 3) is "Lord Wemyss, Gosford House, Scotland." On the collecting by the earls see: Pictures from Gosford House Lent by The Earl of Wemyss and March, exh. cat., National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh, 1957; "The Earls of Wemyss and March," in Dutch Art and Scotland: A Reflection of Taste, exh. cat., National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh, 1992: 171; Shelagh Wemyss, "Francis, Lord Elcho (10th Earl of Wemyss) as a Collector of Italian Old Masters," Journal of the Scottish Society for Art History 8 (2003): 73-76.

[3] The Wildenstein invoice to the Kress Foundation for 16 items, including this painting, is dated 23 June 1949 (copy in NGA curatorial files). The painting is described as "Portrait of Francesco Duodo." Some of the Kress Foundation's paperwork during the acquisition process includes the title *Portrait of a Procurator of St. Mark's, possibly Francesco Duodo*.

**EXHIBITION HISTORY**

1886 Exhibition of Works by the Old Masters. Winter Exhibition, Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1886, no. 144, as *A Venetian Senator*.


1938 Exhibition of Venetian Painting From the Fifteenth Century through the Eighteenth Century, California Palace of the Legion of Honor, San Francisco, 1938, no. 66, repro., as *Portrait of Francesco Duodo*.


2009 Botticelli to Titian: Two Centuries of Italian Masterpieces, Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest, 2009-2010, no. 109, repro.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1984: 230, no. 289, color repro.

1985  

1990  

2007  
ENTRY

Summer is one of three known paintings from a cycle by Jacopo Tintoretto depicting the personifications of the four Seasons. The other two are Spring (Chrysler Museum of Art, Norfolk) [fig. 1] [1] and Autumn (private collection) [fig. 2]; [2] there is no trace of Winter. All three of the surviving Seasons feature powerful, Michelangelesque figures, combined with a decorative elegance that is especially prominent in Summer, in the undulating line of stalks of grain silhouetted against the sky, the lacy grape leaves and clustered grapes, and the exquisitely rendered birds.

Summer is represented as Ceres, goddess of agriculture, with her attribute, stalks of wheat. [3] Of the other two surviving Seasons, Spring is Flora, decked with flowers, while Autumn is a youthful god, probably Vertumnus, reclining among branches or vines with a large squash or gourd. In Venetian paintings of this period, Winter was typically personified as a white-bearded older man (Hyems, Boreas, Saturn, or Vulcan). [4]
Carlo Ridolfi describes a decorative cycle by Tintoretto in the Casa Barbo a San Pantaleone in which “one sees in the paneling (intavolato) of a room a capriccio of dreams and some divinities in the heavens, with various images of the things brought to the minds of mortals in their sleep, and the four Seasons personified in the surrounding area (nel recinto).” [5] The central painting of this ensemble is unmistakably the octagonal Allegory of the Dreams of Men (Detroit Institute of Arts) [fig. 3], [6] an illusionistic ceiling painting designed to be seen from below (di sotto in sù), making it clear that Ridolfi’s reference to the intavolato means a decorative ceiling framework. Despite its current title, taken from Ridolfi’s description, the allegory represented in the Detroit picture seems to be concerned primarily with time and fortune. It involves a complicated network of symbols which, when considered together, comment upon the interaction of human dreams and desires, fortune, and the great cycles governing heaven and earth. [7] The depiction of the Seasons surrounding the central allegory would have complemented the motif of cyclical change.

Not all scholars have agreed that the Gallery’s Summer and the other two surviving Seasons come from the Barbo ensemble, or indeed that they are autograph works by Jacopo Tintoretto. [8] Nevertheless, the evidence for a shared origin with the Allegory of the Dreams of Men is strong. The Seasons were originally elongated octagons in format, like the Allegory. The figure types and pictorial technique are similar in all four pictures. An exhibition at the Detroit Institute of Arts in 1994 that brought together the Detroit, Norfolk, and Washington pictures confirmed their compatibility in color and scale. [9] Moreover, although these works have been dated variously from the mid-1550s through the late 1570s, the Seasons can be identified as autograph works by Jacopo from the period leading up to his triumphant Miracle of the Slave of 1548. They show numerous links to such pictures as the Contest of Apollo and Marsyas (Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford; documented to 1545), Venus and Mars Surprised by Vulcan (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), Venus, Vulcan, and Cupid (Galleria Palatina, Palazzo Pitti, Florence), and the Last Supper (San Marcuola, Venice; dated 1547). [10] Summer’s features particularly resemble those of Minerva in the Hartford ceiling and Venus in the Munich and Pitti paintings. Whatever doubts scholars have had about the autograph nature of Summer can be explained by the fact that it is a relatively early work, and thus different in style and technique from his paintings after 1550. [11] The central Allegory is painted somewhat more broadly than the Seasons. The major figure in the lower part of the canvas is seen in shadow against a bright background, a device that the artist used in the Miracle of the Slave and frequently
thereafter. It is possible that Tintoretto executed the centerpiece in 1548 or shortly thereafter, even in the early 1550s.

As in his other youthful works, Tintoretto’s Casa Barbo ensemble demonstrates a clear intent to show off his mastery of the most up-to-date central Italian manner. Here the primary source of inspiration can be identified as Giorgio Vasari. During his Venetian stay of 1541–1542, Vasari produced paintings for a ceiling in the Palazzo Corner, from which several allegorical figures survive, among them Patience (Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice) [fig. 4].[12] Like Tintoretto’s surviving Seasons, Vasari’s paintings employ a slightly reduced point of view and are at once heroic and elegantly decorative. In its facial type and curly hair, Vasari’s Patience shows a close resemblance to Tintoretto’s Summer. Even closer connections can be seen between other paintings in Tintoretto’s cycle and Vasari’s Palazzo Corner ceiling. For example, Tintoretto’s Spring and Autumn show similarities in pose and figure type to Judas (now Casa Vasari, Arezzo) [fig. 5], which may have originally been part of the Allegory of Hope in Vasari’s cycle. Tintoretto’s Allegory of the Dreams of Men is analogous to the central Allegory of Charity from Vasari’s ceiling (now Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice) in its basic composition and many of the component figures. Similar allegorical figures also appear on the ceilings of Vasari’s own house in Arezzo, which he decorated in the mid- to late 1540s.[13] Thus the Casa Barbo ensemble can be seen as reflecting the very latest central Italian taste of circa 1546–1548. Tintoretto would have been aware of Vasari’s productions after he left Venice through Pietro Aretino, a close friend of Vasari and an early sponsor of Tintoretto.

Recent archival findings by Stefania Mason have clarified that the Casa Barbo was occupied at midcentury by three brothers, Zuan Francesco, Jacopo, and Alessandro. Francesco and Jacopo were both noted for their culture and erudition and associated with Aretino’s literary circle. Francesco was a historian and collector of antique coins and medals. Jacopo was a poet and scholar to whom Lodovico Dolce dedicated his translation of Seneca’s tragedy Thyestes in 1543 and addressed a letter published in 1552. Alessandro played an active role in Venice’s political life, holding a number of important offices. The brothers lived together under a fidecommesso, an arrangement that ensured that the family’s patrimony would be passed down through a single male heir: Zuan Francesco’s eldest son, Faustino, who would inherit the palace and carry the name forward. In 1557, Faustino’s uncle Alessandro, in his will, noted that at some unspecified time he had spent 212 ducati in restoring the house at San Pantalon that would go to Faustino.
on the condition that Faustino not raise the rent for Alessandro’s wife and stepson as long as they wished to live there. Faustino married in 1548, and his upcoming wedding could have provided the impetus for the decoration of the house that he would inherit as the future head of the family; nevertheless, the stylistic evidence suggests that if that was the case, the ensemble was begun somewhat before the actual wedding, although it might not have been completed until 1548 or later. [14]

The Barbo family had produced a pope several generations earlier (Paul II), a factor that may have inspired them to adopt a central Italian–oriented artistic patronage. [15]

Ridolfi’s description of the Casa Barbo ensemble, which states that the Seasons were “nel recinto,” or in the area surrounding the central allegory, does not make clear whether they were originally high on the wall, at the frieze level, canted at an angle on a vault, or flat on the ceiling. Any of these seems possible. The slightly reduced point of view would have worked in all three positions; although similar figures tend to appear flat on the ceiling in Venetian ensembles of the mid- and later 16th century, there are occasional examples set on vaults and on the wall at the frieze level. [16]

Robert Echols
March 21, 2019

COMPARATIVE FIGURES

fig. 1 Jacopo Tintoretto, Spring, c. 1546/1548, oil on canvas, Chrysler Museum of Art, Norfolk, Gift of Walter P. Chrysler, Jr.

fig. 2 Jacopo Tintoretto, Autumn, c. 1546/1548, oil on canvas, Private Collection
fig. 3 Jacopo Tintoretto, *Allegory of the Dreams of Men*, c. 1546/1548, oil on canvas, Detroit Institute of Arts

fig. 4 Giorgio Vasari, *Patience*, 1542, oil on panel, Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice. Su concessione del Ministero dei beni e delle attività culturali e del turismo. Museo Nazionale Gallerie dell’Accademia di Venezia © Archivio fotografico G.A.VE
fig. 5 Giorgio Vasari, *Judas*, 1542, oil on panel, Casa Vasari, Arezzo. Su concessione del Ministero dei beni e delle attività culturali e del turismo. Soprintendenza archeologia belle arti e paesaggio per le province di Siena Grosseto e Arezzo. Photo: Alessandro Benci

NOTES


[3] Other elements appear in the picture that are not attributes of Ceres. Grapes are usually linked with autumn rather than summer, although a general association with the idea of harvest does not seem out of place.
The appearance of the parrot cannot be easily explained. In Cesare Ripa’s *Iconologia* (first published in 1593), the parrot is an attribute of eloquence; see Cesare Ripa, *Iconologia* (Siena, 1613), 207–209. It is possible that the parrot here may have played a role in the complex allegory of the ceiling ensemble, discussed elsewhere in this entry. Perhaps, because of its association with tropical climates, it is intended to suggest the heat of summer, or it may appear solely for decorative purposes, to add color and a touch of luxury and exoticism to the painting. Parrots appear occasionally as pets in later 16th-century paintings, for example in Veronese’s frescoes showing members of the Barbaro household in the *sala* of the Villa Maser, 1561. See generally Richard Verdi, *The Parrot in Art: From Dürer to Elizabeth Butterworth* (Milan and London, 2007).

[4] The fact that the third surviving season is shown among bare branches leads to some ambiguity about whether he is intended to represent autumn or winter, although the presence of the squash and the fact that the figure is a youth and not an old man make the former seem more likely. For a discussion of the representation of the Seasons by Tintoretto’s contemporaries, see Bertina Suida Manning, “Two ‘Seasons’ by Jacopo Tintoretto,” in *Studies in the History of Art Dedicated to William E. Suida on His Eightieth Birthday* (London, 1959), 253. On the ceiling of the *albergo* in the Scuola Grande di San Rocco, and on the ceiling of the Atrio Quadrato in the Palazzo Ducale, Tintoretto represented the Seasons as four putti; see Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi, *Tintoretto: Le opere sacre e profane* (Venice, 1982), 1: nos. 255–258 and 266–269; 2: figs. 339–342 and 353–356. In the four Seasons that decorate the clockface in the Sala del Collegio in the Palazzo Ducale, designed by Tintoretto and executed (in grisaille) by his studio, Winter is a female deity crowned with a crescent, probably Diana. The other personifications on the clockface appear to be Flora, Ceres, and Vertumnus (again, a youth with a squash). See Pallucchini and Rossi, *Tintoretto*, 1:221–222, no. 421; 2:570, fig. 539. A pair of paintings by a Tintoretto follower in the Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh, shows, in one painting, Spring as a seated, dressed female figure in the foreground, with Summer in the background as a female figure cutting wheat, and in the other, Winter as a nude old man in the foreground, with Autumn in the background as a nude youth bending down the limbs of a tree; Pallucchini and Rossi, *Tintoretto*, 1: cat. nos. 153–154, 2: figs. 202–203; Robert Echols and Frederick Ilichman, “Toward a New Tintoretto Catalogue, with a Checklist of Revised Attributions and a New Chronology,” in *Jacopo Tintoretto: Actas del congreso internacional/Proceedings of the International Symposium, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, February 26–27, 2007* (Madrid, 2009), nos. C66–C67. Three paintings of *Spring*, *Summer*, and *Winter* by another Tintoretto follower in the National Galleries of Scotland, Edinburgh, show the Seasons as Flora, Ceres, and an old man, probably Hyems, respectively; Pallucchini and Rossi, *Tintoretto*, 1: nos.
In addition to the Casa Barbo group discussed elsewhere in this entry, Carlo Ridolfi, *Le maraviglie dell'arte, overo Le vite de g'illustri pittori veneti, e dello stato* (Venice, 1648), 2:43; Carlo Ridolfi, *Le maraviglie dell'arte, overo Le vite de g'illustri pittori veneti, e dello stato*, ed. Detlev von Hadeln (Berlin, 1924), 2:52, mentions another ensemble in which Tintoretto depicts the Seasons, in the house of Giovanni da Pesaro at San Stae; there they are not personified, but represented by depictions of typical activities associated with each season. Given Tintoretto’s dependence in this ensemble on a ceiling design by Giorgio Vasari (discussed elsewhere in this entry), it is worth noting that the latter included personifications of the Seasons in his designs for the ceiling of the Sala di Opi (Chamber of Opis), Palazzo Vecchio, Florence: there Spring and Summer are female, of a type generally similar to the Gallery’s picture, while Autumn is a youth and Winter is an old man. Although the Sala di Opi postdates Tintoretto’s Casa Barbo ensemble by some years (the decoration of the rooms was not begun until 1555), it is possible that the young Tintoretto had access to earlier drawings by Vasari depicting the Seasons.

“*In casa Barba a San Pantaleone miransi nell’intavolato d’una stanza un capriccio de’ sogni, & alcuni Deità in un Cielo, con varie imagini delle cose apportate nel sonno alle menti de’ mortali, e le quattro staggioni in figura nel recinto.***” Carlo Ridolfi, *Le maraviglie dell’arte, overo Le vite de g’illustri pittori veneti, e dello stato* (Venice, 1648), 2:46; Carlo Ridolfi, *Le maraviglie dell’arte, overo Le vite de g’illustri pittori veneti, e dello stato*, ed. Detlev von Hadeln (Berlin, 1924), 2:55.

Like the three paintings of the Seasons (see Entry notes 1–2), the *Allegory of the Dreams of Men* also first appeared on the art market in the 20th century; it was purchased in 1921 from the Lucerne Fine Arts Co. (Steinmeyer). Information from curatorial files, Detroit Institute of Arts.

The protagonists include Saturn, the personification of Time; his son, Opportunity or Good Fortune, balanced on the crystal sphere before him; a mask and poppies, symbols of sleep; the winged goddess Fame, holding her trumpet, accompanied by a lion, the emblem of the Barbo family; and in the heavens, with the signs of the zodiac, Jupiter and two goddesses, possibly Juno, who bestows wealth upon mortals, or alternatively Urania, the muse of Astronomy, and Venus, or alternatively Erato, muse of lyric poetry. See Robert Echols, “‘*Jacopo nel corso, presso al palio*: Dal soffitto per l’Aretino al *Miracolo dello Schiavo*,” in *Jacopo Tintoretto nel quarto centenario della morte: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi*, ed. Paola Rossi and Lionello Puppi (Padua, 1996), 78–79. For an alternate interpretation, see Francesco Gandolfo, *Il “Dolce Tempo”: Mistica, ermetismo e sogno nel Cinquecento* (Rome, 1978).

Bertina Suida Manning, the first to publish *Spring* and *Summer*, connected them with the Barbo ensemble, which she dated to the early 1550s. See


[10] On the Contest of Apollo and Marsyas, see Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi, Tintoretto: Le opere sacre e profane (Venice, 1982), 1: cat. no. 82; Miguel Falomir, ed., Tintoretto (Madrid, 2007), cat. no. 4. Venus and Mars

[11] Joyce Plesters, an expert in Tintoretto’s technique, after reviewing paint cross sections and other documentation relating to the *Allegory of the Dreams of Men*, concluded that the painting’s technique was consistent with a date shortly before the *Miracle of the Slave* (discussion with Robert Echols and Julie Moreno, Mellon Conservation Fellow, Detroit Institute of Arts, June 4–5, 1993, Venice, documented in Moreno’s report on her research travel, in NGA conservation files).


[14] Mason’s findings appear in her essay “Tintoretto the Venetian” in *Tintoretto: Artist of Renaissance Venice*, ed. Robert Echols and Frederick Ilchman (New Haven, 2018), 36–61. *Spring*, in particular, with its inflated, mannerist figure type, is inconsistent with Tintoretto’s work after 1548. The figure of Opportunity in the *Allegory of the Dreams of Men*, by contrast, presented in deep shadow against a bright sky, does recall the executioner in *Miracle of the Slave*. These and the other comparisons cited suggest that Tintoretto may have begun the Barbo project around 1546 or 1547 and completed it in 1548. As a general matter, after 1548, Tintoretto was much less reliant on wholesale quotations from central Italian sources, and it seems unlikely he would have followed Vasari’s model so closely.
TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The painting was executed on a piece of medium-weight fabric with a twill weave. Plain-weave fabric has been added at the corners to convert the original shape of an elongated octagon into a rectangle. Additional fabric has been added at the top (2.5 centimeters) and bottom (4 centimeters) edges. Tintoretto did not use a ground to prepare the canvas. Instead, he drew the design directly on the fabric in black paint, then drew it again in layers of warm white and brown paint. [1] Infrared examination at 1.1 to 1.8 microns shows the black liquid underpainting and brown underlayers, and x-radiographs show the white underpainting. [2] Tintoretto made adjustments to the figure’s position, twisting her body so that her right hip was raised up and her left leg was bent. He also adjusted the position of her right arm and the fingers of her left hand. Pentimenti can also be seen in the leaves and the


[16] For example, on Tintoretto’s ceiling for the albergo of the Scuola Grande di San Rocco of 1564, the central illusionistic painting is surrounded by decorative panels, among which are reclining figures seen from a point of view similar to that in the Seasons; see Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi, Tintoretto: Le opere sacre e profane (Venice, 1982), 1: nos. 272–275 and 277–280; 2: figs. 359–372, 364–367. Most analogous figures in the Palazzo Ducale, Venice, also appear flat on the ceiling, although as Suida Manning noted, the Sala del Anticollegio and other rooms in the palace do have horizontal paintings at the frieze level. Bertina Suida Manning, “Two ‘Seasons’ by Jacopo Tintoretto,” in Studies in the History of Art Dedicated to William E. Suida on His Eightieth Birthday (London, 1959), 257. While the wooden framework for Vasari’s Palazzo Corner paintings is now lost, the appearance of the fictive moldings in the paintings suggests that they were flat on the ceiling; see Jürgen Schulz, “Vasari at Venice,” The Burlington Magazine 103 (1961): 507. In Vasari’s house in Arezzo, similar allegorical figures appear surrounding central illusionistic panels both flat on the ceiling and at the frieze level in the Chamber of Fortune, which also includes personifications of the Seasons as part of a complex allegory; among those appearing at the frieze level are some virtually identical to figures from the Palazzo Corner. See Liana Cheney, The Homes of Giorgio Vasari (New York, 2006), 120–135, figs. 30 and 31 (at frieze level), 32 and 33 (flat on the ceiling).
grapes. Tintoretto applied the paint fairly thinly using a combination of wet-into-wet and wet-over-dry brushwork. There is some impasto in the highlights. He used glazes in the drapery and the foliage. [3]

The painting is in good condition overall. Some abrasion is apparent, most notably in the left background, where the canvas threads are visible. A 12-centimeter circular tear is located in the sky and grapes at the top of the picture near the left corner. In 1959–1960 Mario Modestini applied varnish and retouched the painting. By 2016 that varnish had discolored and the painting was treated again between 2016 and 2018 to remove it and to reduce an earlier discolored varnish that had only been selectively removed in the past.

Joanna Dunn and Robert Echols based on the examination reports by Michael Swicklik and Joanna Dunn

March 21, 2019

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] The preparatory layers were analyzed by the NGA Scientific Research department using cross sections and scanning electron microscopy in conjunction with energy-dispersive spectrometry (see report dated February 6, 2017, in NGA conservation files). The white layers were predominantly comprised of lead white, with a small amount of vermilion.

[2] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with H and J astronomy filters.

[3] The pigments were analyzed by the NGA Scientific Research department with x-ray fluorescence spectroscopy and scanning electron microscopy in conjunction with energy-dispersive spectrometry (see report dated February 6, 2017, in NGA conservation files). The pigments found are consistent with those used by Tintoretto and other artists of the period.

PROVENANCE


Summer
© National Gallery of Art, Washington
[1] In a 1648 publication, Carlo Ridolfi describes a decorative cycle of paintings by Tintoretto: “In casa Barba a San Pantaleone miransi nell’intavolato d’una stanza un capriccio de’ sogni, & alcuni Deità in un Cielo, con varie imagini delle cose apportate nel sonno alle menti de’ mortali, e le quattro staggioni in figura nel recinto” ("...one sees in the paneling [intavolato] of a room a capriccio of dreams and some divinities in the heavens, with various images of the things brought to the minds of mortals in their sleep, and the four Seasons personified in the surrounding area ['nel recinto']"). Three of the paintings depicting the personifications of the four Seasons are known: Spring (Chrysler Museum of Art, Norkolk), the NGA painting, and Autumn (private collection); Winter is unlocated. See: Ridolfi, Le maraviglie dell’arte, overo Le vite de gl’illustri pittori veneti, e dello Stato, 2 vols., Venice, 1648: 2:46; Ridolfi, Le maraviglie dell’arte, overo Le vite de gl’illustri pittori veneti, e dello Stato (Venice, 1648), edited by Detlev von Hadeln, 2 vols., Berlin, 1914-1924: 2(1924):55.

Tintoretto may have begun the paintings at Casa Barbo around 1546 or 1547, and completed them in 1548. It was in 1548 that Faustino Barbo married, and because he was the designated heir to the palace, the occasion may have been the impetus for a restoration and decoration of the family house that was noted in Faustino's uncle's will of 1557. For details, and additional discussion of the Barbo family in residence at the Casa Barbo in the mid-16th century, see Stefania Mason, "Tintoretto the Venetian," in Tintoretto: Artist of Renaissance Venice, edited by Robert Echols and Frederick Ilchman, exh. cat., Palazzo Ducale, Venice; National Gallery of Art, Washington, New Haven, 2018: 36-61.

[2] The central painting in the cycle described by Ridolfi, Allegory of the Dreams of Men (Detroit Institute of Art), as well as another of the surrounding personifications of the Seasons, Spring (see note 1), were both previously in a collection in southern France. The Detroit painting was acquired from this unknown collection by the dealers Mont and Newhouse in 1957, and the Norfolk painting was acquired by Walter Chrysler from Newhouse Galleries in 1958. Mont frequently worked with the Newhouse Galleries, so it is very possible the NGA painting shares this provenance. (Information provided by Robert Echols, email of 11 June 2010, in NGA curatorial files.)
[3] Betty Mont wrote to Guy Emerson of the Kress Foundation on 5 November 1956 that they had "a splendid painting by Tintoretto" in their studio. The invoice from Frederick Mont & Company to the Kress Foundation, for four paintings including the Tintoretto (called "Allegorie of Summer"), is dated 14 February 1957; three payments for the group were completed in September of the same year. (Copies of the letter and invoice are in NGA curatorial files.)

EXHIBITION HISTORY


BIBLIOGRAPHY


1973 Shapley, Fern Rusk. Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection: Summer


The painting depicts the events of Exodus 32, with the main events of the story appearing in the middle and background. In the center middle ground, the Israelites watch as the high priest Aaron collects golden ornaments for the making of an idol in the form of a golden calf, which he is shown casting in the far background. In the left background, the completed calf is displayed upon an altar, surrounded by worshippers; in the center right background are scenes of feasting and merrymaking. In the far upper right, the now-truncated figure of Moses on Mount Sinai (see Technical Summary) is bathed in a fiery light as he receives the Ten Commandments. In the foreground, to the left and right, are richly dressed revelers and observers. The man at the far upper left looking out of the scene appears to be a portrait.

Around the time of its purchase by the Kress Foundation in 1935, *The Worship of the Golden Calf* was attributed to Jacopo Tintoretto in manuscript opinions from Roberto Longhi, Giuseppe Fiocco, Raimond van Marle, August L. Mayer, F. Mason.
Perkins, Wilhelm Suida, Adolfo Venturi, and Bernard Berenson, most of whom considered it an early work. [1] The autograph status of the work was affirmed in 1950 by Rodolfo Pallucchini, who dated it to circa 1555 or later, and by Berenson in 1957. [2] Subsequent scholars have moved away from the early dating and seen signs of studio assistance. Pierluigi De Vecchi classified it as by Jacopo with collaboration from circa 1560. Fern Rusk Shapley, too, considered it a largely studio work from circa 1560, but because of the vigor of the underpainting, suggested that Jacopo laid in the principal figures and supervised the execution. Pallucchini and Paola Rossi acknowledged considerable studio assistance, while retaining the attribution to Jacopo and the date of circa 1555. [3]

Hans Tietze, in 1948, took a different view, dating the picture late in the century and relating it to the style of Marco Tintoretto. [4] More recently, Bert W. Meijer has attributed the landscape to Paolo Fiammingo (Pauwels Franck; 1540–1596); noting that the painting is usually dated to the 1550s and that Paolo was not documented in Venice before the 1570s, he commented that either the landscape was added later or the whole painting dates from some time after Paolo’s arrival. [5] Robert Echols and Frederick Ilchman assigned the picture to the Tintoretto studio, 1592 or later, agreeing that the landscape suggests the work of a northern painter. [6]

The judgment of the picture first made by Tietze (although not his specific link to the name of Marco Tintoretto) remains convincing. Like a number of works assigned in the past to Tintoretto in his early years or around 1555, The Worship of the Golden Calf is the work of a later, different hand. [7] While the figure types are generically similar to those of Tintoretto, they lack the dynamism and convincing anatomy that appear in the master’s autograph paintings. [8] The loose brushwork in the highlights is a weak imitation of Tintoretto’s fluid calligraphy. Moreover, a distinctive hand seems to be present here, one that cannot be identified in other works associated with Tintoretto. It is detectable in the principal faces, the overall pastel tonalities, the northern qualities of the landscape, and the shiny texture of the fabrics on the two principal figures.

The overall composition is loosely based upon the Gathering of the Manna of 1592/1594, still in the church for which it was created, San Giorgio Maggiore, and one of the last works produced by the Tintoretto studio during Jacopo’s lifetime [fig. 1]. That painting also features repoussoir figures at either side, with a series of vignettes carrying the narrative into the background. Particularly close is the treatment of space in the upper center of the painting, with a round hillock and
a view of figures in a covered area (a grotto in the San Giorgio Maggiore painting, a tent in the Gallery’s picture).

All of this evidence suggests that The Worship of the Golden Calf was painted in the Tintoretto studio around the time of Jacopo Tintoretto’s death in 1594, or possibly later, when the shop was headed by Domenico Tintoretto. The northern quality of the landscape, along with the sheen of the fabrics, suggests an artist from beyond the Alps. Meijer’s attribution of the landscape to Paolo Fiammingo seems apposite; however, the figure types and the technique used to render them differ from those in Paolo’s paintings. It is possible that Paolo painted the landscape, but it seems more likely, given the probable date, that the entire painting was executed by another northern artist, perhaps one who had also worked with Paolo. A number of northern artists seem to have come and gone in Tintoretto’s studio; however, the role of northern artists in the body of paintings associated with Tintoretto is a complicated question that has only recently begun to receive the attention it merits. [9]

Robert Echols
March 21, 2019

COMPARATIVE FIGURES

fig. 1 Jacopo Tintoretto and Workshop, The Gathering of the Manna, 1592/1594, oil on canvas, Abbey of San Giorgio Maggiore, inside the Basilica of San Giorgio Maggiore. Photo: Mauro Magliani
NOTES

[1] Those dating it were Roberto Longhi (early); Giuseppe Fiocco (1545–1548); Raimond van Marle (later part of Tintoretto’s early career); August L. Mayer (c. 1545–1548); and Wilhelm Suida (beginning of the 1540s). Copies of all manuscript opinions are in NGA curatorial files.


[7] For other works by followers that were mistakenly considered by Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi to be autograph, see Robert Echols and Frederick Ilchman, “Toward a New Tintoretto Catalogue, with a Checklist of Revised Attributions and a New Chronology,” in Jacopo Tintoretto: Actas
TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The support consists of six pieces of a heavy, twill-weave fabric with four seams. Two vertical seams are located 75 centimeters from the left edge and 120 centimeters from the right edge, just in between the two repousoir groups. The horizontal seam is located 39 centimeters from the top, through the arms of the standing figures on the left and just above the head of the balding man on the right. A seventh piece of fabric, a small strip at the bottom center, roughly 13 centimeters in height, is a later replacement. All the tacking edges have been removed, but cusping at the sides and bottom indicates that these dimensions are near the original. The lack of cusping at the top supports the visual evidence that

---


the canvas has been cut there, severing the kneeling figure at the upper right.

The white ground is very thin, and the x-radiographs suggest it was applied with a palette knife or spatula. The artist laid in the central composition with a free, brushy sketch in black over the ground. A thin, dark imprimatura blocks in the area of the left repousoir, which is then sketched with white. The brown imprimatura may extend over other parts of the composition, including the right-side repousoir, which combines differently colored underpainting layers and white-paint sketching. The paint is applied freely, using a full range of applications, from glazes through impasted linear highlights. The preliminary sketching provided a guide for the painter but is not rigorously followed, and revisions are quickly sketched over broader paint layers. Just to the right of center, a male figure and an area of green landscape are partly covered by a transparent layer of blue paint. This appears to be the result of the mistaken removal during an old restoration of the top layers of paint that the artist had added over the figure, intending to cover it. The overall condition is good, although there is scattered flaking and some abrasion of the paint, especially in the darks. The abrasion allows the dark fabric to show through in some areas. There is also an old tear extending from the top edge at the center of the composition. Some retouching has become discolored, and there are stains and remnants of old, discolored varnishes on the surface. The paint on the inserted canvas is different in color and texture; this can be assumed to be a later replacement. In 1936 Stephen Pichetto relined the picture, removed a discolored varnish, and inpainted it. Mario Modestini inpainted the picture further and applied another layer of varnish in 1955.

Robert Echols and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Catherine Metzger

March 21, 2019

PROVENANCE


[1] The bill of sale to the Kress Foundation (see note 3) says the painting was
"formerly in the Hasting's[sic] Collection, England." It has not yet been determined which collection this was; see notes in NGA curatorial files.

The Getty Provenance Index Database of the contents of sale catalogues lists a Christie's sale of 24-27 June 1833, held in Bath, England, of the large collection of "John Pura, Esq., deceased" (sale catalogue Br-13849). Lot number 130 of this sale, sold on the second day of the sale to "Rickets," was described as a painting by Tintoretto, "The Worshipping the Molten Calf, -- a grand composition of many figures." As there are no dimensions, further description, or illustration in the catalogue, it is not possible to determine if this was the NGA painting.

[2] See the letter of 27 October 1948, in NGA curatorial files, from Stephen Pichetto, Kress Foundation conservator, to John Walker, then NGA curator, in which Walker wrote that Koetser said he had once owned the painting. Koetser told Walker the painting had been purchased "at Christie's or at Sutherland's in three parts and that there was a fourth part that they did not succeed in acquiring." Walker suggested the fourth part "must have been the trees at the top."

[3] The bill of sale was for seven paintings and a number of decorative art objects (copy in NGA curatorial files).

EXHIBITION HISTORY

1939 Dutch and Italian Masterpieces from the Samuel H. Kress Collection, Dayton Art Institute, 1939-1940, no catalogue.

1939 Masterpieces of Five Centuries, Golden Gate International Exposition, San Francisco, 1939, no. 55.

Circle of Tintoretto

Italian
The high quality of *Christ at the Sea of Galilee* has always been recognized. Seascapes are rare in Venetian painting, and here the turbulent waters, with their flickering highlights, as well as the blustering clouds and the play of light on the distant shore, are rendered with a painterly brio that has in retrospect evoked the names of Théodore Géricault and Eugène Delacroix. [1] The disjunction between the vigor of the landscape and the sketchy and attenuated figure of Christ, apparently unfinished in some passages, contributes to a mystical, almost hallucinatory effect that has been compared to some of Jacopo Tintoretto’s great paintings at the Scuola Grande di San Rocco. [2] Most scholars have considered the picture to be an autograph work by Tintoretto, and many have ranked it among his masterpieces. Nevertheless, the painting is so fundamentally different from Tintoretto’s art that it can be removed from his autograph oeuvre without hesitation.
The picture has never been located convincingly in Tintoretto’s oeuvre: datings have ranged from August L. Mayer’s 1546/1555, through Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi’s 1558/1562 and Terisio Pignatti’s later 1570s, to Tintoretto’s last years, 1591/1594, as favored by Lionello Venturi, Erich von der Bercken, and Pierluigi De Vecchi. [3] Nor has the attribution gone unquestioned.

In 1948, Hans Tietze gave the picture to El Greco, a conclusion reached by Manolis Chatzidakis in 1950 as well. [4] In a lengthy written statement in NGA curatorial files, Tietze and Erika Tietze-Conrat argued convincingly that the essential invention, the figure types, the technique, and the coloring of the picture are alien to Tintoretto at every stage of his career. As the Tietzes noted, Tintoretto’s art is always based primarily on the human figure and conveys a fundamental sense of the underlying structure and mechanics of the body, which is absent here. [5] Moreover, in Tintoretto’s paintings, to quote the Tietzes, water is never “in itself an independent means of expression. . . . It is simply the milieu in which some event takes place. In the Washington picture, the sea is not a detail, but the subject of the painting.” [6] The painting’s unusually thin pictorial technique, employing virtually no impasto, is also uncharacteristic of Tintoretto. [7] On the other hand, while the Tietzes’ attribution to El Greco accords with the picture’s mannerist elements and high quality, the technique, in particular the lack of impasto, is equally inconsistent with that of the Cretan painter. [8]

As the present writer has argued elsewhere, the best explanation for the picture’s peculiar genius lies in an attribution to the Amsterdam-born painter Lambert Sustris during his later career in Venice, a period which has remained mysterious and largely unexplored. [9] Born around 1515, Sustris is recorded in Rome in 1536, and within a year or two he had settled in Venice. His paintings there show him to be extremely versatile, moving comfortably back and forth between the conventions of central Italian mannerism, Titian (in whose studio he is reported to have worked), and northern literalism. [10] In the 1540s he was active as a painter of fresco cycles decorating palaces and villas on the Venetian terraferma, and he seems to have played a role in developing the characteristic domestic decoration style there, especially its landscape components, which combine the Roman antiquarian landscapes of Polidoro da Caravaggio with elements of northern panorama and Venetian pastoral lyricism [fig. 1]. [11] He is also recorded by early sources as one of the northern artists who worked in Tintoretto’s studio, as well as Titian’s, painting landscapes. [12] Giorgio Vasari’s 1568 Lives implies that Lambert was still alive but no longer in Venice, and his career is not usually discussed beyond this point. [13]
However, as first noted by Arthur Peltzer, there are indications that he continued to work in Venice, at least occasionally, for more than three decades and received payments there under the name of “Alberto d'Ollanda” for three official portraits in 1591 that Tintoretto was unable to complete. (Sustris signed paintings as Alberto earlier in his career, and he is identified by the name in at least two documents.) [14] Many direct links between paintings previously attributed to Tintoretto and works by Lambert suggest that during this later phase of his career, Sustris had an association of some kind with Tintoretto. Although the structure of Tintoretto’s studio remains unclear, it seems likely that he had some associates who worked there relatively independently. Northern artists particularly seemed to have gravitated to the Tintoretto bottega. [15] Lambert Sustris may well have been one of them.

The attribution of the Gallery’s painting to Lambert Sustris is based upon strong similarities in works by Lambert to the figure of Christ, the small figures of the apostles, and the landscape. The attenuated figure of Christ, with his rectangular-shaped head, follows the mannerist conventions that Sustris frequently used in his early paintings. Because of the sketchiness of the figure, especially close connections can be found in Lambert’s drawings. For example, in a drawing depicting a Sacrifice to Priapus (Albertina, Vienna) [fig. 2], a female nude seen from the rear is articulated in exactly the same manner as the figure of Christ, especially in the definition of the back, the shoulders, the calves, and the feet, as well as the distinctive mannerist facial profile. [16] Christ’s exaggeratedly extended finger reflects a morphological trait that appears in the central figure in armor in the Sacrifice to Priapus and numerous other drawings and paintings (see fig. 1) by Sustris. [17] The little figures of the apostles in the boat are analogous to those who populate Lambert’s frescoed landscapes, and even closer to figures in his drawings, where the sketchily rendered faces frequently show the same hollow-eyed, skull-like appearance and summary treatment of the limbs. They are particularly close to a compositional sketch for a Roman triumph (Gabinetto dei Disegni, Uffizi, Florence) [fig. 3]. [18]

The landscape in the Gallery’s picture shows striking similarities to Lambert’s Paduan frescoes (for example, one at the Villa Godi at Loneda, Lugo di Vicenza; see fig. 1), especially in the treatment of the receding shoreline, the swaths of yellow and green defining the hills in the middle distance, the tree stump, the puffy clouds, and even the boat itself. [19] In addition, the panoramic landscape lying beneath the current painting, though visible only through x-radiography and
infrared reflectography at 1.5 to 1.8 microns [fig. 4], [20] can also be linked to Lambert’s paintings. As in his Paduan frescoes and other works, the architecture includes both classicizing and contemporary buildings. Among them are several that replicate structures in Lambert’s paintings—for example, a triple-arched bridge with exact counterparts in his fresco cycles. [21] While it is not possible to make judgments about attribution based on the incomplete image of the unfinished portrait painted over the panoramic landscape, what can be seen of the portrait through infrared reflectography is generally consistent with both Lambert’s earlier document portraits and the 1591 paintings by “Alberto d’Ollanda,” while the x-radiographs reveal that it lacks the bold brushwork that Tintoretto typically used to sketch in the structural forms of the head when he began his portraits. [22]

Tintoretto specialists have remained mostly silent about the attribution of the Christ at the Sea of Galilee since it has been linked to Sustris. [23] While the attribution to Sustris cannot be confirmed with certainty, the picture is surely the work of a painter who fits Sustris’s profile: one who was active in Venice in the second half of the cinquecento; probably having some association with Tintoretto and certainly aware of his oeuvre and types; familiar with the iconography of northern painting; and painting in a mode that combines mannerist figure types with the landscape style characteristic of Venetian villa decorations of the 1540s.

Christ’s pose is loosely related to several other paintings from the Tintoretto studio, including two versions of the Raising of Lazarus, datable to 1573 (private collection) and 1576 (Katharinenkirche, Lübeck). [24] The Gallery’s painting can be tentatively dated to around the 1570s on the theory that there must be some relationship among the pictures.

The painting represents one of Christ’s several earthly manifestations following the Resurrection, his appearance on the shore of Lake Galilee on the occasion traditionally known as the second “miraculous draught of fishes.” As recounted in John 21:1–13, seven apostles had fished all night in a boat on Lake Galilee, without success. At dawn, Christ appeared at the shore and told them to cast their nets to the right side of the boat, where the catch would be plentiful. When Peter recognized Christ, he cast himself into the water to swim to the shore. The subject is more frequent in northern than in Italian painting, and the composition of the Washington painting, with its panoramic landscape, is characteristically northern in type. [25] The Gallery’s picture has sometimes been seen as representing Christ walking on the water during a storm, and Peter about to attempt to follow his example, as told in Matthew 14:22–29. [26] Nevertheless, the iconography of the
painting as a whole makes it clear that the subject is indeed the occasion described in John 21: Christ is standing on the shore, as evidenced by the rocks and vegetation at his feet; there are seven apostles on the boat (not twelve as in the scene of Christ walking on the water); the apostles are casting the net off the right side of the boat; and the sky suggests that the event takes place at sunrise.

In 16th-century Venice, biblical narrative pictures of this size and format were often hung in the large central halls (portego or sala) of private palaces. [27]

Robert Echols
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fig. 2 Lambert Sustris, *Sacrifice to Priapus*, 1540s, ink and wash on paper, The Albertina Museum, Vienna. Photo © Albertina, Vienna
NOTES


attribution, noting that the picture is “ascribed to Tintoretto, but may also be considered as a possible El Greco.”

[5] As Hans Tietze and Erika Tietze-Conrat wrote, in Tintoretto’s figure’s one can always “discern a drawing which explains everything. . . . [Here] Christ is an apparition. Instead of a head between his shoulders, instead of skull, eye and mouth to say words, there is only a profile, or more exactly the shadow of a profile.” An example that shows how differently Tintoretto treats a comparable figure is provided in the Finding of the Body of Saint Mark (Pinacoteca di Brera, Milan); see Robert Echols, “Tintoretto, Christ at the Sea of Galilee, and the Unknown Later Career of Lambert Sustris,” Venezia Cinquecento 6, no. 12 (1996): 94.

[6] A prominent example of Tintoretto’s treatment of a stormy sea is provided by Saint Mark Rescues a Saracen (Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice). Although cited by Fern Rusk Shapley, Catalogue of the Italian Paintings (Washington, DC, 1979), 1:645, and Terisio Pignatti, in Golden Century of Venetian Painting (Los Angeles, 1979), 106, as providing a comparison to the Gallery’s painting, the treatment is utterly different there: the sea is rendered with long, curving strokes of white representing the foam over a dark blue background. The prominent use of green earth as the primary pigment in the seascape in Christ at the Sea of Galilee, noted in the scientific analysis report (see Technical Summary, note 3), is uncharacteristic of Tintoretto and other Venetian painters; it is more common among fresco painters. See Robert Echols, “Tintoretto, Christ at the Sea of Galilee, and the Unknown Later Career of Lambert Sustris,” Venezia Cinquecento 6, no. 12 (1996): 149 n. 109, and the sources cited there.


[8] Among those scholars attributing the painting to Tintoretto, a number have seen a connection to El Greco, stressing the importance of the painting as an influence on the latter and noting how Tintoretto anticipated some of El Greco’s effects; see Georg Gronau’s manuscript opinion of April 28, 1935, transcribed in NGA curatorial files; Harold Wethey, El Greco and His School (Princeton, NJ, 1962), 1:90 n. 113; Denys Sutton, “Venetian Painting of the Golden Age,” Apollo 110 (1979): 386; Rodolfo Pallucchini and Paola Rossi, Tintoretto: Le opere sacre e profane (Venice, 1982), 1:179.


The list of the Venetian painter’s guild includes the name “Alberto Fiammingo,” and no other name that could reasonably refer to Lambert Sustris. In addition, the visual evidence provided by the three documented “Alberto” portraits of 1591 is consistent with what Lambert might be expected to have produced some four decades after his documented portraits, now working in a more Tintoretto-influenced mode. Robert Echols, “Tintoretto, Christ at the Sea of Galilee, and the Unknown Later Career of Lambert Sustris,” *Venezia Cinquecento* 6, no. 12 (1996): 102–110. On Lambert Sustris as “Albert d’Olland,” see Arthur Peltzer, “Chi è il pittore ‘Alberto de Ollanda,’” *Arte Veneta* 4 (1950): 118–122; see also Bert W. Meijer, in *Venezia da stato a mito* (Venice, 1997), 134–135.


See Robert Echols, “Tintoretto, Christ at the Sea of Galilee, and the
Unknown Later Career of Lambert Sustris,” Venezia Cinquecento 6, no. 12 (1996): figs. 8, 9a, and 9b. For other comparable figures, see 113 and figs. 10 and 14 in the same article.


[20] Infrared reflectography was performed using a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with an H astronomy filter.

[21] See Vincenzo Mancini, Lambert Sustris a Padova: La Villa Bigolin a Selvazzano (Selvazzano Dentro, 1993), figs. 33, 34, and 78.

[22] For example, in A Procurator of Saint Mark’s, National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1952.5.79.

[23] Bert W. Meijer, “Flemish and Dutch Artists in Venetian Workshops: The Case of Jacopo Tintoretto,” in Renaissance Venice and the North: Crosscurrents in the Time of Dürer, Bellini and Titian, ed. Bernard Aikema and Beverly Louise Brown (Milan, 1999), 143, rejected Echols’s attribution to Sustris of several other paintings previously assigned to Tintoretto, without explanation, while attributing the landscapes in these pictures to northern painters. He did not, however, include Christ at the Sea of Galilee among the group that he discussed. Robert Echols and Frederick Ilchman, “Toward a New Tintoretto Catalogue, with a Checklist of Revised Attributions and a New Chronology,” in Jacopo Tintoretto: Actas del congreso internacional/Proceedings of the International Symposium, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, February 26–27, 2007 (Madrid, 2009), 149, no. C90, reaffirmed the Sustris attribution. They placed the picture in their “Circle of Tintoretto” checklist rather than considering it a studio work, stating, “Although it is possible that this picture was executed [by Sustris] in Tintoretto’s studio, it is far more distinctive than related works . . . which exemplify the Tintoretto studio ‘house style.’ Given its exceptionally high
quality and the individuality of its style, an attribution to ‘studio of Tintoretto’ as an alternative to Sustris would not be appropriate in this case, and therefore we do not include it with the related works in the studio category.” Guillaume Cassegrain, *Tintoret* (Paris, 2010), 45, cited the painting as an example of the complexities involved in the Tintoretto catalog, arguing that it might represent either an “exercise in style” on the part of Tintoretto, a departure from his usual manner, or the work of a northern painter in Tintoretto’s studio, such as Sustris.


[26] While early ascriptions of this latter subject to the present painting may have been based on the fact that it appears to show Christ with one foot on the surface of the water, Anna Pallucchini, followed by Pallucchini and Rossi, insisted on the stormy water as the defining element. The subject has been identified as Christ walking on the water by Tancred Borenius, “A Seascape by Tintoretto,” *Apollo* 2 (July–December 1925): 249; Lionello Venturi, *Pitture italiane in America* (Milan, 1931), no. 411 (“Christ saving Peter”); Harold Wethey, *El Greco and His School* (Princeton, NJ, 1962), 1:90 n. 113; Anna Pallucchini, *National Gallery, Washington: Musei del Mondo* (Milan, 1968), 5;
TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The support is formed of four irregularly sized pieces of similar, medium-weight, twill canvas that have been sewn together. A large piece in the center has been augmented with a thin strip to the right extending the entire height of the painting, ranging from 8.25 centimeters in width at the bottom to 10.5 centimeters at the top; a strip to the left of 37–37.5 centimeters in width extending the entire height of the primary fabric; and a narrow strip along the bottom spanning the left addition and the primary fabric, but ending before the addition on the right, which ranges from 2 centimeters in height on the left to 6.25 centimeters in height on the right. The entire composite has been lined to two pieces of plain-weave fabric.

All four pieces of canvas were prepared with a gesso ground followed by a layer of glue. [1] The paint was applied directly on this gesso and glue priming, with no imprimatura layer, though one cross section showed a layer consisting of a mixture of materials observed in paintings from the Tintoretto studio and identified as "palette scraping." [2] The forms were outlined first in dry white paint. The paint films are generally thin and the structure is less complex than is usually found in Venetian paintings. Occasionally the outline of the figure was reemphasized after the form was painted. Christ’s red robe was painted over the white crest of a wave. Christ’s foot appears to be unfinished. The following pigments have been identified: azurite, smalt, red lake, vermilion, red lead, lead tin yellow, orpiment, green earth, iron earths, umber, lead white, and lamp black (possible, in sketch for underlying portrait, see below). [3] Beneath the current composition are two other unfinished paintings painted perpendicular to the current composition. The first is a landscape, which does not appear to have progressed past the initial painted sketch. On top of this is a portrait of a man, of which the initial sketch can be seen clearly with infrared reflectography at 1.5 to 1.8 microns [fig. 1]. [4] The flesh tones and highlights appear white in the x-radiographs.

The paint is abraded in many places, and discrete losses to paint and ground are scattered throughout, particularly along the seam joins and edges of the painting.

The painting was relined, cleaned, and restored by Stephen Pichetto in 1944. In 1993–1995, it was treated again to remove or reduce discolored varnish and extensive retouching and to inpaint the abrasion.

Robert Echols and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Paula De Cristofaro and the treatment report by Susanna Griswold

March 21, 2019
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fig. 1 Infrared reflectogram, Circle of Jacopo Tintoretto (Probably Lambert Sustris), Christ at the Sea of Galilee, c. 1570s, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] The materials of the painting were analyzed by the NGA Scientific Research department using cross sections in conjunction with scanning electron microscopy with energy dispersive x-ray microanalysis (SEM-EDS), x-ray fluorescence spectroscopy (XRF), x-ray powder diffraction (XRD), and polarized light microscopy. (See report dated September 27, 1995, in NGA conservation files.)

PROVENANCE


[1] This name appears on an undated prospectus for the painting in NGA curatorial files. The painting was not in the Gallotti sale at Hôtel Drouot, Paris, on 28 June 1905.

[2] There is no record of this painting in the extant Durlacher stockbooks at the Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles.


[4] The painting is recorded as being with the dealer Jacques Seligman in New York by Fern Rusk Shapley, Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection: Italian Schools, XVI–XVIII Century, London, 1973: 53, and in Germain Seligman, Merchants of Art: 1880-1960, Eighty Years of Professional Collecting, New York, 1961: pl. 87. However, according to Seligmann records, the firm did not own the picture but acted for Sachs in its sale (Seligmann Papers, Archives of American Art, Washington: Series 2.1, Collectors Files, Box 204, folder 1, copy in NGA curatorial files). The bill of sale to the Kress Foundation for two paintings, dated 25 March 1943 and including Tintoretto’s "Christ on Lake of Galilee," is on Moses & Singer letterhead and indicates that the sale is from "Mr. Arthur Sachs c/o Moses & Singer" (copy in NGA curatorial files).

Analysis also indicated the possible presence of copper resinate green. (See report dated September 27, 1995, in NGA conservation files.)

Infrared reflectography was performed using a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with an H astronomy filter.
EXHIBITION HISTORY

1927 Loan to display with permanent collection, Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1927.


1933 A Century of Progress Exhibition of Paintings and Sculpture, Art Institute of Chicago, 1933, no. 135, repro., as Christ on the Lake of Galilee.

1934 Landscape Paintings, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1934, no. 5, as Christ Walking on the Water.


1938 Exhibition of Venetian Painting From the Fifteenth Century through the Eighteenth Century, California Palace of the Legion of Honor, San Francisco, June-July 1938, no. 66, repro., as Christ on the Sea at Galilee.

1938 Religious Art, an exhibition of fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth-century paintings; sculpture, illuminated manuscripts, metalwork, rosaries, textiles, stained glass and prints, Baltimore Museum of Art, 1938-1939, no. 35, repro.


1939 A Loan Exhibition of Paintings by Jacopo Robusti, il Tintoretto, 1519-1594, Durlacher Brothers, New York, February-March 1939, no. 5, as Christ on the Sea of Galilee.


1942 Loan to display with permanent collection, Society of Liberal Arts, Joslyn Memorial (now Joslyn Art Museum), Omaha, 1942-1943.
1946 Recent Additions to the Kress Collection, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1946, no. 825.
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1954 Tietze, Hans. *Treasures of the Great National Galleries*. New York, 1954: 15, 125, pl. 205 ("ascribed to Tintoretto, but may also be considered as a
Christ at the Sea of Galilee

possible El Greco.


1984: 228, no. 287, color repro.
2001 Herrmann Fiore, Kristina. Paolo Veronese: la predica di Sant’Antonio ai Pesci: spunti di riflessione per una rilettura del dipinto restaurato. Rome, 2001: 36, fig. 35, as attributed to Tintoretto or Friedrich Sustris.
2010 Cassegrain, Guillaume. Tintoret. Paris, 2010: 45, fig. 21, as Tintoretto or Lambert Sustris.
The image of the dead Christ lying in the lap of the Virgin Mary at the foot of the cross, surrounded by mourners, was a well-established subject in Venetian painting by the second half of the 16th century. [1] The chief mourners are usually Saint John the Evangelist and Mary Magdalene. Others often depicted include Mary Cleophas and the two followers who took Christ’s body down from the cross and bore it to the tomb, Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus; of the two men, the rich Joseph is typically the elder and better dressed. Thus, the protagonists in the Gallery’s painting might tentatively be identified as Saint John, the Virgin, Mary Magdalene (usually dressed in red, and thus more likely to be the woman in the background), Mary Cleophas (in the foreground), and Joseph of Arimathea. The evidence in the x-radiographs of other figures, including a turbaned head directly above the Virgin, silhouetted against the cross, indicates that the composition was originally somewhat different, and may have included additional mourners.
The Gallery’s picture—specifically the poses of Saint John and Mary Magdalene—dimly reflects Jacopo Tintoretto’s *Deposition* from around 1562 (originally in the church of the Umiltà, Venice; now Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice), although that painting, with its depiction of the fainting Virgin, has a greater narrative emphasis. [2] The overall style and figure types in the Gallery’s picture are also generically in the vein of Tintoretto, although weak even by the exceedingly loose standards of the artist's studio in his later years. Perhaps the closest comparison among works that can definitively be linked to the Tintoretto studio is the cycle of paintings on the life of Saint Catherine, originally painted for the church in the convent of Santa Caterina (now in the Palazzo Patriarcale, Venice). A few of the paintings in that cycle show sufficient compositional imagination to be plausibly linked to compositional sketches by Jacopo Tintoretto, while several show the unmistakable figure types of his son Domenico. [3] Other parts of the cycle show awkward compositions and limp and inexpressive figures similar to those in the *Lamentation*. Indeed, several of the figures in the *Lamentation* find counterparts in the cycle; for example, all three executioners to the left and the face of the saint herself in *The Scourging of Saint Catherine* [fig. 1]. [4]

Adolfo Venturi identified the hand of Jacopo Tintoretto in two paintings in the Santa Caterina cycle, attributing the remaining four to Domenico and another hand, whose figures he characterized as having a puppetlike quality. The latter, he hypothesized, could be Tintoretto’s son Marco (circa 1560–1637), whom he assumed to be a member of the studio but less favored and less talented than Domenico. [5] Venturi assembled a small proposed oeuvre for Marco based on similarities to the Santa Caterina paintings; among them is the Gallery’s *Lamentation*. However, Venturi’s proposal, based on the leap of faith that the weak hand in the Santa Caterina cycle must be Marco’s, is fundamentally lacking in substance and has failed to find favor. [6]

The decorative approach and small scale of the *Lamentation* suggest the work of a Venetian madonnero, a painter who made and sold images of the Madonna for ordinary households. While the similarities to a documented Tintoretto commission (that is, the Santa Caterina cycle) suggest that the artist may have painted in the Tintoretto studio, the *Lamentation* is so distant from the works of Jacopo Tintoretto himself that an attribution only to the Circle of Jacopo Tintoretto is warranted. The Gallery adopted this attribution in 2018. The details of Tintoretto’s studio organization remain unknown; however, the profusion of derivative works that
include references to studio types and figures from Tintoretto’s paintings, yet are manifestly by different hands, raises the possibility that there may have been semi-independent painters associated with the bottega, subject to little in the way of quality control, producing pictures that did not meet the standard of the “house style.” On the other hand, Tintoretto may have hired assistants to work on an occasional basis on projects such as the Santa Caterina cycle, and these painters may have had their own separate businesses executing works like the Lamentation that aped Tintoretto’s style. Pictures associated with Tintoretto that seem to be related to the Lamentation, with similar figure types but of marginally higher quality, include a Descent from the Cross, Christ among the Doctors, and Miraculous Draught of Fishes, all recently on the art market. [7]

The relationship to the Santa Caterina cycle, which is not documented but datable to the 1580s, provides an approximate dating for the Lamentation. [8]
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![fig. 1 Workshop of Jacopo Tintoretto, The Scourging of Saint Catherine, 1580s, oil on canvas, Seminario Patriarcale, Venice. © Cameraphoto Arte, Venezia](image-url)

**fig. 1** Workshop of Jacopo Tintoretto, *The Scourging of Saint Catherine*, 1580s, oil on canvas, Seminario Patriarcale, Venice. © Cameraphoto Arte, Venezia
The painting’s title was changed from Pietà to Lamentation in 1989 to reflect the fact that the term pietà usually refers to depictions of Christ and the Virgin alone, without surrounding mourners.


Other comparable figures include the kneeling man in a red bonnet in Saint Catherine before the Emperor and the Empress in Saint Catherine in Prison.

Adolfo Venturi, Storia dell’arte italiana, vol. 9, pt. 4, La pittura del Cinquecento (Milan, 1929), 678.

Hans Tietze and Erika Tietze-Conrat, The Drawings of the Venetian Painters in the 15th and 16th Centuries (New York, 1944), 294–295, have also proposed an oeuvre for Marco. Melania G. Mazzucco, Jacomo Tintoretto e i suoi figli: Storia di una famiglia veneziana (Milan, 2009), 576–601, raises the question of whether Marco actually worked for any significant time as a painter. She notes that no contemporary or 17th-century sources refer to Marco as a painter and that he was never enrolled in the fraglia dei pittori, the painter’s guild. He spent at least some time working with a group of actors. Although Jacopo Tintoretto’s will expresses hope that Marco will not fail to apply himself to the profession he shared with his father and will join
TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The original support is a fine, plain-weave canvas. It has been lined and enlarged. The thinly applied ground on the original canvas is off-white. Infrared reflectography at 1.5 to 1.8 microns reveals that underdrawing was initially laid out in broad strokes of black paint and stiff strokes of white paint. [1] The x-radiographs reveal various changes in the composition: Christ’s forearm was originally wider, three or possibly four more figures were originally planned, the Virgin’s foot protruded from beneath her robe, the figure to the right of the Virgin originally gazed upward at her, and the horizontal arms of the cross were visible. The paint layer consists of glazes on top of the white underpainting in the clothing and background, and thick, blended layers of paint in the figures.

At some point after the painting was completed it was enlarged from its original size of approximately 61 × 61 centimeters (24 × 24 inches). X-radiography reveals that cusping is present along all four edges of the original canvas. The left and right tacking margins were opened up and incorporated into the composition, and slightly coarser fabric additions were attached to the top and bottom edges. These additions to the paint surface were coated with lead white paint, which extends

Domenico in the studio, there is no documentation that he actually did so.


over a portion of the original paint layers, and overpainted. The paint surface is abraded and the overpainting around the edges has discolored. Small areas of retouching in the figures are also evident. The thick natural resin varnish has yellowed.

Robert Echols and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Ann Hoenigswald

March 21, 2019
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[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with an H astronomy filter.

PROVENANCE


[2] The painting was lent by the Timkens in 1928 to an exhibition at the Reinhardt Galleries in New York.

EXHIBITION HISTORY

1928 Loan Exhibition of Paintings From Memling, Holbein and Titian to Renoir and Picasso, Reinhardt Galleries, New York, 1928, no. 7.


BIBLIOGRAPHY


BIOGRAPHY

One of the towering figures of Italian Renaissance art, Titian dominated painting in Venice from the death in 1516 of his probable master, Giovanni Bellini (Venetian, c. 1430/1435 - 1516), until his own death 60 years later. His long career is exceptionally well documented in his middle and later years, but contemporary evidence regarding his birthdate is contradictory, and major problems of dating and attribution still surround his earliest works. A key issue of his early career has traditionally been that of his relationship with his older contemporary Giorgione (Venetian, 1477/1478 - 1510). For much of the past century, art historians have been divided about whether a masterpiece, such as, for example, the Concert champêtre (Louvre, Paris), is a late work by Giorgione or an early work by Titian. Now, however, there is growing critical consensus that this and certain other Giorgionesque works are by the young Titian, by stylistic analogy with his earliest documented commission, the Life of Saint Anthony frescoes in the Scuola del Santo in Padua (1510–1511).

Thereafter, Titian’s progress to artistic maturity and public prominence was rapid. In 1513, still in the lifetime of Giovanni Bellini, he secured the commission to paint a large canvas representing the Battle of Spoleto in the premier council chamber of the Venetian government in the Doge’s Palace (not executed until 1537–1538; destroyed 1577). In 1518 he completed his huge-scale Assunta for the high altar of the church of the Frari (in situ). Further major altarpieces followed, including that for the patrician Pesaro family, likewise for the Frari (completed 1526; in situ), and the Death of Saint Peter Martyr for the church of Santi Giovanni e Paolo (completed 1529; destroyed 1867; full-size copy in situ). Meanwhile, Titian came to the attention of a foreign prince, Alfonso d’Este, duke of Ferrara, for whom he painted a series of mythologies (1518–1523) in one of his private apartments, with subjects celebrating the pagan gods Bacchus and Venus. This commission also involved the reworking of Bellini’s earlier contribution to the same cycle, The Feast of the Gods.
Titian remained based in Venice, and he never ceased working for Venetian patrons. But his success at Ferrara led in turn to a close involvement with other north Italian princes, notably Federigo Gonzaga, duke of Mantua, and then in the 1530s Francesco Maria della Rovere, duke of Urbino. The increasingly international character of his career received a further boost in 1529, when Federigo introduced him to Emperor Charles V. Titian’s highly productive relationship with the emperor culminated in visits to the imperial court at Augsburg in 1548 and 1551. In the meantime, the painter pursued equally advantageous contacts with the pope’s grandson, Cardinal Alessandro Farnese. In 1541–1542 he painted the portrait of the cardinal’s younger brother Ranuccio, during a visit by the boy to Venice, and in 1545–1546 Titian visited the papal court in Rome. His most important patron of all was the emperor’s son, King Philip II of Spain, the recipient of a high proportion of the greatest works painted during the last 25 years of the artist’s life. These included another set of celebrated mythologies, including an earlier version of the Venus and Adonis, but also many religious pictures. After 1551, however, the painter made increasingly few journeys outside Venice, and his work for Philip no longer involved him in attendance at court.

Titian was a master of portraiture as much as of religious and mythological painting, and throughout his career he was much in demand in this field. The sitters of most of his early portraits, up to about 1520, remain anonymous, but thereafter they include some of the most powerful and influential personages of his day. As well as painting grandeens, such as his princely patrons, the doge of Venice, the emperor, the pope, and various members of their families, he also portrayed eminent men of letters, such as his friend Pietro Aretino and Cardinal Pietro Bembo. He also painted a number of pictures of women in a portraitlike format, but it is often a matter of debate whether these are intended to be recognizable portraits of real persons, or generalized images of feminine beauty, inspired by a poetic or erotic ideal.

Another area of debate in Titian studies is the extent to which many of the pictures associated with his later career may be regarded as autograph. Sometimes he himself produced repetitions or variants of his most successful compositions. But more often, his extraordinary fame led to a public demand for his works that he could only satisfy by employing a number of assistants to produce replicas and variants after his designs. Such works are sometimes of manifestly inferior quality, but often, too, Titian’s involvement in the initial and final stages of a shop production makes it difficult or impossible to draw a clear line between autograph

**Titian**

© National Gallery of Art, Washington
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and nonautograph. The technical procedures whereby his workshop produced replicas remain unclear, and it is sometimes supposed that he made small-scale oil sketches, in the manner of Sir Peter Paul Rubens (Flemish, 1577 - 1640) or Giovanni Battista Tiepolo (Venetian, 1696 - 1770), which would serve as the basis for repetition by his assistants. But there is no real evidence for this supposition, and it is more likely that his compositions were preserved in his shop in the form of large-scale but long-since-lost drawings, or that a full-size painted version was retained for some years in the workshop. It is noteworthy, in any case, that technical examination has revealed that not only works by Titian himself, but also those ascribable to his collaborators or followers, show extensive pentimenti, or departures from the original design. The problem of assessing the extent of the master’s contribution to works painted in Titian’s late style is further compounded by the fact that when he died he left in his studio a large number of works in a more or less unfinished state, which his former assistants then completed in a way that they thought would make them easier to sell.

Titian has always been regarded, from within his own lifetime and in subsequent centuries, as the supreme master of color. His colors are characteristically warm and rich, thanks in part to the high quality of his pigments, but even more to his ability to exploit the oil medium to give them depth and intensity and to soften and blend the edges of forms. Closely linked to this was his pioneering exploitation of the canvas support to endow his paintings with an expressively uneven texture while also using varying brushwork, with the result that some areas are thickly impastoed while others are thin and sketchy. His pictorial technique is highly evocative, both of sensuous surfaces, such as soft female skin, and of poetic mood. Typically, as revealed by x-radiography and infrared reflectography, he would prepare his paintings with only the sketchiest of underdrawings, made with the tip of a brush, and then evolve his compositions freely and spontaneously, making frequent and sometimes radical revisions. Many of these characteristics are evident in his art at the outset, but during the course of his career they became more pronounced, as his handling of paint became broader and looser and color planes became more fragmented. Virtually all of the leading painters of the 17th century, most especially Rubens, Sir Anthony van Dyck (Flemish, 1599 - 1641), and Diego Velázquez (Spanish, 1599 - 1660), but also some of those working in a different tradition, such as Nicolas Poussin (French, 1594 - 1665) and Rembrandt van Rijn (Dutch, 1606 - 1669), were deeply indebted to Titian’s example.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Ever since 1815, when it was discovered by Count Leopoldo Cicognara in the attic of a palace in Ferrara, the picture has attracted controversy with regard both to its attribution and to its subject. [1] Cicognara, a renowned antiquarian and connoisseur, had been commissioned by the Duchess of Sagan to find works by Titian for her, and he was convinced that his discovery was autograph. His friend Stefano Ticozzi agreed, and went on to identify the figures as Alfonso d'Este, Duke of Ferrara, and his mistress (later wife), Laura Dianti, partly on the basis of the Ferrarese provenance, partly on a supposed resemblance of the male figure to known portraits of Alfonso, and partly on the report by Giorgio Vasari that Titian had painted a portrait of Laura. [2] With these credentials, Cicognara sold the picture (together with Titian's Self-Portrait now in Berlin) to Lord Stewart, British ambassador to the imperial court in Vienna and lover of the Duchess of Sagan. But Stewart was advised by the Milanese dealer Gerli that both pictures were copies, and he accordingly had them sent to Rome to be appraised by the Accademia di San Luca. The academicians pronounced the Self-Portrait to be authentic, but because of the presence of retouching ("alcuni ritocchi") on the other picture, they were unable to decide between Giorgione and Paris Bordone. Since he was only interested in authentic works by Titian, Stewart insisted on returning the picture to Cicognara, who subsequently sold it to Count Pourtalès-Gorgier in Paris. [3]

In Paris the picture could be compared with the compositionally similar Woman with a Mirror in the Louvre [fig. 1], previously known as La maîtresse de Titien, but which on the basis of Ticozzi's identification was now also accepted as a double
portrait of Alfonso and Laura. By the mid-19th century it was further widely believed
that the Washington picture was the earlier, since the nudity of the female figure
implied that she was still merely the duke’s mistress, while the Louvre picture, in
which the female figure is clothed, was seen as dating from after her marriage. [4]

But a certain skepticism toward both the traditional attribution and the title was
already expressed by Joseph Archer Crowe and Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle in
1877, and then more emphatically by Carl Justi and Seymour de Ricci; [5] and by
the time that the picture came to America around 1922, Ticozzi’s romantically
fanciful title was becoming increasingly discredited. Wilhelm R. Valentiner, while
still accepting the possibility that the male figure represents a portrait of Alfonso,
interpreted the picture rather in terms of mythology and called it the *Toilet of
Venus*. [6] Valentiner continued, however, to support the attribution to Titian and
retained an early dating to circa 1518. Subsequent adherents to this view have
included Adolfo Venturi, Lionello Venturi, Wilhelm Suida, and Günther
Tschmelitsch, [7] and the picture retained its attribution to Titian when it entered
the National Gallery of Art in 1939. But postwar 20th-century critics have
increasingly tended to see the picture as a later workshop variant of the
unquestionably autograph Louvre *Woman with a Mirror* of circa 1515, and this view
has been supported by the emergence of a number of other variants, likewise of
less than autograph quality. Two of the best of these (Museo de Artes Decorativas,
Barcelona; National Gallery, Prague) [8] show the female figure clothed, as in the
Louvre original; but as pointed out by Alessandro Ballarin, another nude version,
apparently by a Netherlandish hand and possibly copying another lost variant by
Gallery’s picture “Follower of Titian,” disassociating it even from Titian’s workshop,
and Harold Wethey downgraded it still further, calling it “Sixteenth-century
Venetian School.” [10]

The very poor condition of the painting and the presence of extensive overpaint
and discolored varnish make such negative judgments understandable. The
generally thin and bland application of the paint, without any of Titian’s
characteristically expressive brushwork, certainly argues against his personal
involvement in the execution, at least of the upper layers. However, the evidence
of extensive pentimenti, and the fact that the original composition was even closer
to that of the Louvre *Woman with a Mirror*, suggests that the executant had access
to Titian’s designs, and hence that he was at least a member of Titian’s workshop,
and not an independent imitator. The man’s costume is of a fashion dating from at
least a decade after the Louvre picture: the doublet, with its short, pleated skirt, resembles that worn by Federico Gonzaga in Titian’s portrait of 1529 (Prado, Madrid); and the pleated collar and cuffs of the shirt, and the cut of the hair and beard, are similarly of a style that did not become fashionable until the mid-1520s. Probably, therefore, the painter adapted Titian’s design, perhaps in the form of an underdrawing begun circa 1515–1520, and completed it at some date in the 1530s. In doing so, he changed the dynamic composition of the underdrawing, in which the man appears to have just arrived, into the more static image of the completed work.

Since the female figure is not accompanied by any of the particular attributes of a mythological deity, there is no good reason to follow Valentiner’s title of the Toilet of Venus, and still less convincing is the identification by Tschmelitsch of the two figures as Venus and Mars. Like its Louvre prototype, the picture clearly belongs rather to a category of erotic painting that hovers ambivalently on the borders of allegory, mythology, and genre, and which is much discussed in current art-historical discourse (see also Woman Holding an Apple and Venus with a Mirror).

In the Louvre Woman with a Mirror, Titian achieved a masterly balance between erotic suggestiveness, poetic idealization, and moralizing or philosophical reflection. In the Washington picture, the eroticism has become more blatant—Goffen has rightly drawn attention to the shift in the erotic balance of power between the two figures—and the mirror held by the man has lost any possible reference to the passing of beauty and time and, like the perfume jar on the parapet, has become merely an accoutrement of his beloved’s toilette. With more justification than its Louvre prototype, the picture may be regarded as belonging to the category of “courtesan picture,” of a type practiced in Venice from the 1520s above all by Paris Bordone. Yet the generalization of the features and body of the female figure, and the fact that she is incongruously set not in a boudoir but against a landscape, suggest that she does not represent a particular courtesan, but an ideal mistress; indeed, her anonymity, as in other versions of the composition, remains central to her erotic allure. By contrast, and as in the other versions of the composition, the male figure, with his contemporary clothes and particularized features, is much more portraitlike. Goffen expressed sympathy with the 19th-century tradition that he represents Alfonso d’Este; although there is no substance in this identification, the figure may well represent a portrait of the original owner. Essentially constituting, therefore, a personalized erotic fantasy, the picture may nevertheless retain sufficient allegorical content to justify the present title of an Allegory of Love.

Allegory of Love
© National Gallery of Art, Washington
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fig. 1 Titian, Woman with a Mirror, c. 1515, oil on canvas, Musée du Louvre, Paris. © Musée du Louvre, Dist. RMN-Grand Palais / Martine Beck-Coppola / Art Resource, NY

NOTES


[2] Stefano Ticozzi, Vite dei pittori Vecelli di Cadore (Milan, 1817), 52–64. Titian's portrait is now universally identified with that in the Kisters collection, Kreuzlingen.
For the story of the discovery of the portrait and Cicognara’s dealings with Stewart, see Vittorio Malamani, *Memorie del Conte Leopoldo Cicognara* (Venice, 1888), 2:113–114, 125–133.


For the Barcelona and Prague variants, see Harold Wethey, *The Paintings of Titian* (London, 1975), 3:163–165, nos. 23–24; for the latter see also Jaromír Neumann, *The Picture Gallery of Prague Castle* (Prague, 1967), 280. Variants showing the female figure alone include those exhibited in Venice in 1947 (Alberto Riccoboni, ed., *Pittura veneta: Prima mostra dell’arte antica delle raccolte private veneziane* [Venice, 1947], pl. 37), and in Toledo, OH, in 1940 (see *Four Centuries of Venetian Painting* [Toledo, OH, 1940], no. 62).

Alessandro Ballarin in *Le siècle de Titien: L’âge d’or de la peinture à Venise* (Paris, 1993), 363; the sale was Christie’s, London, May 14, 1971, no. 24, as a Flemish copy (98 × 74.9 cm). Formerly in the Pierre Bezine collection (sold Fievez, Brussels, June 14, 1927, no. 124) and in the collections of Prince Ourasoff and Prince Menschikoff, as Paris Bordone. It is not clear whether this is the same as the picture that appeared in a sale at Christie’s, South Kensington, July 9, 2010, no. 45 (102 × 73.7 cm). Paul Joannides and Rupert Featherstone, “A Painting by Titian from the Spanish Royal Collection at Apsley House, London,” *Hamilton Kerr Institute Bulletin* 5 (2014): 73, surmised that the latter is a copy after a lost Titian.


As pointed out by Jane Bridgeman, this type of doublet was fashionable throughout the 1530s, but had become obsolete by c. 1540 (letter to Peter
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Humfrey, Sept. 11, 2000).  


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The support consists of four pieces of fabric sewn together. The largest piece is in the center, and most of the composition fits onto this piece. One strip of fabric was sewn to the length of the right side, and two shorter pieces of fabric were sewn together with a horizontal seam and then sewn to the left side of the large center piece of fabric. Although all of the fabrics are plain-weave, the center piece is much coarser and looser than the fine-weight additions. The support has been lined, and the tacking margins have been removed. Tack holes and lines of losses indicate that the painting was reduced in size at least once, possibly twice, and later opened up again.

The support was prepared with a light ground, and the original paint appears to have been applied fairly thinly in the flesh areas, with soft modeling and blended brushstrokes. The costumes are painted with more visible brushwork, but apart from in small details, such as the jeweled ring, there is very little impasto. X-radiographs show no trace of Titian’s customarily vigorous undermodeling.
However, x-radiographs and infrared reflectography at 1.5 to 1.8 microns [1] reveal several major changes in the composition, which originally much more closely resembled that of Titian’s *Woman with a Mirror* in the Louvre [fig. 1]. Originally, the man’s left arm was placed higher, presumably to hold a circular mirror above the woman’s left shoulder; traces of the red paint of the earlier sleeve are still visible to the naked eye. The man’s right hand held the rectangular mirror from the side rather than from below. A drapery hung from his right arm, his beard was shorter, and his white collar was wider and simpler in design.

The paint layer is very worn, with numerous scattered losses and discolored retouchings, and is covered with a thick accumulation of discolored varnish. Technical examination has revealed several campaigns of overpainting, the heaviest of which is in the upper right. Two losses below the man’s chin have been repaired with insets. The painting was last treated in 1937 by Stephen Pichetto, who lined and “slightly restored” it. [2]

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Jane Tillinghast
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**TECHNICAL COMPARATIVE FIGURES**
fig. 1 Titian, *Woman with a Mirror*, c. 1515, oil on canvas, Musée du Louvre, Paris. © Musée du Louvre, Dist. RMN-Grand Palais / Martine Beck-Coppola / Art Resource, NY

**TECHNICAL NOTES**

[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with an H astronomy filter.


**PROVENANCE**

Counts Benacosi, Ferrara;[1] on consignment 1815 with Count Leopoldo Cicognara, Venice; sold 1815 to Charles William Vane, Lord Stewart [1778-1854, later 3rd marquess of Londonderry], but returned 1816 to Cicognara;[2] sold after 1821 to...

[1] These owners are first mentioned in the catalogue of the Pourtalès-Gorgier sale: Catalogue des Tableaux Anciens et Modernes Dessins qui composent les Collections de M. le Comte de Pourtalès-Gorgier, Paris, 1865: 43-44, no. 118. According to Vittorio Malamani, Memorie del Conte Leopoldo Cicognara, 2 vols., Venice, 1888: 2:113-114, the painting was found by Cicognara in the attic of an old house in Ferrara.

[2] Vittorio Malamani, Memorie del Conte Leopoldo Cicognara, 2 vols., Venice, 1888: 2: 113-114, 125-133. Stewart's brief ownership is also recorded in a seal bearing his coat of arms now affixed to the stretcher of the relined canvas. Ross Watson identified the seal in 1971; see his notes in NGA curatorial files.

[3] The Paris branch of Duveen Brothers wrote to the New York branch on 29 December 1920, describing the visits of Henry Goldman (they spell the name Goldmann) to see "the Titian" and, after Goldman asked them where the picture "had turned up," their telling him "that Lazzaroni, who was an amateur and had been studying Titian for some years, having spent some years tracing it from the time it left the Pourtalès Collection, had found the picture in England" (Duveen Brothers Records, accession number 960015, Research Library, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles: Series II.I, Collector's files, reel 312, box 457, folder 1 [Goldman #1, 1911-1925], copy in NGA curatorial files).

[4] Duveen records document their possession of the painting: it is entered under Lazzaroni's name on 26 March 1920 in their Paris ledger, and the earliest date listed in the "X Book" entry for the painting is 30 September 1920, where it is described as "Painting by Titian, 'Lady at Toilet', ex Baron Lazzaroni" (Duveen Brothers Records, accession number 960015, Research Library, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles: Series II.I, Collector's files, reel 312, box 457, folder 1 [Goldman #1, 1911-1925], copy in NGA curatorial files).


[6] The invoice for 24 paintings, including "An Oil Painting on Canvas representing Alfonso D’Este and Laura Dianti known as A Lady at a Mirror - by Titian," is dated 9 March 1937. Payment was to be made in five installments, the last no later than 5 May 1938. (Duveen Brothers Records, accession number 960015, Research Library, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles: Series II.I, Collector’s files, reel 329, box 474, folder 5 [Kress, Samuel Henry, c. 1936-1939]; copies in NGA curatorial files.)

**EXHIBITION HISTORY**

1924 Loan Exhibition of Important Early Italian Paintings in the Possession of Notable American Collectors, Duveen Brothers, New York, 1924, no. 33 as by Titian (no. 46, as The Toilet of Venus in illustrated 1926 version of catalogue).

1939 Classics of the Nude: Loan Exhibition, Pollaiuolo to Picasso, for the Benefit of the Lisa Day Nursery, M. Knoedler and Co., New York, 1939, no. 4, repro.
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1933 Venturi, Lionello. *Italian Paintings in America*. Translated by Countess Vanden Heuvel and Charles Marriott. 3 vols. New York and Milan, 1933:
3:no. 508.
1941 *Preliminary Catalogue of Paintings and Sculpture*. National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1941: 197, no. 370, as by Titian.


The portrait is known in two other main versions, respectively in the Detroit Institute of Arts [fig. 1] and the Royal Collection [fig. 2]; in the latter, known as Titian and His Friends, the sitter is accompanied by portraits of Titian himself (a variant of the Self-Portrait in the Gemäldegalerie, Berlin) and of another man (a variant of the male portrait in the Fine Arts Museum of San Francisco). (A third version, in the Indianapolis Museum of Art, clearly represents the same sitter, but at a significantly more advanced age.) Both of the other main versions show the sitter in waist length and include his left hand holding a letter. The truncation of the tablet with an inscription in the present version indicates that the picture has been cut at the left edge, and the technical evidence suggesting that it has also been cut below confirms the natural supposition that this version likewise originally included the hand holding the letter.

Critics have not always agreed about the relative merits of the various versions. The Royal Collection group portrait was generally accepted as an autograph painting by Titian until it was demoted by Joseph Archer Crowe and Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle in 1877, [1] and although its exact status remains problematic, it is now universally regarded as inferior to and considerably later than the Detroit version. [2] Crowe and Cavalcaselle, Bernard Berenson, Charles Holmes, Hans Tietze, Wilhelm Suida, and Gunter Troche all accepted the Gallery’s version as autograph, and the last two even considered it to be superior to that in Detroit. [3]
But Rodolfo Pallucchini, followed by Harold Wethey, Fern Rusk Shapley, John Shearman, and Filippo Pedrocchi, thought the opposite to be the case; and, indeed, compared with the pictorially and psychologically much more refined Detroit version, the present picture appears coarse and veristic. The absence of any underdrawing or pentimenti (see Technical Summary) further suggests that it postdates the Detroit version and was based on it.

The sitter was first identified, with respect to the Royal Collection picture, as Andrea de’ Franceschi, grand chancellor of Venice, by Anna Jameson, on the basis of an engraved portrait after Titian. Crowe and Cavalcaselle rejected the identification, proposing instead that the sitter is the mosaicist Francesco Zuccato, on the grounds that Carlo Ridolfi described a picture in which Titian portrayed himself with Zuccato. But in 1927 Jameson’s identification was independently reaffirmed from two different quarters. Berenson pointed out that the sitter reappears prominently in a group of bystanders next to the papal throne in Palma Giovane’s Pope Alexander III and Doge Ziani Receiving the Emperor’s Son, painted circa 1583 for the Sala del Maggior Consiglio in the Doge’s Palace (in situ), and that Ridolfi had mentioned the presence of Andrea de’ Franceschi in this group. Berenson further pointed out that Palma Giovane’s posthumous portrait must have been based on an original by Titian, since such a portrait, mentioned in the grand chancellor’s will, was also recorded by Ridolfi in the Widmann collection in Venice. Writing in the same year as Berenson, Stephan Poglayen-Neuwall reasonably surmised that the engraving to which Jameson was referring was the one by the 18th-century master Crescenzio Ricci, which carries the inscription “ANDREAS DE FRANCISCIS / Eques Magnus Cancellarius Venetus” (Andrea de’ Franceschi, Knight and Grand Chancellor of Venice) [fig. 3].

Poglayen-Neuwall also provided basic biographical information about Andrea de’ Franceschi (1473–1552), which has now been supplemented by Sergio Zamperetti, Thomas Weigel, and especially Deborah Howard. A member of the cittadinanza (citizen class), De’ Franceschi pursued a highly successful career in the civil service, rising to become secretary to the powerful government magistracy of the Council of Ten in 1519, and, finally, to become grand chancellor in 1529. This office, which was the highest attainable to any Venetian from a nonnoble family, was held for life. In rank it was senior to that of senator, and it was junior only to that of doge and procurator of San Marco. It entitled the holder to wear the distinctive red robe, with a black stole—and presumably large open sleeves—worn by the sitter in the present portrait and in that in Detroit.
intellectual and social distinction, De’ Franceschi was also, according to Titian’s 17th-century biographer Carlo Ridolfi, a close friend of the painter.

A particularly valuable document for Andrea de’ Franceschi’s biography is provided by his will, drawn up in 1535. [14] This mentions that at this date he owned two portraits of himself by Titian. The natural assumption that one of these was the portrait now in Detroit is confirmed by its style, which as pointed out by Pallucchini and Wethey, fits comfortably with Titian’s other portraits of the early 1530s, such as the Ippolito de’ Medici (Pitti, Florence) and the Charles V with a Hound (Prado, Madrid). [15] The identification of the other portrait of De’ Franceschi is more problematic. In theory this could have been of a quite different composition, possibly painted before his election as grand chancellor in 1529, and now lost or unrecognized. It is more likely, however, that the second portrait was simply a close variant or copy of the Detroit picture—especially since the various other versions provide clear evidence that such copies were made by Titian’s workshop.

Holmes proposed a reading of the truncated inscription ( . . . TIS/ . . . OIX) on the present portrait as AETATIS ANNO LX, suggesting that the penultimate letter has been reduced from an L to an I by abrasion. [16] Although Howard has plausibly suggested that this should be modified to AETATIS SVO LX, both readings would interpret the inscription as indicating that the sitter was aged 60, giving a date for the portrait of circa 1533. On this basis Howard drew the seemingly obvious inference that the Gallery’s portrait—in which the sitter arguably appears slightly older than in the Detroit portrait—is identical with the “second” portrait mentioned in De’ Franceschi’s will and that it was painted just three or four years later than the original, which was presumably painted circa 1529, directly after the sitter’s election as grand chancellor. [17]

This attractive interpretation of the documentary and orthographic evidence is not, however, borne out by the style of the present portrait, which is difficult to reconcile with that of Titian in the early 1530s. As indicated above, the handling is harsher and cruder than that of Titian at any date, as is evident not only in the treatment of the head, but also in the change of the color of the gown from a subtly modulated crimson to a crude scarlet. Indeed, although a majority of recent scholars have accepted it as a product of Titian’s workshop, the more severe verdict by Shapley—that it was painted independently of the master’s supervision, perhaps even after his death—remains more convincing. [18] The work may be seen, then, as a copy either of the Detroit original, or of a close version of it, dating from the later 16th or the early 17th century. In that case the information on the
sitter’s age provided by the now-truncated inscription would have been taken from
the now-illegible inscription in minuscules on the letter held by the sitter in the
Detroit picture—which may well have been painted in 1533. [19]

Peter Humfrey
March 21, 2019
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fig. 1 Titian, Andrea dei Franceschi, c. 1533, oil on canvas, Detroit Institute of Arts

fig. 2 After Titian, Titian and His Friends, c. 1550/1560, oil on canvas, Royal Collection Trust / © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2017
fig. 3 Crescenzio Ricci, after Titian, Portrait of Andrea de’ Franceschi, 18th century, engraving, Museo Correr. © Photo Archive - Fondazione Musei Civici di Venezia

NOTES


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The painting was executed on a coarse, plain-weave fabric. It has been lined, and the tacking edges are no longer extant. Comparison with the version of the


[16] Charles Holmes, “The Inscription upon Titian’s Portrait of Franceschi,” The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs 55 (1929): 159–160. However, John Shearman, The Early Italian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen (Cambridge, 1983), 270, observed that “the spacing of the surviving letters discourages such a reconstruction.”


[19] John Shearman, The Early Italian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen (Cambridge, 1983), 270, tentatively read the much-damaged inscription on the letter in the Detroit version as “. . . eas Franceschinus . . . / Ma . . . /A . . . M.D.L.” But 1550 is an impossible date, from the point of view both of style and of the sitter’s age.
composition in Detroit, together with the fragmentary character of the inscription, suggests that the painted surface has been reduced along the right, left, and bottom edges. This supposition is confirmed by the fact that cusping of the original fabric is absent along those three tacked edges but is present along the top edge. The support was prepared with a thin, white ground. Infrared reflectography (Vidicon) [1] has not exposed any underdrawing, and no compositional changes have been revealed by x-radiography. The paint was applied thinly, and the individual strokes are well blended. The x-radiographs of the painting suggest that the image was originally stronger in painterly expression, as the surface has suffered extensively from abrasion. The inpainting is extensive and has darkened, and the surface coating is thick and somewhat discolored.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Susanna Griswold
March 21, 2019

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Hamamatsu c/1000-03 Vidicon camera and a Kodak Wratten 87A filter.

PROVENANCE


[1] The painting was lent by Lord Elcho to the British Institution in 1859.
Confirmation that the painting was not inherited by Lord Elcho, but was purchased by him from a London dealer named “Anthony,” was kindly provided to Peter

[2] Mellon date deeded to Mellon Trust is according to Mellon collection records in NGA curatorial files and David Finley’s notebook (donated to the National Gallery of Art in 1977, now in the Gallery Archives).
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1859 Pictures by Italian, Spanish, Flemish, Dutch, French, and English Masters, British Institution, London, 1859, no. 40, as Head of a Man by Titian.
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The traditional attribution to Titian and the identification of the sitter as the eminent humanist and prelate Pietro Bembo (1470–1547) have never been seriously contested. Bembo’s distinctive features, with his long aquiline nose, are also known from two inscribed contemporary medals: one by Valerio Belli, probably of 1532 [fig. 1] and another by an anonymous medallist, sometimes identified as either Benvenuto Cellini or as Danese Cattaneo [fig. 2]. [2] A 16th-century copy (Accademia Carrara, Bergamo) of a later variant by Titian of the present portrait (Capodimonte, Naples) [fig. 3], in which the head is turned at the same angle, is inscribed: P. BEMBO IMAGO/ EX PENNICILLO/ TICIANI. [3]

Bembo’s historical importance is owing above all to his Aldine editions of Dante and Petrarch, which lent these authors the dignity of modern classics, and to his role in promoting the supremacy of their Tuscan language for all Italian literature. In his own day, he was also celebrated as a lyric poet and as the author of a Latin history of Venice. Bembo’s literary vocation led him from an early age away from Venice, where as a member of a patrician family he would have been expected to enter public service, to the courts of Ferrara and Urbino (1506–1512), and subsequently to that of Leo X in Rome (1512–1521). After the death of Pope Leo, he pursued his literary and scholarly career chiefly at his family villa outside Padua, becoming official historian and librarian to the Venetian Republic in 1530. He was proclaimed cardinal in March 1539 and took up residence in Rome in October of the same year. He made a final visit to northern Italy, including Venice, in the autumn of 1543, and died in Rome as bishop of Bergamo and cardinal of San Clemente in January 1547. [4]
Although Bembo’s scholarly career was crowned with the award of a cardinal’s hat, his literary output was almost entirely secular, and his religious piety was no more than conventional. He was ordained as a priest only in December 1539, and although in his final years in Rome he was a friend of luminaries of the Catholic Reform, such as Cardinal Pole and Vittoria Colonna, he did not share their reforming zeal. By contrast, he took a keen interest in ancient and modern art, and during his years in Padua, he assembled one of the finest collections of paintings, sculptures, and manuscripts in northern Italy. His friend Marcantonio Michiel compiled a detailed description of Bembo’s “museum” as it had evolved by circa 1530. [5] Some of the objects listed by Michiel, notably a diptych by Memling (incorporating the Saint Veronica panel now in the National Gallery of Art), [6] and portraits by Jacopo Bellini and Jacometto Veneziano (including one of Pietro as an 11-year-old boy), must have been collected or commissioned by Bembo’s father, the distinguished diplomat Bernardo Bembo. But most of the works of art in the collection, including a portrait by Sebastiano del Piombo of the poet Sannazaro, and Raphael’s double portrait Andrea Navagero and Agostino Beazzano (Galleria Doria Pamphili, Rome), clearly reflect the refined aesthetic tastes and personal interests of Bembo himself. At the same time, Michiel’s description must be far from complete, since it does not mention any works by Giovanni Bellini or Titian, painters with whom Bembo is known to have had cordial relations. In two of his early sonnets, Bembo speaks of the portrait of his mistress painted for him by Bellini; [7] and according to Vasari, Titian had already painted a portrait of Bembo when the latter, in his capacity of secretary to Leo X, urged him to move to the papal capital—in other words, some time before February 1512. [8] A decade later, in 1523, Titian also included Bembo’s portrait, together with those of his literary colleagues Sannazaro and Ariosto, among the many bystanders in his narrative canvas the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa Kneeling before Pope Alexander III outside San Marco, in the Sala del Maggior Consiglio in the Doge’s Palace (destroyed by fire in 1577). [9]

The present portrait, in which Bembo wears the red biretta and cape of a cardinal, must have been painted between March 1539, the date of the official proclamation of his elevation, and May 30, 1540, the date of a letter sent by Bembo in Rome to his friend Girolamo Querini in Venice. In the letter Bembo asks Querini to thank Titian for the gift of the “second portrait” of him, which he has just received, and adds that although he had intended to pay the painter for it, he would instead find another way of adequately returning the favor. [10] On the reasonable assumption...
that the portrait was made from life, David Alan Brown pointed out that the date of
the portrait could be narrowed down to the seven-month period between March
1539 and Bembo’s departure for the papal capital in October. [11] In the past the
phrase “second portrait” has presented scholars with a problem of interpretation,
since Titian’s only other extant portrait of Bembo, that in Naples (fig. 3), clearly
shows him older; the lost portrait mentioned by Vasari had been painted nearly 30
years earlier and is unlikely to be the implied “first” portrait. But as recently pointed
out by Matteo Mancini, a mediocre portrait in the Prado, Madrid, is almost certainly
an exact copy of Titian’s “first” portrait [fig. 4]. [12] Indeed, the fact that the features
and turn of the head are identical to those of the Gallery’s portrait implies that the
original of the “first” portrait, now lost, was painted only months before March 1539,
and that Titian used the existing design as a basis for the “second” portrait, in
which the robes of a knight of Malta were exchanged for those of a cardinal. It now
appears possible, therefore, that instead of being painted from life, Titian painted
the present portrait after Bembo’s departure for Rome, perhaps in the early months
of 1540, before sending it off to reach the sitter by May.

Further circumstantial evidence confirming that both these portraits were painted
in the brief period 1538 to 1540 is provided by the relative length of Bembo’s
beard. Up to 1532, as shown by Belli’s medal (fig. 1), Bembo was clean-shaven. In a
letter of 1536, Benedetto Varchi in Venice wrote to Benvenuto Cellini in Rome that
Bembo was letting his beard grow. [13] In his autobiography Cellini recalled that
when he visited Bembo in Padua in 1537, he wore his beard short, “in the Venetian
fashion.” [14] But in a mosaic of 1542 signed by Francesco and Valerio Zuccato
(Bargello, Florence) [fig. 5], Bembo’s beard flows down his chest, [15] and it is even
longer in the late portrait in Naples. The date of the last, much-damaged picture is
not known; but if taken from life, it must have been painted either during Bembo’s
north Italian journey of 1543 or when Titian visited Rome in 1545–1546, a year
before the sitter’s death at the age of 76. [16] (Konrad Oberhuber argued on
stylistic grounds that the Washington portrait dates from Titian’s Roman visit, but
this is to ignore the external evidence. [17]) In addition to the very early lost portrait,
Giorgio Vasari mentioned a portrait by Titian of Bembo “after he had been made
cardinal”; [18] but it is impossible to say to which of the surviving two Vasari was
referring, or indeed, whether he knew yet another lost portrait, recorded in a
number of engravings. [19]

Unlike the more contemplative image in Naples, in which the aged Bembo appears
almost like an oriental magus, the present portrait shows him as a still-vigorous 69-
year-old, his features alert with intellectual energy and his pose and gesture suggestive of rhetoric and debate. As pointed out by Peter Burke, it may be no coincidence that the outstretched hand, with the palm facing upward, corresponds to the gesture recommended by Quintilian for the beginning of a speech, in Book 11 of his much-consulted *Education of the Orator*. [20] Presumably commissioned to celebrate his elevation as cardinal of the Roman church, the portrait may be regarded as a re-elaboration of Raphael’s canonical *Portrait of a Cardinal* of circa 1510–1511 (Museo del Prado, Madrid). At the same time, it conveys the exceptional authority that Bembo had attained as supreme arbiter of Latin and Italian literary style.

Peter Humfrey
March 21, 2019

**COMPARATIVE FIGURES**

**fig. 1** Valerio Belli, *Pietro Bembo, 1470–1547, Cardinal 1538 [obverse]*, probably 1532, bronze, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection

**fig. 2** Italian 16th Century (Attributed to Benvenuto Cellini), *Pietro Bembo, 1470–1547, Cardinal 1538, Venetian Philologist, Poet and Belletrist [obverse]*, 1537/1547, bronze, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection
fig. 3 Titian, Portrait of Cardinal Pietro Bembo (1470–1547), 1545, oil on canvas, Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, Naples. Scala / Ministero per i Beni e le Attività culturali / Art Resource, NY

fig. 4 After Titian, Pietro Bembo as Prior of the Order of Saint John of Jerusalem, first half of the 16th century, oil on canvas, Museo Nacional del Prado. © Photographic Archive Museo Nacional del Prado
fig. 5 Valerio Zuccato, *Portrait of Pietro Bembo*, 1542, mosaic, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence

**NOTES**


[7] See Pietro Bembo, Prose e rime, ed. Carlo Dionisotti (Turin, 1960), nos. 19 and 20. Quoting these lines, Carlo Ridolfi, Le maraviglie dell’arte, overo Le vite de g’illustri pittori veneti, e dello stato, ed. Detlev von Hadeln (Berlin, 1914), 1:73, also claimed that Bellini painted an early portrait of Bembo himself, but as pointed out by Hadeln in his annotation to this comment, it seems to have constituted a misunderstanding of Vasari’s mention of the portrait of Bembo’s beloved. Ridolfi’s claim has sometimes been used in support of the view that Bellini’s Portrait of a Man (Royal Collection, Hampton Court), evidently dating from the first decade of the 16th century, represents Bembo. For a skeptical reaction, see John Shearman, The Early


But if Suida was correct in attributing the design of the mosaic to Titian, it cannot have been taken from life. Bembo wears a similarly long beard in his portrait as a bystander in Vasari’s Paul III Distributing Benefices of 1546 (Palazzo della Cancelleria, Rome), and in the posthumous portrait bust by Danese Cattaneo, carved for the monument to the cardinal in the Santo in Padua (in situ). See Wilhelm Suida, “New Light on Titian’s Portraits, II,” The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs 68 (1936): 281–282.


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The original, medium-weight, plain-weave fabric was last relined in 1943, and its tacking margins have been cropped. The off-white ground is thinly applied, and examination with infrared reflectography at 1.5 to 1.8 microns [1] has not revealed any underdrawing. Minor pentimenti can be seen with the naked eye: the cardinal’s hat, for example, was previously nearly 1 centimeter wider along all the contours and had a broader and more rounded peak. Both of his shoulders were altered, with the profile of that on the right raised by nearly 1 centimeter. There are also some changes in the fingertips, which were originally placed slightly farther to the lower right. The x-radiographs reveal a large white area under the sitter’s head and upper torso, which are also marred by traction crackle. This suggests that Titian repainted this area.

The paint surface is somewhat abraded, giving a misleading effect of smoothness and lack of finish, although the arm at the lower right does appear always to have been unresolved and without detail. Darkened repaint can be seen strengthening the hair, beard, contours of the cape, fingers, and palm.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Sarah Fisher and Joanna Dunn

March 21, 2019


PROVENANCE


[1] In his final testament, drawn up in 1544, Bembo left his entire art collection to Torquato, and instructed him to integrate the objects then in Rome with the bulk of the collection in Padua. For about the next twenty years it remained complete; but thereafter Torquato began to dismantle it, sending important parts of it back to Rome for sale in 1581 and 1583. See Sabine Eiche, “On the Dispersal of Cardinal Bembo’s Collections,” Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Instituts in Florenz 27 (1983): 353–359. Perhaps Titian’s portrait was sold from the Bembo collection around this time.

[2] As pointed out by Jeremy Wood, “Van Dyck’s Cabinet de Titien: The Contents and Dispersal of His Collection,” The Burlington Magazine 132 (1990): 681 n. 9, the picture is very likely to be identical with the portrait of Bembo by Titian acquired by the Sicilian nobleman Don Fabrizio Valguarnera from the dealer Ferrante Carlo before 1631. The portrait is mentioned twice in the documents relating to Valguarnera’s trial for theft in that year: first in an inventory of his possessions (“Il Ritratto di Monse Bembo è di mano di Titiano è quell’istesso che hò detto di sopra...”)
d’haver compro da Ferrante de Carolis”); and second in Carlo’s testimony to the
court (“Un’ritratto dicono del Bembo di mano di Titiano grande dal mezzo in su’ del
naturale”). See Jane Costello, “The Twelve Pictures ‘Ordered by Velasquez’ and
the Trial of Valguarnera,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 13 (1950):
273, 276.

[3] According to an inventory of Cardinal Barberini, the picture was acquired on 20
November 1636 from Leone Galli. See Marilyn Aronberg Lavin, Seventeenth
Century Barberini Documents and Inventories of Art, New York, 1975: 41 no. 334:
“Uno in tela con cornice di noce alto pmi cinque in circa un retratto di un Cardinale
mano Chredosi della prima maniera de Titiano.” Despite the vagueness of the
description, which fails to identify the sitter, the portrait is clearly identical with the
one of Bembo listed in subsequent Barberini inventories. These include Cardinal
Antonio’s inventories of 1644 (Lavin 1975, 166 no. 232) and 1671 (Lavin 1975, 295
no. 71), and the inventory of his bequests of 1672 (Lavin 1975, 345 no. 230),
according to which it was inherited by his nephew. The portrait duly appears in the
posthumous 1686 inventory of Maffeo’s legacy to his son (Lavin 1975, 409 no. 342).
The evidence of the seventeenth-century Barberini inventories published by Lavin
disproves the attempted identification by Wethey of the picture with a portrait of a
 cardinal by Titian that had been acquired for the family by Bernini before 1631; see

[4] According to the Getty Provenance Index, the painting is recorded in a 1730
inventory of Cardinal Francesco II Barberini (p. 35, no. 218): "3695 Un Ritratto del
Cardle. Bembo a sedere alto pmi 5, largo pmi 4 incirca, con barba longa, e libro
nella mano manca, con cornice liscia dorata, si dice mano del Titiano [attribution
crossed out] in cattivo stato 50." The painting is still recorded in the Barberini
collection by Oskar Fischel, Tizian: Des Meisters Gemälde, Stuttgart [u.a.], 1904: no.
72, and by George Lafenestre and Eugène Richtenberger, La Peinture en Europe.

purchase date, are according to the Getty Provenance Index and the M. Knoedler
& Co. archives, the latter courtesy in 2002 of Edye Weissler, Knoedler archivist and
librarian (see the e-mail of 12 September 2002, in NGA curatorial files). The
painting is in Colnaghi’s private ledgers, and was Knoedler’s London number 3828

[5] According to the Getty Provenance Index; Pichetto was the Kress Foundation’s curator and conservator.
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1946 Recent Additions to the Kress Collection, National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1946, no. 826.
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Cardinal Pietro Bembo

© National Gallery of Art, Washington
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


2007 Romani, Vittoria. *Tiziano e il tardo rinascimento a Venezia: Jacopa...*


The picture was first published in 1931 by Wilhelm Suida, who rejected a previous, traditional association with Correggio in favor of Titian. Suida’s attribution has been generally but not universally accepted: Hans Tietze and Rodolfo Pallucchini omitted the picture from their monographs on Titian; and Francesco Valcanover and Harold Wethey explicitly denied Titian’s authorship. Alternative attributions proposed by the skeptics include Romanino (Bernard Berenson, MS opinion, 1938); Giulio Campi (Hans Tietze and Erika Tietze-Conrat, MS opinion, 1947); and Follower of Veronese (Wethey). But none of these have won any further acceptance, and Suida’s much more convincing attribution is supported by his comparison of the figure of Cupid with the angels in Titian’s *Assunta* (Frari, Venice) of circa 1515–1518. Another particularly relevant comparison, pointed out by Fern Rusk Shapley, is with the cupid on the far right in Titian’s *Three Ages of Man* of circa 1513–1515 (Scottish National Gallery, Edinburgh, Bridgewater loan). These close similarities of figure type (and also with the cupids in the Prado *Feast of Venus* of 1517–1518) further suggest that the picture is a relatively early work of circa 1515/1520. Consistent with such a dating is the fact that Cupid is standing on a foreground parapet parallel to the picture plane, a compositional device characteristic of Giovanni Bellini and the 15th-century tradition, and used by Titian only in his early career. Anjelica Dülberg suggested a later date of circa 1540–1560, without providing any particular reason.

The doubts entertained by some critics regarding the attribution may stem from the fact that the picture is in several respects unique in Titian’s oeuvre. Several of his

---

**Cupid with the Wheel of Time**

Titian

Venetian, 1488/1490 - 1576

C. 1515/1520

Oil on canvas

Overall: 65.9 × 55.3 cm (25 15/16 × 21 3/4 in.)

Framed: 84.9 x 80 x 6 cm (33 7/16 x 31 1/2 x 2 3/8 in.)

Samuel H. Kress Collection 1939.1.213
works include fictive reliefs in monochrome (for instance, the Votive Picture of Jacopo Pesaro, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp; the Schiavona, National Gallery, London; the Sacred and Profane Love, Galleria Borghese, Rome; and the Clarissa Strozzi, Staatliche Museen, Berlin); but such reliefs are all details of larger paintings, and are painted in imitation of marble sculpture. The present work, by contrast, is executed entirely in monochrome and with a much more fluid technique, in which the rapid handling of the brush is conspicuously evident. But this difference of treatment may in part reflect a different source of inspiration, since, as observed by Douglas Lewis, [9] the combination of Cupid, chariot wheel, and tree trunk derives from a 15th-century Roman plaquette [fig. 1]—in other words, a small-scale bronze all’antica.

In part, too, as observed by Dülberg, the technical characteristics of the Cupid are entirely consistent with the suggestion first made by Giuseppe Fiocco (MS opinion, 15 March 1935, in NGA curatorial files), and later by Alessandro Conti, that the picture originally functioned as the cover, or timpano, to a portrait. [10] Such complements to portraits were not uncommon in Venetian painting in the decades around 1500 (examples in the Gallery’s collection include Allegory of Virtue and Vice and Allegory); and the fact that they became increasingly unusual after circa 1520 is again consistent with a relatively early dating.

Another element in favor of the supposition that the picture was painted as a cover is its allegorical subject, which, as was customary, presumably in some way reflected the personality, status, or philosophy of the sitter of the portrait beneath. An interpretation of the subject as an allegory of Fortune was outlined by Suida: Cupid (identifiable from his wings) symbolizes the triumph of Love, at least temporarily, over the rolling Wheel of Fortune and the inevitability of death (represented by the animal’s skull suspended from the tree). [11] Elaborating on this interpretation, Edgar Wind identified the skull as that of an ox, and hence as a symbol of Patience, and saw Love as setting the Wheel of Chance into motion; for the writer, therefore, the picture was an allegory of the classical tag festina lente (make haste slowly). [12] Yet as Shapley rightly objected, the skull is not apparently that of an ox, and Cupid appears to be restraining the roll of the wheel rather than setting it into motion. [13] Dülberg accordingly proposed a somewhat different refinement of Suida’s interpretation: Love holds a central position in human life and lends sweetness to the fleeting hours, even though the roll of time must in the end lead to death. [14] This reading is further supported by the writer’s observation that Cupid is apparently struggling to maintain a moment of stability, despite the wind.
that makes his draperies flutter in opposite directions. While Patricia Fortini Brown agreed with Suida, [15] a similar interpretation of the subject as Love arresting the Cycle of Life was offered by Lewis, based partly on his interpretation of the Renaissance plaquette from which the central motifs derive. [16]

Although there is no obvious candidate for a surviving portrait by Titian for which the picture could have served as the cover, the field is limited by the fact that the majority of his portraits, and particularly those of his middle and later career, are considerably larger in their dimensions. The relative intimacy of scale, combined with the allegorical message, suggests that the sitter below, if a man, was a poet or philosopher and/or a friend of the painter, rather than a member of high society. But the themes of love and of the passing of time would also have been appropriate as complements to an image of female beauty, and in this connection it is worth observing that the dimensions of the picture correspond closely to those of the so-called Violante (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna; 64.5 × 50.8 cm), usually dated to circa 1515.

Peter Humfrey
March 21, 2019

COMPARATIVE FIGURES
**fig. 1** Roman 15th Century, after the Antique, *Bacchus and Ariadne on a Chariot*, mid-15th century, bronze with yellow-brown patina, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection

---

**NOTES**


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The support is a fine-to-moderate weight fabric. The painting has been lined and the original tacking edges have been cut off, but x-radiographs reveal slight cusping along the edges of the original fabric, indicating that the painting has not been cut down substantially. The ground consists of a moderately thin white layer. Infrared reflectography (Vidicon) [1] reveals some underdrawing executed in a liquid medium marking the contours of Cupid and the wheel. In the x-radiographs it is possible to see some of the rough brushwork originating from the ground and the background paint layers; the x-radiographs make the latter more apparent than does examination under normal light. There are no appreciable compositional changes, only some minor alterations of contour. Apart from some scattered small
losses, the worst damage is caused by abrasion, as is particularly evident in the
area around the top right corner and generally in the background. The extensive
inpainting, applied to pull together the areas of abrasion, dates mainly from the
conservation treatments undertaken in 1936 and 1942, as the painting has not
been treated since then. Although the inpainting has only discolored slightly, the
varnish has discolored considerably.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Kate Russell
March 21, 2019

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Hamamatsu c/1000-03
Vidicon camera and a Kodak Wratten 87A filter.

PROVENANCE

(Angelo Bonelli, Rome), by 1803; (Bonelli sale by private contract [not an auction],
No. 4 Duke Street [The Roman Gallery], London, 4 January 1803 and continuing
until 15 December 1803, no. 65, as A Genius trying to stop a Wheel by
Parmegianino[sic], not sold); (Bonelli sale, Christie’s, London, 24-25 February 1804,
first day, no. 24, as A Sketch, very spirited by Parmigiano[sic], bought in); (Bonelli
sale, Farebrother, London [?], 2 May 1804, no. 42, as An allegory, a beautiful sketch
-- from the Altieri Palace at Rome by Polidoro),[1] Viani, Rome. (Count Alessandro
Contini-Bonacossi, Florence and Rome); sold October 1935 to the Samuel H. Kress
Foundation, New York,[2] gift 1939 to NGA.

[1] The original catalogue for the 1803 sale is in the Woolcombe Library at
Hemerdon near Plymouth in Devon, England. This information and the details of
the Bonelli sales are in a 12 September 1989 letter from Burton Fredericksen of the
Getty Provenance Index to Suzannah Fabing, in NGA curatorial files. See also
Fredericksen’s descriptions of the three sales in their records, Sale Catalogs Br-151-
A, Br-241, and Br-257, the Getty Provenance Index databases, J. Paul Getty Trust,
Los Angeles.
[2] The bill of sale for several paintings including this one, which is titled Cupid with Wheel of Life, is dated 10 October 1935, with payment received 23 October (copy in NGA curatorial files).
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Since its cleaning soon after its arrival in America in 1954, the picture has been universally regarded as one of the finest of all Titian’s portraits. Previously, the authenticity of the signature was occasionally contested, as by Joseph Archer Crowe and Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle, who reattributed the picture to Pordenone; by Henry Thode, who attributed it to Tintoretto; and by August L. Mayer, who found the “Falstaffian” bulk alien to Titian, and who suggested Palma Giovane as the author. [1] Mayer also implicitly questioned the reliability of the inscription identifying the sitter as Doge Gritti, a doubt at one time shared by Rodolfo Pallucchini. [2] In part, this doubt was the consequence of the observation by both these authors that for stylistic reasons the picture appears to date from after circa 1545, whereas Gritti had died in 1538. But comparison with the various other known likenesses of Gritti, in both painting and sculpture, provides ample confirmation that he is indeed the doge portrayed here; and the outstanding matter of debate, therefore, is whether Titian painted the portrait during Gritti’s reign as doge (1523–1538) or to commemorate him some time after his death.

Andrea Gritti (1455–1538) was a prominent figure in Venetian public life long before his election as doge in 1523. [3] He first came to public attention in 1502, when following several years of residence in Constantinople, where he had been active both as a grain merchant and as a spy, he was instrumental in negotiating a peace treaty with the Turks. Appointed commissioner of the Venetian army in 1509, he took an important early initiative in reversing the setbacks of the initial stages of
the War of the League of Cambrai, in particular by reconquering the city of Padua. Captured by the French at Brescia in 1512 and taken to France, he used the opportunity to establish good personal relations with King Francis I and, as earlier with the Turks, to negotiate a favorable peace treaty. In 1517 he led the triumphal reentry of the Venetians into Verona, the last major terraferma city to be regained. Of a highly ambitious, even autocratic personality, Gritti was mistrusted by his fellow patricians and was passed over for the dogeship in 1521. Finally elected in 1523, his impatience with the complexities of the Venetian constitution led to constant frustrations of his wider political ambitions. He nevertheless succeeded in becoming one of the most effective and influential of all post-medieval doges, and during his relatively long reign he skilfully preserved the republic from the disastrous warfare that afflicted much of the rest of Italy during these years.

Despite the constraints of his office, and through the force of his personality, Doge Gritti played a major role as a patron of art and architecture, which he saw as a powerful weapon of political ideology. [4] In particular, he was concerned for the public buildings in the city’s political, religious, and commercial centers to lend expression to the revival of Venice after the disaster of the War of Cambrai and to the city’s claims to constitute a New Rome; in keeping with this aim, he successfully persuaded the sculptor-architect Jacopo Sansovino, a refugee from the Sack of Rome, to settle in Venice in 1527. From the beginning of his reign, Gritti also identified Titian as the painter best qualified to implement his cultural policy. In 1523 Titian painted large-scale figures of the Four Evangelists in fresco (lost) to flank a votive marble relief above the altar of the chapel of San Niccolò in the Doge’s Palace. Probably in the same year he painted the Saint Christopher fresco in the ducal apartments nearby. And in 1531 Titian completed the Votive Picture of Doge Andrea Gritti for the Sala del Collegio in the palace. Before the doge’s death in 1538, Titian seems also at least to have begun the succession portrait of Gritti for the Sala del Maggior Consiglio, even though he did not receive his final payment for the work until 1540. [5]

Gritti’s features are reliably recorded in a number of contemporary portraits, apart from these last two by Titian: in the votive relief of 1523 by an anonymous sculptor from the chapel of San Niccolò (now chapel of San Clemente, church of San Marco); on the medal by Andrea Spinelli, struck to commemorate the rebuilding by Sansovino of the church of San Francesco della Vigna; [6] and in Fiumicelli’s altarpiece of 1536 in the church of the Eremitani in Padua. Titian’s succession portrait of circa 1537–1540 for the Sala del Maggior Consiglio was destroyed by fire.
in 1577, but its composition is recorded in the substitute painted by Domenico Tintoretto, as well as in a number of studio versions by Titian’s workshop, the best of which is probably the one now in a private collection [fig. 1]. [7] This lost succession portrait, which constituted the chief official likeness of Gritti, showed him in waist-length and three-quarter view, with his body and face both turning toward the (viewer’s) left. The votive picture for the Sala del Collegio was likewise destroyed by fire, three years earlier, in 1574. The composition, recorded in a woodcut attributed to Nicolò Boldrini, shows the figure of Gritti replaced by that of Doge Francesco Donà; but since the figure was obviously shown kneeling in profile, there are good grounds for supposing that both Catena’s portrait of Gritti in the National Gallery, London, and that in Tintoretto’s Votive Picture of Doge Gritti, painted for the Collegio as a substitute after the fire, are both closely based on Titian’s lost original. [8]

In composition and character, the Washington portrait is unique of its type and differs greatly from these other two well-diffused images by Titian. This suggests that it was not conceived as an official image for a public building, but was commissioned privately, and subsequently remained in the possession of the Gritti family. The question of whether it was the doge himself or a member of his family who commissioned the portrait clearly depends on the much-debated question of its date. Oskar Fischel dated it to the beginning of Gritti’s reign, circa 1523, contemporary with the Saint Christopher fresco. [9] Wilhelm Suida later advanced this date to circa 1533, the year in which Titian was knighted, since his signature is suffixed with the letter E (Eques). [10] Georg Gronau, followed by Hans Tietze, dated the picture to circa 1540, implying some connection with the documented portrait for the Sala del Maggior Consiglio of that year, and also implying that it was painted (or at least completed) after the doge’s death. [11] Fern Rusk Shapley accepted that the portrait was painted in the phase proposed by these writers, circa 1533–1540. [12]

Mayer, however, had already argued that the figure was too colossal, and the technique too broad, for Titian’s style of the 1530s; and Pallucchini agreed that the closest point of stylistic comparison was Titian’s portrait of Pietro Aretino (Pitti, Florence), painted shortly before the painter’s journey to Rome in 1545. [13] While not absolutely excluding this late date, with its implication of a posthumous commission, Harold Wethey upheld the traditional dating to the later 1530s, arguing that the way in which the figure fills the picture field is comparable to that in Titian’s portraits of the Eleven Caesars of 1536–1540 for the duke of Mantua.
(lost, but recorded in drawings by Ippolito Andreasi and engravings by Aegedius Sadeler). [14] Hans Ost agreed, adding that the quality of finish in Titian's pictures is an unreliable guide to their dating, since it could vary according to the relative formality of the commission and according to its destined placing. [15] But David Alan Brown, followed by Filippo Pedrocco, was certainly correct to agree with Pallucchini's later dating to the mid-1540s and to compare the portrait with other works by Titian of the mid-1540s, such as the Pope Paul III with His Grandsons (Capodimonte, Naples) of 1545–1546, and the Vendramin Family (National Gallery, London) of circa 1547. [16] As far as it is possible to judge from the Andreasi drawings and Sadeler engravings, the Eleven Caesars resembled Titian's other portraits of the later 1530s, such as the Bella of 1538 (Pitti, Florence) and, especially, the Francesco Maria della Rovere of 1536–1538 (Uffizi, Florence), in the relative crispness of the modeling, in the selective attention to detail, and in the brilliant evocation of specific surface textures. Similar characteristics are still evident in the Cardinal Pietro Bembo of 1539/1540 and the Ranuccio Farnese of 1541–1542 in the Gallery. In the Doge Andrea Gritti and the Pietro Aretino, by contrast, the handling is boldly sketchy throughout, and the figures more completely dominate their fields. Indeed, the freedom of the brushwork and the richness of the well-preserved impasto suggest that the Gritti may even be slightly later than the Aretino, perhaps in the immediate aftermath of the trip to Rome, when the painter could have experienced for the first time the direct impact of Michelangelo's Moses. [17] In any case, despite the recent attempt by Michael Overdick to return to a dating to circa 1538, within the sitter's lifetime, the arguments in favor of a somewhat later date remain compelling. [18]

A contemporary parallel instance of the posthumous commission of the portrait of a doge by his family is provided by an entry in the account book of Lorenzo Lotto, which records that in 1542 the nobleman Giovanni Marcello commissioned a portrait of his ancestor Doge Niccolò Marcello (reigned 1473–1474). [19] Yet Titian's portrait has nothing of the lifelessness usually associated with posthumous portraits. On the contrary, by contrast with the tame and placid official portrait of Gritti (fig. 1), the present work gives powerful expression both to the majesty of the office of doge and to the physical and intellectual vitality of Gritti the man. As in the official portrait, the figure is shown in waist-length and the head in three-quarter view; but the torso now turns energetically in a contrasting direction, the huge right hand clutches the drapery of the cloak, and the face conveys the awe-inspiring authority of an angry Jove.
Erica Tietze-Conrat plausibly suggested that Gritti is meant to be shown walking, or rather striding, in procession; according to Carlo Ridolfi, Titian portrayed two other doges in this way. [20] Although Wethey rejected this suggestion, [21] in keeping with it is the gesture of the right hand, as if holding up the cloak, as well as the vigorous contrapposto pose. Peter Meller commented on the leonine aspect of the figure, with his ferocious expression, pawlike hand and tawny robe, and on the appropriateness of suggesting an analogy between the doge of Venice and the Lion of Saint Mark. [22] Suida saw the right hand as a quotation of that of Michelangelo’s Moses, which according to the writer he would have known from a cast brought from Rome to Venice by Jacopo Sansovino; [23] but if, as seems likely, the portrait dates from immediately after the Roman journey of 1545–1546, Titian could also have known the original statue. In either case, the quotation would represent another aspect of the painter’s lifelong sense of rivalry with Michelangelo, and of the relative merits of the different artistic traditions of central Italy and Venice. As pointed out by Brown, followed by Annette Weber, the quotation may also be interpreted as an implied comparison between the personalities of Doge Gritti and of Pope Julius II, for whose tomb the Moses was made. [24] Thus, both rulers were renowned for their terribilità, [25] for their domineering personalities as leaders in war and politics; Julius also provided a striking precedent for Gritti in his energetic and ambitious promotion of art and culture as an expression of political renewal.

Finally, the recent revelation that the picture was originally framed as an oval (see Technical Summary, and implied by the infrared reflectogram [fig. 2]) may provide further confirmation both that the portrait was painted well after Gritti’s death and that it was painted for an unofficial, domestic setting. Oval and circular formats were to remain rare in Venetian portraiture of the 16th century, but a closely contemporary example would have been Titian’s circular Self-Portrait, painted in 1550 and later recorded in the collection of Gabriele Vendramin (died 1552), who happened to be Gritti’s nephew by marriage. [26]
fig. 1 Workshop of Titian, Portrait of Doge Andrea Gritti, c. 1540, oil on canvas, Private Collection

fig. 2 Infrared reflectogram, Titian, Doge Andrea Gritti, c. 1546/1550, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection

NOTES


Doge Andrea Gritti
© National Gallery of Art, Washington


[5] Charles Hope, “Titian as Official Painter to the Venetian Republic,” in Tiziano e Venezia: Convegno internazionale di studi (1976) (Vicenza, 1980), 304, plausibly argued that the succession portrait was one of two works by Titian in the Sala del Maggior Consiglio reported to be in progress in 1537; for the payment of 1540, see Wilhelm von Bode, Georg Gronau, and Detlev von Haldeln, Archivalische Beiträge zur Geschichte der venezianischen Kunst aus dem Nachlass Gustav Ludwigs (Berlin, 1911), 134.


[9] Oskar Fischel, Tizian: Des Meisters Gemälde (Stuttgart [u.a.], 1904), xviii, 42.


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The painting was executed on a highly textured herringbone canvas, and since all the tacking margins are intact, the painted surface corresponds to its original dimensions. [1] Two old fold lines, one just above the hat and one between the lines of signature, indicate that at two points in its history the painting was reduced in size and later expanded back to the original dimensions. The thinly applied gesso ground has aged from an original white to light brown. The canvas has remained unlined, and the painter’s underdrawing for the figure, executed with the brush with dilute black paint as a simple contour, is clearly visible on the reverse. Infrared reflectography at 1.5 to 1.8 microns [fig. 1] [2] and x-radiographs reveal further elements of underdrawing and some pentimenti, the most significant of which was a change from an original look of the eyes directly outward to the present glance to the sitter’s right. The painted surface, which survives in excellent condition, with passages of exceptionally well preserved impasto, was applied rapidly and confidently in alternating thick and thin layers. The x-radiographs have revealed further adjustments to the figure’s contours introduced at the painting stage, notably along the right side of the cap, along the proper right shoulder, and around the hand. Both the infrared reflectogram and the x-radiographs imply, as might already have been discerned with the naked eye, that the portrait was originally framed as an oval. [3] The rounded top is particularly obvious in the upper spandrels, where the framing would have covered the more thinly painted areas with the present inscription at the upper left; unlike the gilded signature at center right, this is certainly a later addition. The fact, however, that there is no difference between the pigments in the spandrels and those in the central oval indicates that any change of format must have been undertaken by the painter himself. [4] In 1955 Mario Modestini replaced the stretcher, cleaned, and inpainted the painting.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Michael Swicklik, Elizabeth Walmsley, and Kay Silberfeld
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fig. 1 Infrared reflectogram, Titian, Doge Andrea Gritti, c. 1546/1550, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Technical notes on the painting were published by Elizabeth Walmsley, in Der späte Tizian und die Sinnlichkeit der Malerei, ed. Sylvia Ferino-Pagden (Vienna, 2007), 471–473, including a full account and photographs of the various labels, inscriptions, and seals on the reverse.

[2] Infrared reflectography was performed using a Santa Barbara focalplane InSb camera fitted with an H astronomy filter.

[3] After examination of the painting in 2009, Walmsley surmised that the painting was originally framed as an oval (unpublished memorandum, copy
PROVENANCE


[1] On a label on the reverse of the painting is written “Bought for His Majesty in Italy, 1626.” It is not known from whom in Italy the picture was bought. As pointed out by Erica Tietze-Conrat, “Titian’s Workshop in His Late Years,” The Art Bulletin 28 (1946): 81, it is certainly identifiable with the item in Abraham Van der Doort’s 1639 inventory of Charles I’s collection, placed in the Privy Lodging Room of Whitehall Palace, and described as follows: “Item Above the doore. Duke grettie of Venus wth his right hand houlding his roabes: Bought by the Kinge halfe figures So bigg as the life. In a black wodden guilded frame. Done by Tichian” (Oliver Millar, “Abraham van der Doort’s Catalogue of the Collection of Charles I,” Walpole Society 37 [1960 : 21].) (The handwriting on the label, while apparently of the 17th century, is not that of Van der Doort, cataloger of the royal collection.) The dimensions, given as 4 feet 4 inches high by 3 feet 4 inches wide, also correspond closely. See also Francis Haskell, “Charles I’s Collection of Pictures,” in The Late King’s Goods. Collections, Possessions and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories, ed. Arthur MacGregor, London and Oxford, 1989: 204. The royal stamp of a CR surmounted by a crown was once visible on the back of the canvas (as reported by Karl Wilczek, Katalog der Graf
Czernin'schen Gemäldegalerie in Wien, Vienna, 1936: 88-89, but the 1955 transfer of the canvas to a new stretcher has concealed it.
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The portraits of the sisters Emilia and Irene di Spilimbergo, presumably painted as a pair, remained in the possession of the Spilimbergo family and their descendants until 1909, when they were sold under controversial circumstances to Duveen and exported from Italy to America. Much of the controversy stemmed from a persistent local tradition that the portraits were by Titian. An engraving of the Irene, for example, had served as the frontispiece of Count di Maniago’s influential account of the history of art in Friuli of 1819. [1] From about 1930, however, most critics have seen them rather as by a close follower, perhaps identifiable as Gian Paolo Pace.

Emilia (1536–1585) and her younger sister Irene (1538–1559) were the daughters of the Friulian nobleman Adriano di Spilimbergo and Giulia, daughter of the wealthy Venetian citizen Zuan Paolo da Ponte. According to Giorgio Vasari, Titian painted the portraits of the members of three generations of the family: “Among the portraits by Titian is one . . . of Paolo da Ponte, whose beautiful young daughter Giulia (who was a confidante of his) Titian also portrayed, as he did the lovely Signora Irene, a young woman well versed in literature and music who was studying design. When she died about seven years ago she was honoured by nearly every Italian writer.” [2] At least part of this information is certainly correct, as has been shown with the recent rediscovery of Titian’s portrait of Zuan Paolo da Ponte, together with references in the latter’s Memoriale—a manuscript journal in five volumes covering the years 1520 to 1562—which show that this portrait and that of Giulia were commissioned from the painter in 1534. [3] And in his last remark about Giulia’s daughter Irene, Vasari is clearly referring to a volume of nearly 400
Latin and Italian poems, including contributions by Torquato Tasso and Lodovico Dolce, which was published in 1561 by Dionigi Atanagi, in honor of the gifted young woman who had died at such a tragically early age. [4]

Atanagi’s biography of Irene, together with further modern research, provides considerable information about her personality and accomplishments. [5] After the death of their father in 1541, she and her sister were educated under the supervision of their maternal grandfather, who actively encouraged their interest in the arts, and who in about 1555 brought them to Venice. Irene was remarkable in her ambition to excel, and stimulated by the example of Sofonisba Anguissola, she persuaded Titian, as a family friend, to allow her to copy his works and to give her tuition as a painter. But her very determination apparently led to overexertion and hence to illness and early death. Much less is known of Emilia, who was born in 1536, married in 1561, and died in 1585. But three of the poems in Atanagi’s volume praise her as the image of her sister, and two years later she was the dedicatee of Anton Maria Amadi’s edition of one of Petrarch’s Sonnets. [6]

On June 28, 1560, a few months after Irene’s death the previous December, her grandfather noted in his Memoriale that a portrait of her—and presumably also one of her sister—had been begun two years previously by Gian Paolo Pace, but that this painter had sketched it so poorly that the patron asked Titian to complete it. [7] If begun in 1558, the portraits had as their original function, as observed by Elsje van Kessel, some probable relation to the sitters’ prospective marriages: either to present two highly eligible, aristocratic young women to prospective husbands; or, given their character as balancing pendants, as permanent souvenirs for their family after they were married. [8] With the premature death of Irene, however, the function of her portrait was suddenly changed to become an elegy for what might have been, in a way analogous to the volume of poems. [9] A number of details are certainly consistent with this change of function, notably the inscription (“If the fates had allowed”). Although there is no particular reference to her activity as a painter, the laurel crown in her hand presumably alludes to her achievements in the arts in general, and the evergreen palm to her everlasting fame. Another obvious symbol is the unicorn in the left middle ground, which as already pointed out in 1819 by Di Maniago, refers to her perpetual virginity. [10] The column with its base further invests Irene’s portrait with a grandeur not present in that of her sister. Too little information exists about Emilia’s biography to know for certain why the seascape to the right shows a storm-tossed ship; but since the portraits were almost certainly painted contemporaneously as pendants, the motif probably alludes to the
turbulent state of her emotions on the loss of her sister. Such an allusion, and such a close linkage with Irene, would perhaps have been less appropriate after Emilia’s marriage in 1561. On circumstantial evidence, therefore, the pair of portraits—like Atanagi’s celebratory volume—is likely to have been completed in the immediate aftermath of Irene’s death in 1559.

The traditional attribution of the portraits to Titian, based on the account of Vasari, and also on the very similar one by Carlo Ridolfi, was still unchallenged at the beginning of the 20th century. [11] Only Joseph Archer Crowe and Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle had expressed doubts about their quality, but they attributed any shortcomings to damage and repaint. [12] In 1904, when they were in the possession of Count Niccolò D’Attimis Maniago, a descendant of the Spilimbergo and Da Ponte families, they were listed in an Italian government catalog as works of “sommo pregio” (the highest value), implying that they were by Titian. In 1908, however, Count Enrico D’Attimis Maniago applied to the Italian commission on the export of works of art for a downgrading of the status of the portraits, and hence for permission to sell them abroad. In 1909 the commission agreed that they were not by Titian, and an export license was granted; within the same year, they passed through the hands of the dealer Elia Volpi and were acquired by Joseph Duveen. [13] It was clearly now in Duveen’s interest to revert to the traditional attribution, and this case was greatly aided by the discovery of Zuan Paolo da Ponte’s Memoriale in 1910, and the publication in 1911 by Ferruccio Carreri of the passages referring to Titian’s involvement (see Entry note 7). In 1949 doubts about the authenticity of these passages were raised by Michelangelo Muraro, who having examined the original manuscript, noted first that the two relevant pages were now missing, and second that the name of Titian does not appear in the index to the volume. Muraro observed that the publication of the two passages coincided closely with the controversy surrounding the sale of the portraits from the Spilimbergo family to Duveen, and suggested that they had been fabricated to prove Titian’s authorship of the Irene. [14]

In the absence of the original document, it is difficult to assess the reliability or otherwise of the passages published by Carreri; yet it seems likely that even if they were tampered with, they were not, after all, complete fabrications. It is true that in terms of their aesthetic quality neither of the Spilimbergo portraits can be accepted as the work of Titian, even in part; and although a case has sometimes been made for seeing the Irene as superior to the Emilia—for instance by the Tietzes, Harold Wethey, and Fern Rusk Shapley [15]—the two works are perfectly homogenous in
terms of their style and handling. Yet in these respects, as well as in their compositions, they are undeniably Titianesque, and the suspicions about the authenticity of the documentation do not disprove the obvious inference that they are products of Titian’s workshop. At this stage of his career, the master himself would have been devoting his best efforts almost exclusively to King Philip II of Spain, and when undertaking what he could only have regarded as an unwelcome chore at the request of a former patron, it is hardly surprising that he should have delegated it to one of his various studio assistants.

Whether or not this assistant was Gian Paolo Pace is another matter. Again, the mention in the Memoriale that he was responsible for making a start at least on the portrait of Irene may be regarded as reliable, since no unscrupulous historian or dealer would have had any interest in inventing a story about a painter who was almost entirely obscure. Since 1911 Pace has, in fact, been widely accepted as the author of the portraits, in whole or in part, including by Corrado Ricci, the Tietzes, Ettore Camesasca, Wethey, and Giorgio Tagliaferro. [16] Recently, however, Mattia Biffis has again minimized Pace’s involvement, following his demonstration that, contrary to previous assumptions, this painter was never an assistant in Titian’s workshop, but rather an autonomous master based in Padua. [17] Further, Biffis provided good reasons for thinking that the most reliable touchstone for his own personal style is neither the Titianesque portrait of Giovanni delle Bande Nere (Uffizi, Florence) [fig. 1], nor the Spilimbergo portraits, but the Gallery’s own, stylistically very different, portrait of Alessandro Alberti. If Biffis is correct, then Pace may indeed have begun both portraits, making studies of the faces from life and blocking out the compositions on their canvases; but then the upper layers would have been executed by an assistant in Titian’s workshop. Unfortunately, the evidence of the x-radiographs [fig. 2] does not provide a clear solution to the attributional conundrum.

Sometimes associated with the pair is a stylistically and compositionally similar Portrait of a Woman, formerly in the Quincy Shaw collection, Boston, and the Peterkin collection, Andover, Massachusetts. Since it is smaller than the pair (72 × 48 cm), Lionello Venturi suggested that it was Titian’s autograph modello for the Irene. [18] The Tietzes identified it instead as Titian’s much earlier portrait of the sisters’ mother, Giulia da Ponte, recorded in Zuan Paolo’s Memoriale and by Vasari. [19] But Francesco Valcanover was certainly correct in rejecting the attribution to Titian; and his own attribution to Cesare Vecellio is more in keeping with the later style of the costume. [20] Crowe and Cavalcaselle recorded a 16th-
century copy of the *Irene* in the possession of Signor Gatorno, San Vito del Tagliamento. [21] Linda Borean drew attention to a picture formerly in the Brownlow collection, in which the composition of the *Irene*, complete with unicorn in the background, is re-elaborated as a *Saint Catherine*. [22]

Peter Humfrey
March 21, 2019
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**fig. 1** Workshop of Titian (Gian Paolo Pace), *Giovanni delle Bande Nere*, c. 1545, oil on canvas, Uffizi Gallery, Florence. Su concessione del Ministero dei beni e delle attività culturali e del turismo

**fig. 2** X-radiograph, Assistant of Titian, possibly begun by Gian Paolo Pace, *Emilia di Spilimbergo*, c. 1560, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Widener Collection

NOTES


[3] See *Tiziano ritrovato: Il ritratto di messer Zuan Paulo da Ponte* (Venice, 1998). The portrait of Zuan Paolo, which in 1998 was with the dealer Pietro Scarpa in Venice, carries the inscription on the reverse: +ZAN PAULO DA PONTE+/ SPILINBERGO. The picture appears to be in poor condition but authentic. Zuan Paolo’s *Memoriale* is reputedly in a private collection in Venice and is not easily accessible.


[7] The first passage, dated June 28, 1560, reads as follows: “Mandai a messer Titian per l’opera per lui fata nel retrato della nostra già benedetta memoria d’Irene abozata assai malamaente da Ser Zuan Paulo de Pase et lassata imperfetta per dui anni si che rimase ben che la poverina andò a miglior vita. Ma Messer Titian per sua gratia si tolse il cargo de volerlo finir et consata talmente che si può dir per certo che se fusse sta presente meglio non si poteva desiderar. Gli mandai ducati 6 viniciani et per sua cortesia se a contenta che mertia assai più” (I sent for Messer Titian to undertake the work he did on the portrait of our Irene of blessed memory. This had been begun very badly by Gian Paolo Pace two years before the poor girl went to a better life, but was left unfinished by him. But Messer Titian graciously assumed the burden of completing it, making her appear as if really present,
in a way that was better than one could possibly have hoped for. I sent him six Venetian ducats, which he courteously accepted, although his work was worth much more). The second passage reads: “Il qual M. Tutian per haver nella mente la sua effigie l’a finita e fata si che se l’havesse avuto presente non l’haveria potuto far meglio” (Titian had retained her likeness in his mind, and when finishing her portrait he made her appear as if present, in a way that could scarcely be bettered). See Ferruccio Carreri, “Report in La Difesa, 17–18 August 1911,” L’arte 14 (1911): 394, repro.; Michelangelo Muraro, “Il memoriale de Zuan Paolo da Ponte,” Archivio veneto 79 (1949): 83.


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The painting was executed on a medium-weight twill-weave fabric, which was prepared with a white ground, followed by a thin dark-brown imprimatura layer. The artist applied the paint wet-into-wet, often using a well-laden brush to produce impasto. The x-radiographs [fig. 1] show that the composition was roughly sketched in with lead white over the dark imprimatura. They also reveal pentimenti in the seascape to the right, in the position of the ship, and in the form of the clouds.

The support was lined and the tacking margins were removed, and although cusping is apparent only on the top and bottom edges, there is no indication that the painting has been reduced in size. The paint is now in poor condition, with the impasto disrupted by the cupped and crushed surface, and it is covered with thick yellowed varnish and copious overpaint. The awkward position of the sitter’s eyes is explained by the fact that little of the left eye is original, and the mouth has also been altered by retouching.

Joanna Dunn and Peter Humfrey based on the examination reports by William Leisher, Susanna Griswold, and Joanna Dunn
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PROVENANCE

Commissioned by the Spilimbergo family, Spilimbergo, Italy; by inheritance to Count Giulio di Spilimbergo, Domanins, by 1819;[1] by inheritance to Count Niccolò d'Attimis Maniago, Florence, by 1904;[2] and Count Enrico d'Attimis Maniago, Florence until 1909; Elia Volpi [1858-1938], Florence; sold 1909 to (Duveen Brothers, Inc., London and New York); sold October 1909 to Peter A.B. Widener [1834-1915], Elkins Park, Pennsylvania;[3] Inheritance from the Estate of Peter A.B. Widener by gift through power of appointment of Joseph E. Widener, Elkins Park.

TECHNICAL COMPARATIVE FIGURES

fig. 1 X-radiograph, Assistant of Titian, possibly begun by Gian Paolo Pace, Emilia di Spilimbergo, c. 1560, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Widener Collection
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Girolamo and Cardinal Marco Corner Investing Marco, Abbot of Carrara, with His Benefice

c. 1520/1525

oil on canvas
overall: 99.8 x 132.1 cm (39 5/16 x 52 in.)
framed: 137.8 x 170.2 x 11.6 cm (54 1/4 x 67 x 4 9/16 in.)
Timken Collection  1960.6.38

A label formerly on the back of the frame (now in the curatorial files) carries inscriptions in two different 18th-century hands: “Quadro di Tiziano rappresentante il Padre, e due Fratelli della Regina Cornaro” (Picture by Titian representing the father and two brothers of the Queen [Caterina] Cornaro); and “In segno di vera stima, di gratitudine, e amicizia / All'onorato Suo Signore e Amico / Cav. G.o Hamilton / Antonio Canova” (As a token of true esteem, gratitude and friendship, to his honored friend Cavalier G. Hamilton, from Antonio Canova).

In an unpublished study of the picture of 1972, [1] Douglas Lewis, formerly curator of sculpture at the National Gallery of Art, identified this “G. Hamilton” as the Scottish painter and dealer Gavin Hamilton (1723–1798), who was resident in Rome.
from 1748, and who played an important part in promoting Canova’s early career. Almost certainly, however, Canova’s dedicatee was William Richard Hamilton (1777–1859), and the initial—the orthography of which indeed appears to read “G.o”—stands for “Guglielmo” (see Provenance).

When the picture first appeared on the art market in 1929, Detlev von Hadeln identified the subject as the conferral of a benefice by an unknown cardinal on a youth in the presence of his father. [2] In his detailed study of 1972, Lewis provided a convincing identification of all three sitters and advanced a range of suggestions regarding the circumstances of the commission. Noting that the inscription on the label on the back identifying the sitters cannot for historical reasons be correct, Lewis nevertheless deduced that they represent members of a subsequent generation of the wealthy and powerful Corner family of Venice. He confirmed this deduction by identifying the cardinal as Marco Corner (1482–1524), nephew of Queen Caterina, on the basis of an anonymous portrait medal [fig. 1]. [3] Since the reverse of the medal carries an inscription describing the subject as Cardinal of San Marco in Rome, a title that he received only seven months before his death in July 1524, the medal must date from this brief period; and since the painted portrait, in strict and archaic profile, is manifestly based on the medal (rather than vice versa), a terminus ante quem of 1524, at least for the right side of the painting, is thereby established. Cardinal Marco was the holder of numerous ecclesiastical benefices, the two most lucrative of which were the Benedictine abbeys of San Zeno in Verona and of Carrara Santo Stefano, south of Padua; and in 1519 he formally agreed to pass them on respectively to two of his Corner nephews: Andrea, son of his elder brother Giacomo, and Marco, son of his younger brother Girolamo.

Lewis proposed that the triple portrait commemorates the bestowal of the lucrative abbacy of Carrara on the youthful Marco (1513–1546), [4] in the presence of the boy’s father Girolamo (c. 1485–1551). The chief argument against identifying the figures on the left as Giacomo and Andrea Corner is that the former was made senator in 1519 and would thereafter naturally have been portrayed in his official toga; further, Giacomo’s possessions, including any family portraits, would have been lost in the devastating fires that consumed each of the family palaces in which he lived, respectively in 1532 and 1535. Girolamo’s possessions, by contrast, were housed in a third family palace, the so-called Palazzo Corner della Regina at San Cassiano, where they remained until they were dispersed toward the end of the 18th century. Girolamo spent most of his earlier life in Candia (Crete), where the
family had important commercial interests, and returned to live in Venice only in 1537. [5] He is known, however, from the copious diaries of Marin Sanudo to have spent three years on a return visit to the city between 1517 and 1520—at the very time, in other words, that his brother Cardinal Marco conferred the benefice of Carrara on Girolamo’s eldest son, Marco. Since Girolamo would not have been available to sit for his portrait after July 1520, Lewis proposed that the central figure—qualitatively the finest of the three—dates from the summer of that year; and consistent with this proposal is the fact that, as pointed out by Hadeln, the style of his costume and hair corresponds to the fashion of the second decade, and would already have been completely outmoded by the mid-1520s. [6] Lewis accordingly concluded that the group portrait, although planned from the beginning to commemorate the event of 1519, was painted in two phases, with the figure of Girolamo painted on the eve of his return to Crete, and that of the cardinal, who was in Rome throughout the period of his brother’s visit, added posthumously in 1524 or soon afterward. Young Marco did not accompany his father back to Crete, but remained in Venice under the guardianship of his grandfather Zorzi Corner; and since he appears in the portrait as an adolescent rather than as a seven-year-old child, it may be assumed that his present figure was executed contemporaneously with that of his uncle and namesake. Consistent with Lewis’s conclusion that the portrait was worked on in more than one phase are the extensive pentimenti revealed by the x-radiographs [fig. 2], including a radical change to the head of the boy. A portrait medal of Girolamo in classicizing profile, made much later, in 1540, by Giovanni da Cavino, shows features that are at least consistent with those of the central figure [fig. 3]. [7] No other portrait of the younger Marco is known.

Girolamo did not return from Crete until 1537. Soon afterward he was elected a member of the powerful magistracy of the Council of Ten, and in 1539–1540 he served as capitano of Padua. At this time he commissioned an important fresco cycle from Domenico Campagnola, Stefano della Arzere, and others in the Sala dei Giganti in the Palazzo del Capitaniato, and the construction by the architect Michele Sanmicheli of the bastion on the city walls that still bears the Corner name. [8]

The attribution of the portrait is controversial. When first publishing it in 1929, Hadeln attributed it to Titian, and dated it to circa 1520. [9] Walter Heil, Wilhelm Suida, Lionello Venturi, and Burton Fredericksen and Federico Zeri agreed with this opinion. [10] However, the picture was ignored by Hans Tietze, Francesco
Valcanover, Rodolfo Pallucchini, and most other writers, and Harold Wethey explicitly rejected it, describing it as “the work of a minor master” of circa 1530. [11] Lewis reasserted the view of Hadeln and drew attention to the traditional attribution to Titian recorded on the 18th-century label on the back. Basing his opinion largely on his investigation of the identities and biographies of the sitters, Lewis also claimed the central figure of Girolamo Corner now represented Titian’s earliest dated portrait. Lewis explained the unsatisfactory aspects of the portrait, and in particular the uncharacteristically disjointed composition and the stilted, uncommunicative expression of Cardinal Marco, with reference to the unfavorable circumstances surrounding the commission, and also to its present abraded and overpainted condition; but he also emphasized the high quality of certain areas, and especially of the figure of Girolamo.

More recently, and without access to Lewis’s paper, Paul Joannides has attributed the painting to an “Associate of Titian,” circa 1520. [12] Also noting the disjointed composition, he suggested that each of the three heads was based on a separate portrait by Titian and that they were combined in the present unsatisfactory way in the manner of a much-later painting from Titian’s workshop, the so-called Titian and His Friends in the Royal Collection at Hampton Court (see illustration in entry on Andrea de’ Franceschi). [13] As has been seen, the head of Cardinal Marco must date from after 1524; and if the figure of Girolamo is not by Titian himself, as suggested by Lewis, but a copy after an independent portrait, painted between 1517 and 1520 but now lost, then the picture as a whole is likely to date from the mid- to late 1520s. The present badly abraded condition of the painting makes the authorship of the central figure almost impossible to determine; but against Lewis it may be argued that it is difficult to imagine Titian bringing the central figure of a triple portrait to a high level of completion while leaving the figure on the right a complete blank. In favor, however, of at least some direct involvement by Titian in the commission, even if he delegated the execution to an assistant, is the fact that the Corner family was one of the wealthiest and most influential in Venice. It may also be noted that the original idea for a monumental column in the left background corresponds to similar motifs in other works of the early 1520s, notably the Ca’ Pesaro altarpiece of 1519–1526 (Frari, Venice). Lewis suggested that the work was commissioned by the powerful cavalier and procurator of San Marco, Giorgio (Zorzi) Corner (1454–1527), brother to the queen of Cyprus, father of Cardinal Marco and Girolamo, and guardian of the younger Marco; but it is perhaps equally likely that it was commissioned by Girolamo in 1519, at the time of the conferral of the benefice. In that case, the return of Girolamo to Crete in 1520, and

Girolamo and Cardinal Marco Corner Investing Marco, Abbot of Carrara, with His Benefice
the continuing absence of Marco, would have removed the pressure on Titian to complete the painting himself, especially at a moment when he was under siege from numerous other important patrons, from within Venice and especially from elsewhere in northern Italy.
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fig. 1 Anonymous portrait medal of Marco Corner (Bibliothèque nationale de France), from George Francis Hill, *A Corpus of Italian Medals of the Renaissance before Cellini*, vol. 2 (London, 1930), plate 96, no. 528. Photograph courtesy of National Gallery of Art Library

fig. 2 X-radiograph, Follower of Titian, *Girolamo and Cardinal Marco Corner Investing Marco, Abbot of Carrara, with His Benefice*, c. 1520/1525, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Timken Collection
fig. 3 Giovanni da Cavino, Girolamo Cornaro, c. 1486–1551, Venetian Patrician, 1540, bronze, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection

NOTES

[1] In NGA curatorial files.


[4] Although the Barbaro genealogies of Venetian patrician families in the Archivio di Stato, Venice, do not record any son of Girolamo named Marco, Lewis cites a number of other documents and sources, including the diaries of Marin Sanudo, which together make up a skeleton biography.

[5] For a further summary biography of Girolamo, see Giulio Bodon, Heroum imagines: La sala dei giganti a Padova. Un monumento della tradizione classica e della cultura antiquaria, foreword by Irene Favaretto, with
interventions by Elisabetta Saccomani and Carla Ravazzolo (Venice, 2009), 30–37, with an acceptance of Lewis’s identification of the subject of the present painting.


[7] Girolamo Cornaro, c. 1486–1551, Venetian Patrician, National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1957.14.984.a. At least two other candidates for portraits of Girolamo by Titian have been advanced in recent years. Joannides thought that he was the sitter for a portrait of c. 1512 that he calls *The Commander* (private collection), but as is clear from Sanudo’s diaries, Girolamo was absent from Venice throughout the period 1510–1517. Hochmann tentatively suggested that the *Man with a Hawk* of c. 1529 in the Joslyn Art Museum, Omaha, apparently a member of the Corner family, is Girolamo; but again, the fact that he was away in Candia throughout the 1520s and early 1530s precludes this identification. See Paul Joannides, “A Portrait by Titian of Girolamo Cornaro,” *Artibus et Historiae* 34, no. 67 (2013): 247; and Michel Hochmann, “Les collections des familles papalistes à Venise et à Rome du XVIe au XVIIIe siècle,” in *Geografia del collezionismo: Italia e Francia tra il XVI e il XVIII secolo*, ed. Olivier Bonfait et al. (Paris, 2001), 210–211.


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The picture, which is in very poor condition, was executed on a plain-weave fabric prepared with a gray ground. It has been lined, and cusping is only visible along the top and bottom edges. Although no underdrawing was detected in the infrared examination, marks made during the course of execution to reassess the design are visible in the x-radiographs [fig. 1]. These are notational arabesques, made with thick paint dragged across the canvas, and are found in the arm of the young man and the hand of the cardinal holding the letter. Significant pentimenti, unrelated to these arabesques, range from a reduction in the size of the young man’s head, to extensive alterations in the top left corner, where architectural features consisting of a column and its base, drawn as if from below, lie beneath the sky. Discrepancies in condition and execution make each face appear different in the x-radiograph. That of the central figure is the best preserved and is painted boldly within a predefined area. The young man’s chin was once lower, with more of his neck visible. The cardinal, whose profile was tightly drawn, is very worn, so that the handling is confused by the multiple losses and small strokes of overpaint that litter this area.

The painting bears signs of old cupping and delamination problems, possibly exacerbated by the lining. The surface has been crushed, and numerous small triangular losses give the painting a speckled appearance. The larger losses have been filled and inpainted, but elsewhere retouching is restrained, and little attempt has been made to disguise the wear.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Mary Bustin
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[1] The transfer of ownership from the Corner family to Kauffmann by way of Udny is documented by a letter of 1788 from Gavin Hamilton to the dealer G.M. Sasso in Venice. Hamilton mentions that Angelica Kauffmann (Zucchi) owned “un bel quadro di ritratti di casa Cornaro di Tiziano. Ha sofferto ed è molto ridipinto, ma è stato bello. Era di mister Udny, e facilmente è uscito da questa casa” (A beautiful
portrait of members of the Corner family by Titian. It is very damaged and has been much repainted, but it has been beautiful. It formerly belonged to Mr Udny, who acquired it without difficulty from the family); see Francesca Del Torre, “Gavin Hamilton a Giovanni Maria Sasso,” in Lettere artistiche del Settecento veneziano, ed. Alessandro Bettagno and Marina Magrini, 4 vols., Vicenza, 2002-2009: 1(2002):450-451. Kauffmann herself mentions the picture in her will of 1803: “A fine painting by Titian, three half-figures, portraits of the old family Cornaro of Venice” (Victoria Manners and George Charles Williamson, Angelica Kauffman, R. A.: Her Life and Her Works, London, 1924: 244). The identification of the subject as three members of the Corner family in half-length, the attribution to Titian, and the mention of the poor condition of the picture together make it virtually certain that it is identical with the Gallery’s picture.

[2] The gift, recorded in the inscription on the back of the painting, was made following Canova’s meeting with Hamilton in Paris in 1815. Hamilton, British Undersecretary of State for Foreign Affairs, played a leading role in forcing the French government to return many of the artistic spoils seized by Napoleon from the papal states; and in token of his gratitude, Canova presented to him not only the NGA picture, but one of his Ideal Heads (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, 1996.395), and a handsomely bound volume of engravings after Titian (Katherine Eustace, ed., Canova: Ideal Heads, Oxford, 1997: 30 n. 76; Giuseppe Pavanello, “La collezione di Antonio Canova: Dipinti e disegni dal Quattrocento all’Ottocento,” in Antonio Canova e il suo ambiente artistico fra Venezia, Roma e Parigi, ed. Giuseppe Pavanello, Venice, 2000: 334). Presumably Canova acquired the picture from the estate of Kauffmann, who had died in 1807 (see note 1).

[3] In common with the other gifts from Canova to Hamilton (see note 2).
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The portraits of the sisters Irene and Emilia di Spilimbergo, presumably painted as a pair, remained in the possession of the Spilimbergo family and their descendants until 1909, when they were sold under controversial circumstances to Duveen and exported from Italy to America. Much of the controversy stemmed from a persistent local tradition that the portraits were by Titian. An engraving of the Irene, for example, had served as the frontispiece of Count di Maniago’s influential account of the history of art in Friuli of 1819. [1] From about 1930, however, most critics have seen them rather as by a close follower, perhaps identifiable as Gian Paolo Pace.

Emilia (1536–1585) and her younger sister Irene (1538–1559) were the daughters of the Friulian nobleman Adriano di Spilimbergo and Giulia, daughter of the wealthy Venetian citizen Zuan Paolo da Ponte. According to Giorgio Vasari, Titian painted the portraits of the members of three generations of the family: “Among the portraits by Titian is one . . . of Paolo da Ponte, whose beautiful young daughter Giulia (who was a confidante of his) Titian also portrayed, as he did the lovely Signora Irene, a young woman well versed in literature and music who was studying design. When she died about seven years ago she was honoured by nearly every Italian writer.” [2] At least part of this information is certainly correct, as has been shown with the recent rediscovery of Titian’s portrait of Zuan Paolo da Ponte, together with references in the latter’s Memoriale—a manuscript journal in five volumes covering the years 1520 to 1562—which show that this portrait and...
that of Giulia were commissioned from the painter in 1534. [3] And in his last remark about Giulia’s daughter Irene, Vasari is clearly referring to a volume of nearly 400 Latin and Italian poems, including contributions by Torquato Tasso and Lodovico Dolce, which was published in 1561 by Dionigi Atanagi, in honor of the gifted young woman who had died at such a tragically early age. [4]

Atanagi’s biography of Irene, together with further modern research, provides considerable information about her personality and accomplishments. [5] After the death of their father in 1541, she and her sister were educated under the supervision of their maternal grandfather, who actively encouraged their interest in the arts, and who in about 1555 brought them to Venice. Irene was remarkable in her ambition to excel, and stimulated by the example of Sofonisba Anguissola, she persuaded Titian, as a family friend, to allow her to copy his works and to give her tuition as a painter. But her very determination apparently led to overexertion and hence to illness and early death. Much less is known of Emilia, who was born in 1536, married in 1561, and died in 1585. But three of the poems in Atanagi’s volume praise her as the image of her sister, and two years later she was the dedicatee of Anton Maria Amadi’s edition of one of Petrarch’s Sonnets. [6]

On June 28, 1560, a few months after Irene’s death the previous December, her grandfather noted in his Memoriale that a portrait of her—and presumably also one of her sister—had been begun two years previously by Gian Paolo Pace, but that this painter had sketched it so poorly that the patron asked Titian to complete it. [7] If begun in 1558, the portraits had as their original function, as observed by Elsje van Kessel, some probable relation to the sitters’ prospective marriages: either to present two highly eligible, aristocratic young woman to prospective husbands; or, given their character as balancing pendants, as permanent souvenirs for their family after they were married. [8] With the premature death of Irene, however, the function of her portrait was suddenly changed to become an elegy for what might have been, in a way analogous to the volume of poems. [9] A number of details are certainly consistent with this change of function, notably the inscription (“If the fates had allowed”). Although there is no particular reference to her activity as a painter, the laurel crown in her hand presumably alludes to her achievements in the arts in general, and the evergreen palm to her everlasting fame. Another obvious symbol is the unicorn in the left middle ground, which as already pointed out in 1819 by Di Maniago, refers to her perpetual virginity. [10] The column with its base further invests Irene’s portrait with a grandeur not present in that of her sister. Too little information exists about Emilia’s biography to know for certain why the seascape
to the right shows a storm-tossed ship; but since the portraits were almost certainly painted contemporaneously as pendants, the motif probably alludes to the turbulent state of her emotions on the loss of her sister. Such an allusion, and such a close linkage with Irene, would perhaps have been less appropriate after Emilia’s marriage in 1561. On circumstantial evidence, therefore, the pair of portraits—like Atanagi’s celebratory volume—is likely to have been completed in the immediate aftermath of Irene’s death in 1559.

The traditional attribution of the portraits to Titian, based on the account of Vasari, and also on the very similar one by Carlo Ridolfi, was still unchallenged at the beginning of the 20th century. [11] Only Joseph Archer Crowe and Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle had expressed doubts about their quality, but they attributed any shortcomings to damage and repaint. [12] In 1904, when they were in the possession of Count Niccolò D’Attimis Maniago, a descendant of the Spilimbergo and Da Ponte families, they were listed in an Italian government catalog as works of “sommo pregio” (the highest value), implying that they were by Titian. In 1908, however, Count Enrico D’Attimis Maniago applied to the Italian commission on the export of works of art for a downgrading of the status of the portraits, and hence for permission to sell them abroad. In 1909 the commission agreed that they were not by Titian, and an export license was granted; within the same year, they passed through the hands of the dealer Elia Volpi and were acquired by Joseph Duveen. [13] It was clearly now in Duveen’s interest to revert to the traditional attribution, and this case was greatly aided by the discovery of Zuan Paolo da Ponte’s Memoriale in 1910, and the publication in 1911 by Ferruccio Carreri of the passages referring to Titian’s involvement (see Entry note 7). In 1949 doubts about the authenticity of these passages were raised by Michelangelo Muraro, who having examined the original manuscript, noted first that the two relevant pages were now missing, and second that the name of Titian does not appear in the index to the volume. Muraro observed that the publication of the two passages coincided closely with the controversy surrounding the sale of the portraits from the Spilimbergo family to Duveen, and suggested that they had been fabricated to prove Titian’s authorship of the Irene. [14]

In the absence of the original document, it is difficult to assess the reliability or otherwise of the passages published by Carreri; yet it seems likely that even if they were tampered with, they were not, after all, complete fabrications. It is true that in terms of their aesthetic quality neither of the Spilimbergo portraits can be accepted as the work of Titian, even in part; and although a case has sometimes been made
for seeing the Irene as superior to the Emilia—for instance by the Tietzes, Harold Wethey, and Fern Rusk Shapley [15]—the two works are perfectly homogenous in terms of their style and handling. Yet in these respects, as well as in their compositions, they are undeniably Titianesque, and the suspicions about the authenticity of the documentation do not disprove the obvious inference that they are products of Titian’s workshop. At this stage of his career, the master himself would have been devoting his best efforts almost exclusively to King Philip II of Spain, and when undertaking what he could only have regarded as an unwelcome chore at the request of a former patron, it is hardly surprising that he should have delegated it to one of his various studio assistants.

Whether or not this assistant was Gian Paolo Pace is another matter. Again, the mention in the Memoriale that he was responsible for making a start at least on the portrait of Irene may be regarded as reliable, since no unscrupulous historian or dealer would have had any interest in inventing a story about a painter who was almost entirely obscure. Since 1911 Pace has, in fact, been widely accepted as the author of the portraits, in whole or in part, including by Corrado Ricci, the Tietzes, Ettore Camesasca, Wethey, and Giorgio Tagliaferro. [16] Recently, however, Mattia Biffis has again minimized Pace’s involvement, following his demonstration that, contrary to previous assumptions, this painter was never an assistant in Titian’s workshop, but rather an autonomous master based in Padua. [17] Further, Biffis provided good reasons for thinking that the most reliable touchstone for his own personal style is neither the Titianesque portrait of Giovanni delle Bande Nere (Uffizi, Florence) [fig. 1], nor the Spilimbergo portraits, but the Gallery’s own, stylistically very different, portrait of Alessandro Alberti. If Biffis is correct, then Pace may indeed have begun both portraits, making studies of the faces from life and blocking out the compositions on their canvases; but then the upper layers would have been executed by an assistant in Titian’s workshop. Unfortunately, the evidence of the x-radiographs [fig. 2] does not provide a clear solution to the attributional conundrum.

Sometimes associated with the pair is a stylistically and compositionally similar Portrait of a Woman, formerly in the Quincy Shaw collection, Boston, and the Peterkin collection, Andover, Massachusetts. Since it is smaller than the pair (72 × 48 cm), Lionello Venturi suggested that it was Titian’s autograph modello for the Irene. [18] The Tietzes identified it instead as Titian’s much earlier portrait of the sisters’ mother, Giulia da Ponte, recorded in Zuan Paolo’s Memoriale and by Vasari. [19] But Francesco Valcanover was certainly correct in rejecting the
attribution to Titian; and his own attribution to Cesare Vecellio is more in keeping with the later style of the costume. [20] Crowe and Cavalcaselle recorded a 16th-century copy of the Irene in the possession of Signor Gatorno, San Vito del Tagliamento. [21] Linda Borean drew attention to a picture formerly in the Brownlow collection, in which the composition of the Irene, complete with unicorn in the background, is re-elaborated as a Saint Catherine. [22]
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fig. 1 Workshop of Titian (Gian Paolo Pace), Giovanni delle Bande Nere, c. 1545, oil on canvas, Uffizi Gallery, Florence. Su concessione del Ministero dei beni e delle attività culturali e del turismo

fig. 2 X-radiograph, Assistant of Titian, possibly begun by Gian Paolo Pace, Irene di Spilimbergo, c. 1560, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Widener Collection

Irene di Spilimbergo
© National Gallery of Art, Washington
NOTES


[7] The first passage, dated June 28, 1560, reads as follows: “Mandai a messer Tutian per l’opera per lui fata nel retrato della nostra già benedetta memoria d’Irene abozata assai malamaente da Ser Zuan Paulo de Pase et lassata imperfecta per dui anni si che rimase ben che la poverina andò a miglior vita. Ma Messer Tutian per sua gratia si tolse il cargo de volerlo finir et conzata talmente che si può dir per certo che se fusse sta presente meglio non si poteva desiderar. Gli mandai ducati 6 viniciani et per sua cortesia se a contenta che mertia assai più” (I sent for Messer Titian to undertake the work he did on the portrait of our Irene of blessed memory. This had been begun very badly by Gian Paolo Pace two years before the poor girl went to
a better life, but was left unfinished by him. But Messer Titian graciously
assumed the burden of completing it, making her appear as if really present,
in a way that was better than one could possibly have hoped for. I sent him
six Venetian ducats, which he courteously accepted, although his work was
worth much more). The second passage reads: “Il qual M. Tutian per haver
nella mente la sua effigie l’a finita e fata si che se l’havesse avuto presente
non l’haveria potuto far meglio” (Titian had retained her likeness in his mind,
and when finishing her portrait he made her appear as if present, in a way
that could scarcely be bettered). See Ferruccio Carreri, “Report in La Difesa,

Venetian Art of the Sixteenth Century (Berlin, 2017), 145.

Venetian Art of the Sixteenth Century (Berlin, 2017), 137, 146–150.


[11] For Vasari, see Entry note 2; Carlo Ridolfi, Le maraviglie dell’arte, overo Le
vite de g’illustri pittori veneti, e dello stato, ed. Detlev von Hadeln (Berlin,
1914), 1:194.

[12] Joseph Archer Crowe and Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle, Titian, His Life

[13] For these events, see Corrado Ricci, “Ritratti ‘tizianeschi’ di Gian Paolo
Pace,” Rivista del R. Istituto d’Archeologia e Storia dell’Arte 7 (1929):
257–258. The rejection of the traditional attribution to Titian is recorded by
Oscar Ulm, “I ritratti d'Irene ed Emilia di Spilimbergo erroneamente attribuiti

veneto 79 (1949): 82–84. See also Hans Tietze and Erica Tietze-Conrat, “I


d’Archeologia e Storia dell’Arte 7 (1929): 257; Hans Tietze and Erica Tietze-
Ettore Camesasca, ed., Lettere sull’arte di Pietro Aretino, comm. Fidenzio
Pertile (Milan, 1960), 3:397; Harold Wethey, The Paintings of Titian (London,
1971), 2:178, 198; Giorgio Tagliaferro in Le botteghe di Tiziano (Florence,
2009), 168–172. Shapley, however, suspicious of Carreri’s document,
rejected the attribution to Pace, and gave the picture to an anonymous
The painting was executed on a medium-weight twill-weave fabric, which was prepared with a white ground followed by a thin dark brown imprimatura layer. The artist applied the paint wet-into-wet, often using a well-laden brush to produce impasto. The x-radiographs [fig. 1] show that the column was originally more gracefully rounded and shown from a lower viewpoint.

The support was lined and the tacking margins were removed, and although cusping is only apparent on the top and bottom edges, there is no indication that the painting has been reduced in size. The paint is now in poor condition, with the impasto disrupted by the cupped and crushed surface, and it is covered with thick, yellowed varnish and copious overpaint. The overpaint blurs the modeling in many places. The inscription has been reinforced, and only the first two words are visible in the x-radiograph.

Joanna Dunn and Peter Humfrey based on the examination reports by William Leisher, Mary Bustin, and Joanna Dunn
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**fig. 1** X-radiograph, Assistant of Titian, possibly begun by Gian Paolo Pace, *Irene di Spilimbergo*, c. 1560, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Widener Collection

PROVENANCE

Commissioned by the Spilimbergo family, Spilimbergo, Italy; by inheritance to Count Giulio di Spilimbergo, Domains, by 1819;[1] by inheritance to Count Niccolò d'Attimis Maniago, Florence, by 1904;[2] and Count Enrico d'Attimis Maniago, Florence, until 1909; Elia Volpi [1858-1938], Florence; sold 1909 to (Duveen Brothers, Inc., London and New York); sold October 1909 to Peter A.B. Widener [1834-1915], Elkins Park, Pennsylvania;[3] Inheritance from the Estate of Peter A.B. Widener by gift through power of appointment of Joseph E. Widener, Elkins Park.
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ENTRY

Ranuccio Farnese (1530–1565) was the grandson of Pope Paul III (reigned 1534–1549); the third son of Pierluigi Farnese, duke of Castro (1503–1547); and the younger brother of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese (1520–1589). [1] As an 11-year-old in 1541, Ranuccio was sent by his family to northeast Italy, where he was looked after by the Venetian prelates Marino Grimani, patriarch of Aquileia, and Andrea Corner, bishop of Brescia, and by the humanist scholar Gianfrancesco Leoni. The main purpose of the trip was for the boy to attend a course of study at the University of Padua, but he was also taken to Venice to visit the church of San Giovanni di Malta in Venice, of which he had recently been made commendatory prior. [2] As was perhaps arranged by Pietro Bembo, [3] while in Venice he sat for the present portrait, in which Titian shows him wearing the black cloak and distinctive eight-pointed silver cross of the Knights of Saint John of Malta.

The fullest contemporary information about the circumstances of the commission is provided by a letter from Leoni in Padua to Cardinal Alessandro in Rome, dated September 22, 1542. Leoni wrote that the bishop of Brescia was about to return to Rome, bringing with him the completed portrait; that the bishop commissioned it as a gift for the boy’s mother (Gerolama Orsini, duchess of Castro); and that it demonstrates Titian’s extraordinary skill as a portraitist, especially since it was executed partly in the presence of the sitter and partly in his absence. [4] Leoni added that the bishop and the patriarch had been applying pressure on the painter to go to Rome to undertake further commissions for the Farnese family.
As is revealed by a letter from the painter’s friend Pietro Aretino to the sculptor Leone Leoni in July 1539, [5] Titian had in fact already been seeking an opportunity to work for the wealthy and powerful Farneses for a few years. As suggested by Wilhelm Suida, a role as intermediary was perhaps played by Cardinal Bembo, [6] who had sat for Titian shortly before leaving Venice for Rome in October 1539 (see Cardinal Pietro Bembo, entry), and who wrote to their mutual Venetian friend Elisabetta Querini to announce Ranuccio’s departure from Rome in August 1541. [7] According to Bembo, the plan was for the boy to stay in Venice for two or three weeks before moving on to Padua, and it may have been at this time that at least initial sittings for the portrait took place. Alternatively, as suggested by Gigliola Fragnito, the portrait may have been begun only in the following July, to commemorate Ranuccio’s attendance at the annual meeting in Venice of the Knights of Malta. [8] In any case, the evident success of the completed and delivered work resulted in an invitation to Titian to attend the pope in Bologna in the spring of 1543, where he painted the portrait of Paul III without a Cap (Capodimonte, Naples), and then to stay with the papal entourage in its progress to a meeting with the emperor at Busseto. These initial contacts with the papal family were then followed by Titian’s visit to Rome in 1545–1546, and by the numerous further Farnese commissions that surrounded the trip, including the celebrated portrait of Paul III with Two Grandsons (Capodimonte, Naples).

The priorship of San Giovanni di Malta was the first in a succession of ecclesiastical offices and benefices conferred on Ranuccio. In 1544 he was made archbishop of Naples; in 1545 he became cardinal of Santa Lucia in Selci (a title later exchanged for that of Sant’Angelo); in 1549 he was made patriarch of Constantinople and archbishop of Ravenna; and in 1564, shortly before his premature death, he became archbishop of Milan. [9] He was much less active as a patron of art than his brother Alessandro, and he did not exploit the contact with Titian by offering him any commissions of his own; he was, however, involved in overseeing the pictorial and architectural decoration of the Palazzo Farnese and the construction of the Oratorio del Crocefisso di San Marcello in Rome. [10]

After being sent to Rome at the end of 1542, the portrait was presumably hung with other family portraits in the Palazzo Farnese. As pointed out by Francis Kelly, it was used by Taddeo Zuccaro as the basis for the full-length portrait of Ranuccio included in his fresco of 1562–1563, Pierluigi Farnese Being Made Gonfalonier of the Church, in the Sala dei Fasti Farnesiani at the Villa Farnese, Caprarola. [11] Anthony van Dyck recorded the portrait in his Italian Sketchbook (British Museum,
London) of 1622/1623 [fig. 1]. [12] Before the transfer of the Farnese collection to Parma in the mid-17th century, inventories still provided an accurate identification of the sitter; already by 1680, however, he was described generically as “a boy.” [13] By the time the picture reached Naples, he was no longer recognized as a member of the Farnese family; and unlike Titian’s various other pictures in the former Farnese collection, the portrait disappeared, presumably onto the market, in the early 19th century. When the picture resurfaced in the Cook collection toward the end of the 19th century, John Charles Robinson accepted the signature as genuine, and because of the Neapolitan provenance, he accurately conjectured that the sitter was a member of the Farnese family. [14] Meanwhile, Amadeo Ronchini had published documents relating to Ranuccio’s visit to Venice in 1541–1542, and Joseph Archer Crowe and Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle had discussed the episode in their biography of Titian; in 1906, Georg Gronau was able to make the first link between the documents and the portrait. [15] But Gronau did not know the picture in the original, and following the judgment of Herbert Cook, he regarded it, together with other versions in the Berlin Museum and in the Brauer collection, Florence, as a copy, and the signature as false. [16] Cook himself had come to a more positive judgment by 1913, [17] but a majority of critics, including Oskar Fischel, Charles Ricketts, Tancred Borenius, Salomon Reinach, and Bernard Berenson, continued to categorize it as a copy after Titian, or else as a studio work. [18] Suida, however, followed by Hans Tietze, reasserted Cook’s revised opinion; [19] and since the cleaning of the picture in 1949–1950, no further doubts have been raised about its authenticity or high quality.

Following John Pope-Hennessy, [20] more recent critics have tended to emphasize its character, together with the Clarissa Strozzi, also of 1542 (Staatliche Museen, Berlin), as one of the outstanding contributions to child portraiture in the history of European art. David Rosand, for example, emphasized the expressive contrast between the trappings of high status, conveyed by the rich costume and the elegant, thigh-length pose, and the gentle innocence and diffidence of the face. [21] Peter Meller similarly pointed out that while the head and proportions are convincingly those of a boy, the neutral background is itself another element that relates the picture to Titian’s portraits of mature sitters. [22] Luba Freedman differentiated between the Ranuccio and the Clarissa Strozzi to the extent that the latter stresses the sitter’s character as a child (in this case, of only two years old), whereas the former portrays him as the future adult, and as the heir to a great
dynasty. However, the writer did not deny Titian’s awareness of the childlike vulnerability of the boy, in contrast to the contemporary court portraits of children by Bronzino, where they appear more purely as miniature adults. [23] A comparison between the more rigid, intellectualizing child portraits of central Italian Mannerism, and the appropriately spontaneous character of the Ranuccio, was already made by Rodolfo Pallucchini in 1969. [24]

Peter Humfrey
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fig. 1 Anthony van Dyck, after Titian, Leaf from Italian Sketchbook, with Ranuccio Farnese, 1622/1623, pen and brown ink, The British Museum, London. © Trustees of the British Museum
NOTES


[2] Also known as San Giovanni dei Furlani, or San Giovanni dei Templari (after its previous owners, the Knights Templar), the church passed in 1312 to the order of the Knights Hospitaller (known after 1530 as the Knights of Malta). See Umberto Franzoi, Le chiese di Venezia (Venice, 1975), 495.


[17] In a note appended to his corresponding entry in the catalog of the Cook collection, Tancred Borenius rejected the portrait, adding that “the slovenly signature is obviously a forgery.” But Cook disagreed, declaring in the same entry, “I cannot share any doubt as to the authenticity of this portrait; unfortunately its condition leaves much to be wished for, and this must explain its failure to command universal recognition.” See Tancred Borenius, *A Catalogue of the Paintings at Doughty House, Richmond, and Elsewhere in the Collection of Sir Frederick Cook Bt.*, vol. 1, *Italian Schools*, ed. Herbert Cook (London, 1913), 170.


THE TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The plainly woven, medium-weight support, which was last lined during conservation treatment in 1948–1950, is covered with an exceptionally thin layer of white ground. The paint is applied in thin, opaque layers throughout, with some low, textured brushwork in the white collar and in the highlights of the sword hilt and belt. Dark, shadowed areas of the face are modeled wet into wet with the flesh paint of the surface and are not, as might be assumed, areas of dark-colored ground left exposed. Examination of the painting with infrared did not reveal any underdrawing, nor did the x-radiographs indicate any major pentimenti, but both infrared reflectography (Vidicon) [1] and x-radiography indicate a slight change in the edge of the right-hand opening of the coat. A gray underpainted layer observed beneath the hand does not appear to exist below the fleshtones of the face.

Close examination of the signature with a binocular microscope did not reveal any cause to question its authenticity. The paint surface suffers from moderate general abrasion, particularly in the face, and elsewhere throughout the composition, the paint is abraded down to the tops of the dark-colored threads of the fabric support. Records indicate that the painting was lined by Stephen Pichetto in 1948 and cleaned and restored by Mario Modestini in 1949–1950.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Paula De Cristofaro
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[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Hamamatsu c/1000-03 Vidicon camera and a Kodak Wratten 87A filter.
PROVENANCE


[3] For the Farnese inventory of 1708, see Giuseppe Bertini, La Galleria del Duca di Parma: Storia di una collezione, Bologna, 1987: 89. See also Descrizione per alfabeto di cento quadri de’ più famosi, e dipinti da i più insigni pittori del modo,
The Farnese collection was transferred to Naples in 1734, probably initially to the Palazzo Reale, when it was inherited by Charles of Bourbon, king of Naples.


A. Filangieri di Candida, "La galleria nazionale di Napoli," *Le gallerie nazionali italiane* 5 (1902): 304, no. 34. As pointed out by M. Utili (see note 5), the picture is probably identical with a "ritratto di giovane di Tiziano," carried off to Rome in 1799 by French troops, together with other pictures from the royal collection, but returned to Naples before 1802.

According to the inventory compiled by Paterno in 1816, quoted by M. Utili (see note 5). The picture appears to have left the Bourbon collection soon afterwards.


[11] The Kress Foundation made an offer to Contini-Bonacossi on 7 June 1948 for a group of twenty-eight paintings, including Titian's "Portrait of a Boy," the offer was accepted on 11 July 1948 (see copies of correspondence in NGA curatorial files).

EXHIBITION HISTORY

1976 Zapadnoevropeiskaia i Amerikanskaia zhivopis is muzeev ssha [West European and American Painting from the Museums of USA], State Hermitage Museum, Leningrad; State Pushkin Museum, Moscow; State Museums, Kiev and Minsk, 1976, unpaginated and unnumbered catalogue.


2009 Titian, Tintoretto, Veronese: Rivals in Renaissance Venice, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Musée du Louvre, Paris, 2009-2010, no. 42 (English catalogue), no. 43 (French catalogue), repros.
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The picture originally formed the central element of the ceiling decoration in the so-called Albergo Nuovo of the Scuola di San Giovanni Evangelista in Venice. Set within an elaborately carved and gilded wooden framework, [1] it was surrounded by 20 much smaller panels (now in the Gallerie dell’Accademia, except for one that is lost), variously representing the symbols of the Four Evangelists, with putti or reclining nudes [fig. 1]; winged putto heads; and masks of females and satyrs. The ensemble is recorded in situ, as the work of Titian, by all the main Venetian sources of the 17th and 18th centuries, beginning with Francesco Sansovino in 1581. [2] The ceiling was demolished and the framework destroyed after the suppression of the confraternity in 1806, when the paintings were confiscated by the state, and in 1812 all 21 were consigned to the Accademia. The Venetian superintendent of paintings, Pietro Edwards, then decided not to retain the Saint John on Patmos for the Accademia galleries, judging that it was "a very lively composition, of which no more than a miserable trace has survived, having first been ruined, and then
shamefully repainted." [3] He considered the options of sending it to the Brera
Gallery in Milan or of installing it on the ceiling of the Sala della Bussola in the
Doge’s Palace, before ceding it in 1818 to the dealer Barbini in Turin as part of an
exchange. [4] All sight of the picture was lost from the end of the 19th century until
1954, when it reappeared on the Italian art market and was acquired by the Kress
Foundation.

The Scuola di San Giovanni Evangelista, founded in 1261, was one of the four
original scuole grandi, lay confraternities that played a central role in the religious,
social, and cultural life of late medieval and Renaissance Venice. Dedicated to
Saint John the Evangelist, the Scuola was the custodian of a particularly prestigious
relic, a fragment of the True Cross, which was reputed to perform miracles. The
confraternity undertook an ambitious series of artistic projects in the last decades
of the 15th century, including a classicizing architectural screen by Pietro
Lombardo, a double-branched staircase by Codussi, and a cycle of canvases by
Gentile Bellini and others representing the Miracles of the True Cross (now
Accademia). This cycle decorated a room that originally served both as the shrine
of the sacred relic and as the meeting room of the Scuola’s board of governors (albergo),
but in 1540 it was decided to separate the two functions by building a
new boardroom (the Albergo Nuovo) adjoining the old. A pair of new doors had to
be cut through the west wall of the old Albergo to provide access, and in April
1544, Titian was called in to give expert advice on the implications of this operation
for the two canvases occupying the wall. Otherwise, however, his involvement with
the Scuola is not documented, and on the basis of the external evidence, work on
the ceiling could have been undertaken at any time from the later 1540s or 1550s.
Certainly, the Albergo Nuovo was still being furnished in the early 1550s: in 1552 its
lower walls were equipped with wooden benches, in 1554 work was continuing on
the windows of the north wall, and in 1555 a wrought iron gate was made for the
doorway. [5] Much later, in the early 1580s, Palma Giovane was employed to paint
four canvases with scenes from the Book of Revelation for the walls of the room (in

Palma’s canvases provided a natural thematic complement to the principal element
of Titian’s ceiling. According to legend, John the Evangelist—patron saint of the
Scuola—was exiled by the emperor Domitian to the Greek island of Patmos, where
he wrote the Book of Revelation (Apocalypse). Titian showed the saint, as if on the
peak of a mountain, with his attributes of a gospel and an eagle, experiencing a
vision of God, who instructs him to record what is to be revealed to him ("What

Saint John the Evangelist on Patmos
© National Gallery of Art, Washington
thou seest, write in a book”; Rev. 1:11). Or, more precisely, as suggested by Erwin Panofsky, Titian represented a pregnant moment immediately before the vision, when the saint reacts in awe and astonishment to the voice of God (“I heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet . . . And I turned to see the voice that spake with me”; Rev. 1:10–12). [7] Silvia Gramigna Dian has argued that the subsidiary panels were iconographically carefully integrated with the apocalyptic theme: thus the putto- and satyr- heads would refer to the final battle between Good and Evil; the symbols of all four Evangelists refer to their appearance round the throne of God in Revelation 4:6–9; the nudes with golden amphorae in the Saint Luke and Saint Mark paintings refer to the “seven golden vials full of the wrath of God” mentioned in Revelation 15:7; and the four female heads refer to the contrast between the City of God and Babylon. [8] Against all this, however, it could be observed that if Titian or any iconographic adviser had wanted to invoke the Book of Revelation in the subsidiary panels, they could have made the references more explicit; and Robert Echols may be right to lay greater stress on the probable decorative unity between the various painted heads and the original carved framework, which is likely to have included similar heads as part of a standard ornamental repertory. [9]

The reconstruction diagram provided by Jürgen Schulz in 1966 has been accepted as essentially correct; [10] to this, however, Gramigna Dian proposed a number of minor modifications, to take account of the not precisely rectangular shape of the Albergo Nuovo [fig. 2]. [11] As is clear from the reconstruction, there is a striking contrast of conception between the subsidiary panels, which show the forms frontally, as quadri riportati, and the principal canvas, in which the steeply foreshortened figure of the Evangelist is seen from a dramatically low viewpoint, approximately corresponding to that of a spectator entering through one of the two main entrances on the west wall. In keeping with the approach to the problems of ceiling painting first formulated by Titian in his three large canvases for the nave of Santo Spirito in Isola (now in the sacristy of Santa Maria della Salute), Saint John is not portrayed as if seen directly from below, with the extreme logic of the worm’s-eye view, but obliquely, as if from the bottom of a slope, in a way that remains consistent with the high placing of the canvas, while not impairing the legibility of the figure’s face and pose. [12]

In adopting this compromise solution, soon to become characteristic of Venetian ceiling painting in general, Titian departed from the approaches on the one hand of Michelangelo in the Sistine Chapel, and on the other of Correggio in Parma and
Giulio Romano in Mantua, all of whom have plausibly been seen as otherwise having provided inspiration for the present work. Following the reappearance of the picture in the 1950s, a majority of commentators have chosen to compare the foreshortened figure of the Evangelist with his counterpart by Correggio at the base of the dome decoration of San Giovanni Evangelista in Parma, a work that Titian would have seen when he visited the city in 1543. [13] More recently, Robert Echols and Paul Joannides have laid greater stress on the similarities of the pose with that of Michelangelo’s figure of God the Father in the Separation of Light from Darkness on the Sistine ceiling. [14] Other possible sources adduced by Echols include Correggio’s standing apostles at the base of the drum in the Cathedral at Parma; Giulio Romano’s figure of Momus in the Sala dei Giganti at the Palazzo del Te; and the figure of Niobe (Galleria Estense, Modena) from a ceiling painted in 1541–1542 for Ca’ Pisani a San Paternian in Venice by Titian’s younger contemporary Tintoretto. [15]

When the picture was first published by Wilhelm Suida in 1956, it was generally thought to be stylistically similar to, and hence closely contemporary with, the Santo Spirito ceiling, which was then universally dated on circumstantial evidence to 1542–1544. [16] This dating of the Saint John the Evangelist to the early 1540s seemed consistent with Titian’s only documented presence at the Scuola di San Giovanni Evangelista in April 1544. Subsequently, however, Schulz drew attention to the differences of pictorial handling between the two works, observing that the greater richness of color in the present work indicated that it was painted somewhat later, soon after the visit to Rome in 1545–1546. [17] This view then won general support, and Echols has added further convincing stylistic arguments for regarding the ceilings as separated by an interval of at least five years. [18] These include the fact that in the Saint John the Evangelist, the painter lays a greater emphasis on surface pattern than in the Santo Spirito canvases, with their greater penetration of pictorial space, and also that he now adopts a softer, looser pictorial texture. In the meantime, however, Joannides pointed out that the previously accepted dating of the Santo Spirito ceiling was far from secure, and provided arguments for supposing that in fact it was painted after Titian’s direct experience of Michelangelo’s work in Rome. [19] Although the same scholar nevertheless continued to date the Saint John the Evangelist to around the same time, [20] the logic of his redating of the Santo Spirito ceiling to circa 1546–1547, or even to circa 1549–1550, following Titian’s return from Augsburg, is that the Saint John the Evangelist was probably painted in the early 1550s, and perhaps as late as circa 1555. [21] Stylistically, in fact, the picture is perfectly consistent with the Gloria
(Prado, Madrid) of 1553–1555, and it may be significant that Carlo Ridolfi listed it with other works datable to the 1550s, such as the Martyrdom of Saint Lawrence (Gesuiti, Venice), the Saint Jerome in Penitence (Brera, Milan), and the Crucifixion (San Domenico, Ancona). [22] Nor is this late dating contradicted by the circumstantial evidence, since (as has been seen above) the interior decoration and furnishing of the Albergo Nuovo was certainly still in progress in 1552/1554. Finally, it may be relevant for the dating that the same unusual and distinctive type of canvas support was also used by Titian for the version of the Venus and Adonis in the National Gallery, London, which there are good reasons to date to circa 1554–1556. [23]

Although undeniably less refined in its execution than Titian’s most masterly achievements of the years around 1550, including the Gloria, the Saint John the Evangelist has been generally accepted as substantially the work of Titian himself. Part of the reason for the more abbreviated handling here may be that the painter was naturally inclined to lavish greater attention on commissions from his most socially elevated patrons, including the emperor Charles V and Prince Philip of Spain, than on one from a Venetian confraternity. It is also true that the breadth of execution would have been appropriate for the distant viewing of a ceiling painting. Even so, the figure of God the Father may be regarded as comparatively weak, probably because it was executed by a studio assistant, rather than because, as suggested by John Shearman, it represents a later substitution. [24]

The picture was engraved in 1716 by Andrea Zucchi for Il gran teatro delle più insigne prospettive di Venezia, published by Domenico Lovisa in 1720. [25]
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fig. 1 Titian and Workshop, Symbol of John the Evangelist from the ceiling of the Scuola di San Giovanni Evangelista, c. 1553/1555, oil on panel, Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice. Su concessione del Ministero del beni e delle attività culturali e del turismo. Museo Nazionale Gallerie dell’Accademia di Venezia © Archivio fotografico G.A.VE

fig. 2 Reconstruction of the ceiling of the Scuola di San Giovanni Evangelista by Silvia Gramigna Dian, from Titian, Prince of Painters (Venice, 1990), 276

NOTES


[21] Peter Humfrey, Titian: The Complete Paintings (Ghent and New York, 2007), 277. The only previous scholar to have dated the picture to later than 1550 was Fisher, who, however, proposed an unacceptable attribution to Palma Giovane. See M. Roy Fisher, Titian’s Assistants during the Later Years, PhD diss., Harvard University, 1958 (New York, 1977), 62–66.


Consistent with the intended placement of the painting on a ceiling, the support consists of an exceptionally robust, double-thread herringbone-weave fabric. A horizontal seam approximately one meter from the top, just above the head of Saint John, was probably necessary to accommodate the limitation of the loom size. It is presumed that the support was prepared with a thin white ground, though it is not visible in the extensive areas of abrasion or on the edges of the fabric. Infrared reflectography at 1 to 2.5 microns and x-radiographs reveal a number of pentimenti: in the position of John’s head; in the wings of the lower cherub, one of which originally covered the cherub’s forearm; and in the foliage near the book, which was originally larger and more complex in form. The paint was applied broadly and evidently at speed, with the figure painted first, then the background, and finally the rock and the eagle. The partial survival of the original tacking margins suggests that the painting has not been cut down. Clearly, however, the operation to remove it from the ceiling resulted in serious damage, notably in the form of a long vertical cut with a diagonal tail, running parallel to John’s right arm and the right arm of God the Father. The painting has been lined, and extensive retouchings along the repair to the vertical cut and along the horizontal join in the fabric remain visible. Heavy abrasion of the ground and paint layers, exposing the tops of the threads, as well as remnants of discolored varnish, have resulted in an overall darkness of tone. The painting was treated by Mario Modestini in 1949, and discolored retouchings were inpainted in 2012.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Ann Hoenigswald and Catherine Metzger

March 21, 2019

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] It has been noted that the unusual and distinctive weave, incorporating a chevron along its spine and of wider than normal width, was also employed by Titian and his workshop in the version of the Venus and Adonis of c. 1554–1556 in the National Gallery, London. See Jill Dunkerton, “Titian’s Painting Technique from 1540,” National Gallery Technical Bulletin 36 (2015): 9, 59.

[2] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Santa Barbara Focalplane
PROVENANCE

Commissioned by the Scuola di San Giovanni Evangelista, Venice; confiscated 1806 by the state, and transferred to the Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice; exchanged 1818 with (Barbini, Turin).[1] Count Bertalazione d’Arache, Turin, by 1885.[2] (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Florence); sold 1954 to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York[3] gift 1957 to NGA.


[3] On 7 June 1954 the Kress Foundation made an offer to Contini-Bonacossi for sixteen paintings, including the NGA painting which was listed as St. John the Evangelist (Ceiling) by Titian. In a draft of one of the documents prepared for the Count’s signature in connection with the offer this painting is described as one “which came from my personal collection in Florence.” The Count accepted the offer on 30 June 1954; the final payment for the purchase was ultimately made in early 1957, after the Count’s death in 1955. (See copies of correspondence in NGA curatorial files.)
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Even more than in the case of the Venus with a Mirror, the Venus and Adonis was one of the most successful inventions of Titian’s later career. At least 30 versions are known to have been executed by the painter and his workshop, as well as independently by assistants and copyists within the painter’s lifetime and immediately afterward. The evolution of the composition was apparently highly complex, and scholars remain divided in their interpretation of the visual, technical, and documentary evidence. While there is general agreement that the Gallery’s version is a late work, dating from the 1560s, there is much less consensus regarding its quality and its relation to the most important of the other versions.

The subject is based on the account in Ovid, Metamorphoses (10.532–539, 705–709), of the love of the goddess Venus for the beautiful young huntsman Adonis, and of how he was tragically killed by a wild boar. [1] But Ovid did not describe the last parting of the lovers, and Titian introduced a powerful element of dramatic tension into the story by imagining a moment in which Venus, as if filled
with foreboding about Adonis’s fate, desperately clings to her lover, while he, impatient for the hunt and with his hounds straining at the leash, pulls himself free of her embrace. The goddess’s gesture is echoed by that of Cupid, who, clutching a dove—a creature sacred to Venus—anxiously watches the lovers’ leave-taking. It is usually assumed that this new conception of the story was the painter’s own idea, and in 1584 he was explicitly criticized by the Florentine Raffaello Borghini for his lack of fidelity to the ancient literary text. [2] Some scholars have suggested that in this respect Titian was following modern literary retellings, for example the Fábula de Adonis by the imperial ambassador to Venice in the early 1540s, Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, or by the Venetian Lodovico Dolce in the later 1540s. [3] But Miguel Falomir and Paul Joannides have argued that, on the contrary, such texts could well have been inspired by their authors’ knowledge of the invention by Titian, which itself is more likely to have been inspired by visual sources. They identify one such source as Marcantonio Raimondi’s engraving Joseph and Potiphar’s Wife, after Raphael’s fresco in the Vatican Loggia, in which a young man similarly escapes the amorous advances of an older woman. [4] As first recognized by Erwin Panofsky, another important visual source for Titian’s composition—although in this case not for the novel interpretation of the myth—was the so-called Bed of Polyclitus, an antique relief known in a number of versions and copies. Panofsky focused in particular on the representation of a twisting female figure from the back, but subsequent scholars have also noted the resemblance of Adonis’s left arm to the dangling arm of sleeping Cupid in the relief. [5]

The many versions of the composition fall into two main groups, which were respectively dubbed Groups A and B by Panofsky, [6] and the “Prado” and “Farnese” types by Harold Wethey. [7] The former type takes its name from the picture in the Prado, Madrid [fig. 1], which Titian painted in 1553–1554 for Prince Philip of Spain (from 1556 King Philip II). Other important versions of this type include those in the National Gallery, London; in the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles; formerly in the collection of Patrick de Charmant, Lausanne; and in a recently discovered example now in a private collection, Moscow. [8] The format of these pictures, although they are all wider than they are tall, is close to square; Adonis has three dogs; Cupid is shown asleep under a tree in the right background; and Venus is again represented in her swan-drawn chariot in the sky. While the Prado painting is universally accepted as the finest example of the type, both the ex-Charmant and the Moscow versions have also sometimes been claimed to precede it. [9] By contrast, the Gallery’s picture, like the version in the

Venus and Adonis
© National Gallery of Art, Washington
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York [fig. 2], is broader and lower in its proportions than Panofsky’s Type A; Adonis has only two dogs; Cupid is awake and close to Venus; and the sky is filled with a rainbow and a burst of light. Wethey called this the “Farnese” type, because he argued that both of these pictures—as well as all the examples of the “Prado” type—were preceded by a painting formerly in the Farnese collection in Rome, Parma, and Naples, now lost, but recorded in an engraving of 1769 by Robert Strange, in which the composition was reproduced in reverse. This lost version was recorded by Carlo Ridolfi in 1648 at Palazzo Farnese in Rome [10] and in a succession of Farnese inventories, beginning in 1644, [11] and the writer implied that Titian painted this version for the pope’s grandson Ottavio Farnese on his visit to the papal capital in 1545–1546, together with the first version of the Danaë (Capodimonte, Naples). Although Ridolfi was certainly incorrect in saying that the Danaë was also commissioned by Ottavio, rather than by his elder brother Cardinal Alessandro, it does not necessarily follow that he was also wrong about the Farnese Venus and Adonis. There remains, in any case, a certain amount of circumstantial evidence in favor of Wethey’s hypothesis that this picture was painted for the Farnese family in the mid- or late 1540s, and critics who accept it include Fern Rusk Shapley, Rona Goffen, David Rosand, and (with reservations) Falomir and Joannides. [12] As documented by a famous letter of 1554, Titian conceived the Venus and Adonis for Philip of Spain as a pendant to a second version of the Danaë, painted for him a year or two earlier; and since the latter is clearly based on the Farnese Danaë, there is some logic in supposing that it, too, had an original pendant in the lost Venus and Adonis. And in the following century, at least, the Farnese Venus and Adonis came to be regarded as one of a pair with the original Danaë, as is evident from the Farnese inventory of 1680, which records the two hanging together. [13]

Yet against Wethey’s hypothesis is the simple fact that there is no mention of any Venus and Adonis in any of Titian’s extensive correspondence with Cardinal Farnese and his agents in the later 1540s. Nor does Giorgio Vasari, who was in Rome at the time of Titian’s visit, and who discusses the Danaë at length, refer to any pendant, and the Farnese version is not mentioned in any document before the inventory of the Palazzo Farnese of 1644. [14] Further, as argued by Nicholas Penny, not only is the Venus and Adonis not a particularly happy complement to the Danaë in terms of its composition, but even more conclusive is Penny’s argument from the visual evidence that the lost Farnese picture, as recorded in Strange’s engraving, actually postdated both the Washington and the New York examples of the type, both of which are always dated for stylistic reasons to the
1560s. It is likely, therefore, either that one of the Farnese brothers ordered it from Titian at some time after circa 1565; or that it was acquired by some later member of the family, at some date before 1644.

The likelihood that Wethey’s name for this type is a misnomer does not, however, prove that Titian invented it only in the 1560s or that it must postdate his invention of the “Prado” type. Joannides and Penny have separately observed that the composition of the “Farnese,” or “two-dog,” type is more satisfactory than that of the “Prado,” or “three-dog,” type, and that for visual reasons it is more logical to interpret the latter as an expansion of the former, than the former as a simplification of the latter. [15] Penny pointed out that the concentration of the figures more tightly into the picture field, without being diluted by landscape, is dramatically more effective. [16] Joannides, in a series of articles, has argued that the “two-dog” type began with a now-lost composition reflected in a picture once in the Arundel collection, and destroyed in Vienna in World War II, of which there exists a miniature copy of 1631 by Peter Oliver (Burghley, Stamford) [fig. 3]. [17] This composition was appreciably more static and less dramatic than in later versions of the type, including the Gallery’s picture, and the foremost of the dogs was shown standing still and looking back toward its master. Not quite ready for the hunt, Adonis was shown with his right arm around Venus’s shoulder, instead of holding a spear. To judge from a prewar photograph of the ex-Arundel picture, it was not of high artistic quality, and it was apparently itself a workshop version of a lost autograph prototype. Joannides argued that both this lost original and the ex-Arundel picture were painted as early as the later 1520s and that the former was perhaps painted for Titian’s most important patron of the period, Alfonso d’Este. His principal reasons were that the poses of the pair of dogs were strikingly similar to those of the two cheetahs in the Bacchus and Ariadne (National Gallery, London) and that the color scheme, as transmitted by Peter Oliver’s copy, resembled that of the other mythologies painted for Alfonso between 1518 and 1523. Against this it may be argued that the thickset anatomy of Adonis in the ex-Arundel picture, the apparent breadth of its handling, and Venus’s hairstyle (which resembles that of the Portrait of a Young Woman of circa 1545–1546 at Capodimonte, Naples) all make it difficult to date it to the 1520s. Nevertheless, the ex-Arundel picture and its lost prototype—in other words, the earliest not only of the “two-dog” versions but of the whole series—cannot for visual reasons plausibly be dated after the mid-1540s. Indeed, if it is conceded that Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza’s Fábula de Adonis, written in Venice between 1539 and 1545 (mentioned previously), was inspired by it, then the prototype cannot have been
Painted much after circa 1543.

Given the likelihood of this early date, the evidence revealed by a technical examination of the Gallery’s picture undertaken in 2004 is both interesting and surprising. Most significantly, the x-radiograph [fig. 4] and the infrared reflectogram [fig. 5] of the latter show that the foremost dog was originally represented in a standing pose, with its head looking backward, exactly as in the ex-Arundel picture; other pentimenti corresponding to this composition include the originally vertical position of one of the leashes and the drapery that originally appeared above Adonis’s proper right shoulder. [18] In other words, the Gallery’s picture must have been begun as another version of the ex-Arundel picture—very likely in the 1540s, or anyway, before the development of the “three-dog” composition—but was then, to judge from its surface handling, set aside and not completed until the 1560s.

This technical evidence naturally also has a bearing on another problem regarding the Gallery’s picture that has been much discussed: its relationship to the New York version. While in general agreement that both of these versions of the “two-dog” composition are late works, and that both show a certain degree of workshop assistance, scholars have expressed divergent opinions about their respective chronological relationship and quality. Hans Tietze regarded the Washington version as superior to that in New York, an opinion later reiterated by W. R. Rearick. [19] Rodolfo Pallucchini, by contrast, followed by Francesco Valcanover, Augusto Gentili, David Alan Brown, and Maria Agnese Chiari Moretto Wiel, judged the New York version to be a substantially autograph work of the early 1560s, and the Gallery’s picture to be essentially a product of Titian’s workshop. [20] At the end of the Titian exhibition in 1990, however, the opportunity was taken by a group of scholars, including Brown and Penny, to make a direct comparison between the two pictures; and a consensus appears to have emerged that despite its abraded surface and the severely compromised state of the blues and greens, the present work is the earlier and the finer, and shows more evidence of intervention by the master. In support of this opinion, Penny has convincingly pointed to the greater tension of Venus’s arm and the greater expressiveness of her face in the Gallery’s picture; to the addition of decorative accessories in the New York picture, such as the draperies over Adonis’s shoulders and the pearls in Venus’s plaits, not present in the Washington version or in the earlier “Arundel” composition or the picture for Philip II; and to several of the pentimenti visible in the x-radiograph of the New York picture, which show changes to initial correspondences with the Washington
version. [21] Since neither picture shows the extremely broken brushwork of Titian’s very late works of the 1570s, both may be dated to the 1560s, with the Gallery’s picture perhaps dating from the first half of the decade.

The various differences of detail between the Washington and New York pictures support the observation by Pallucchini that an engraving of the composition by Raphael Sadeler II, dated 1610 [fig. 6], was made from the present work, probably when it was still in Venice. [22]
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fig. 1 Titian, Venus and Adonis, 1553–1554, oil on canvas, Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid. © Photographic Archive Museo Nacional del Prado

fig. 2 Titian, Venus and Adonis, 1560s, oil on canvas, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, The Jules Bache Collection, 1949
**fig. 3** Peter Oliver, after Titian, *Venus and Adonis*, 1631, tempera on vellum with gold, Burghley House, Stamford. © Burghley House Preservation Trust Limited

**fig. 4** X-radiograph, Titian and Workshop, *Venus and Adonis*, c. 1540s/c. 1560–1565, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Widener Collection

**fig. 5** Infrared reflectogram, Titian and Workshop, *Venus and Adonis*, c. 1540s/c. 1560–1565, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Widener Collection

NOTES


For the last, see Vittoria Markova, “Una nuova versione della Venere e Adone di Tiziano: Notizie storico artistiche,” in Una nuova versione della Venere e Adone di Tiziano (Venice, 2007), 12–24; and Alfeo Michieletto, “Il restauro,” in Una nuova versione della Venere e Adone di Tiziano (Venice, 2007), 26–44.


The picture is described in the Farnese inventory of 1680 as follows: “Una Venere, che siede sopra di un panno cremisi, abbraccia Adone, che con la sinistra tiene duoi levrieri e un Amorino con una colomba in mano, di Tiziano” (Amadeo Ronchini, “Delle relazioni di Tiziano col Farnesi,” Atti e memorie delle RR Deputazioni di Storia Patria per le Province Modenesi e Parmensi 2 [1864]: 144; Giuseppe Campori, Raccolta di cataloghi ed inventarii inediti [Modena, 1870], 211). For the inventory of 1644, see Bertrand Jestaz, ed., L’inventaire du Palais et des propriétés Farnèse à Rome en 1644, Vol. 3, Pt. 3: Le Palais Farnèse (Rome, 1994), 77, no. 4394; for those of 1653 and 1708, see Giuseppe Bertini, La galleria del duca di Parma: Storia di una collezione (Bologna, 1879), 139. The picture was later transferred from Parma to the Palazzo di Capodimonte in Naples with the rest of the Farnese collection and was last heard of in 1804.


[14] As emphasized by Clare Robertson, Il Gran Cardinale: Alessandro Farnese, Patron of the Arts (New Haven and London, 1992), 72–74. The writer notes that, by contrast, the Danaë is mentioned in a report of 1581 of the paintings in the cardinal’s room.


[18] These pentimenti are usefully highlighted in red in the reproduction of the x-radiograph in Miguel Falomir and Paul Joannides, “Dánae y Venus y Adonis: Origen y evolución,” in Dánae y Venus y Adonis: Las primeras “poesías” de Tiziano para Felipe II, ed. Miguel Falomir (Madrid, 2014), fig. 33. It may be noted, however, that some of the other red highlights indicated in this reproduction are not fully warranted by the technical evidence.


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The picture is painted on a relatively coarse, open, plain-weave fabric, estimated to be linen, which has been lined. The tacking edges have been removed, but cusping along all four edges and the composition imply that the painting’s dimensions have not been altered.

Infrared reflectography at 1.1 to 1.4 microns [fig. 1] [1] and x-radiographs [fig. 2] reveal extensive pentimenti, the most significant of which may be summarized as follows: the head of the dog on the right originally looked backward toward the figures; a leash held by Adonis originally hung vertically downward; the contours of his proper left arm and the proper left side of his torso have been adjusted; part of his cloak fluttered above his proper right shoulder; the position of the fabric by Venus’s proper left ankle has been altered; and her left leg was originally slightly higher.

Close inspection by the naked eye suggests that the ground was applied thinly in reddish brown. The paint is freely applied with loose, confident brushwork; lighter
colors are used in a full-bodied, textured manner with scumbles, while the darks are generally painted much more thinly. The red drapery was created by covering a white underpainting with a transparent red glaze. To judge from its present gray/brown color, the sky on the right was painted with smalt pigment, but it has retained its correct hue in the area to the left of Adonis, where the smalt was clearly mixed with white lead. The copper resinate greens used for the foliage have typically discolored to a dark brown.

The picture has suffered from overzealous cleanings, and the fabric is visible in many places where the paint has been abraded. During treatment undertaken in 1992–1995 extensive old retouchings and the badly discolored varnish were removed. The painting had been treated previously in 1924 and again in 1930, this time by Herbert N. Carmer.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Catherine Metzger and Joanna Dunn and the treatment report by David Bull
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![Infrared reflectogram, Titian and Workshop, Venus and Adonis, c. 1540s/c. 1560–1565, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Widener Collection](fig. 1)

![X-radiograph, Titian and Workshop, Venus and Adonis, c. 1540s/c. 1560–1565, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Widener Collection](fig. 2)
PROVENANCE

Robert Spencer, 2nd earl of Sunderland [1641-1702], London and Althorp, Northamptonshire, by 1679;[1] by inheritance to his youngest son, the Hon. John Spencer [d. 1746], Althorp;[2] by inheritance to John Spencer, 1st earl Spencer [1734-1783], Althorp;[3] by inheritance to George John Spencer, 2nd earl Spencer [1758-1834], Althorp;[4] by inheritance to John Charles Spencer, 3rd earl Spencer [1782-1845], Althorp; by inheritance to Frederick Spencer, 4th earl Spencer [1798-1857], Althorp; by inheritance to John Poyntz Spencer, 5th earl Spencer [1835-1910], Althorp; by inheritance to Charles Robert Spencer, 6th earl Spencer [1857-1922], Althorp; by inheritance to Albert Edward John Spencer, 7th earl Spencer [1892-1975], Althorp; sold 1924 to (Thos. Agnew & Sons, Ltd., London); sold 1925 to (Arthur J. Sulley and Co., London); inheritance from Estate of Peter A.B. Widener by gift through power of appointment of Joseph E. Widener, Elkins Park, after purchased 1925 by funds of the Estate; gift 1942 to NGA.

della Terrazza in Venice, and which is sometimes supposed to have been acquired by Cristoforo Barbarigo soon after Titian’s death from his son Pomponio; see Harold Wethey, *The Paintings of Titian*, 3 vols., London, 1969-1975: 3(1975):193–194; and Marco Boschini, *La Carta del Navegar Pitoresco* (1660), ed. Anna Pallucchini, Venice, 1966: 30, 664. But apart from the fact that Cristoforo’s will of 1600, which does mention the Gallery’s *Venus with a Mirror* (NGA 1937.1.34), makes no mention of any *Venus and Adonis*, Siebenhüner demonstrated that the Barbarigo version was of an upright format, was still in Venice in 1793/1795, was sold to the Czar of Russia in 1850, and is now lost. See Herbert Siebenhüner, *Der Palazzo Barbarigo della Terrazza in Venedig und seine Tizian-Sammlung*, Munich, 1981: 30; and also Fern Rusk Shapley, *Catalogue of the Italian Paintings*, 2 vols., Washington, 1979: 1:495.


**EXHIBITION HISTORY**


1989 Masterpieces of Western European Painting of the XVIth-XXth Centuries from the Museums of the European Countries and USA, State Hermitage Museum, Leningrad, 1989, no. 5, repro.
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The composition corresponds closely to the left side of Titian’s *Venus Blindfolding Cupid* in the Galleria Borghese, Rome [fig. 1], universally regarded as an autograph masterpiece and usually dated to circa 1565. Apart from the obvious differences of costume, with the figure of Venus in the present work wearing a costume and jewelry more closely related to contemporary fashion, the main iconographical difference is that the blindfolded Cupid here holds one of his arrows across his mother’s lap. But there are good reasons to suppose that the format of the Gallery’s picture, which is cut at the right, likewise originally consisted of a broad rectangle and included two more figures in the lost section, in addition to the fragmentary third figure, whose disembodied arm holding up a silver dish survived the mutilation of the painting. Mid-18th-century inventories describe the picture as representing “the Elements (or the Graces) offering Tribute” to Venus, implying that a total of three figures are now missing, [1] and the x-radiograph of the Borghese picture has revealed that it, too, was originally intended to have a third figure, between the Venus group on the left and the nymphs on the right. [2] The pose of this figure, subsequently canceled by the artist in the Borghese version, corresponds closely to that of the fragmentary figure in the Gallery’s picture.

When at Stowe the painting was considered to be an autograph Titian, and soon after its arrival in America, this traditional attribution was upheld by Wilhelm Suida,
[3] who argued furthermore that the work preceded the Borghese version by a
decade. Rodolfo Pallucchini likewise regarded the present picture as autograph
and datable to the mid-1550s. [4] The x-radiograph of the Borghese version, which
reveals the cancellation of a figure still present in the Gallery’s version, might
appear to support this opinion. But as first indicated by Paola Della Pergola in 1955,
with the subsequent concurrence of a majority of critics (including Francesco
Valcanover, Fern Rusk Shapley, and Harold Wethey), [5] the style and technique of
the Gallery’s picture indicate rather that it postdates the qualitatively superior
Borghese version and was executed by a shop assistant or follower. The
anonymous compiler of the 1961 catalog of paintings in the Art Institute of Chicago
suggested that the picture was by the same hand as the Chicago Allegory (no.
1943.90; now Allegory of Venus and Cupid), which was at that time attributed to
Titian’s pupil Damiano Mazza. [6] Although sharing some compositional motifs,
however, the two pictures are not particularly close stylistically; and in any case,
too little is known of Mazza’s independent style for either of the two to be
attributed to him with any conviction. [7] Definitely unconvincing is the attribution
of the Gallery’s picture by Federico Zeri to Lambert Sustris, whose personal style,
despite the mystery that still surrounds his later career, [8] remains relatively
recognizable, with its fluid handling of paint and pale color schemes. To some
extent, as implied by Wethey, the bright, variegated colors and the luxurious
accessories are closer to Veronese than the late Titian, whose preference for a
dusker, more monochrome palette is more faithfully represented by the Gallery’s
version of Venus and Adonis. The evidence of the x-radiographs of the Borghese
picture indicate, nonetheless, that the executant of the present work must have
been a member of Titian’s studio, since he clearly had direct access to the master’s
designs. Yet the x-radiographs of the present picture [fig. 2] reveal that the
executant made a number of less radical changes of his own, changing, for
example, the position of Venus’s left forearm, as well as a number of details of her
costume, and incorporating a jeweled chain very similar to that in the Salome of
circa 1560–1570 (Koelliker collection, Milan). It remains difficult to decide whether
the work was painted simultaneously with the Borghese version; immediately after
it, but still directly under Titian’s supervision; or after his death and in imitation of
his unfinished late works, circa 1576–1580. [9]

As pointed out by Robert Wald, a close reflection of the original composition of the
Gallery’s picture is probably provided by a low-quality, perhaps 18th-century
painting in the stores of the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna [fig. 3]. [10]
Although Venus is dressed differently in the latter, the owner of the arm upraising
the dish is present; and apart from the change of the sex of the figure on the far right, the figures in the Vienna picture correspond well to the “Graces offering Tribute to Venus” recorded in Stowe inventories of the 18th century. [11] Thus, all three figures in the Vienna picture seem to bear attributes of the goddess of love: the foremost female holds apples in the folds of her skirt, the figure at the right holds up a dove in a basket, and the silver dish held up by the figure at the center perhaps contains flowers. On this evidence it may be that the Vienna picture represents a more or less literal copy of a lost autograph painting by Titian, which preceded the Borghese picture, and which provided the basis for the Gallery’s variant. [12] All three of the figures included in the now-missing section of the Gallery’s picture then reappear, together or individually, in numerous variants painted by Titian and his workshop during the 1550s and 1560s. [13]

The partly contemporary and courtly character of the costume, together with the more worldly, less classicizing character of her features compared with those of the Borghese picture, led Suida to suppose that the figure was intended as a portrait. In keeping with this supposition, the picture is still entitled Portrait of a Young Lady as Venus Binding the Eyes of Cupid in Shapley’s catalog of 1979. [14] But the features are still highly idealized and the costume is fanciful, and there is every reason to suppose that like the Borghese version, the Gallery’s picture is intended as a mythological allegory. Despite the plausible assumption that it once represented the Three Graces bringing gifts to Venus, the precise significance of the allegory—like that of the Borghese picture, in which the Graces are replaced by two nymphs with the attributes of huntresses—remains unclear. The two most detailed interpretations of the Borghese picture, both in a moralizing, neoplatonic vein but with differing results, have been provided by Erwin Panofsky and Edgar Wind. [15] Panofsky pointed out that the two cupids represent Eros and Anteros, both sons of Venus, but symbols of contrasting aspects of love, the blind and sensuous, and the clear-sighted and virtuous. According to Panofsky, the work should be seen as a marriage picture, in which Venus is shown choosing between the two, opting for virtuous and reciprocal love, and about to remove Eros’s blindfold. Wind emphasized rather the need of the goddess of love to combine perspicacity and passion, and by deliberately sending Eros out into the world blindfolded, the virtuous love advocated by his brother can attain a higher joy. The interpretation of the picture as a Domestication of Cupid by Walter Friedländer is closer to that of Panofsky than of Wind, but the author identified the main figure not as Venus but as Vesta, goddess of the hearth and domestic chastity, who is concerned to protect the world from the harm caused by Eros. [16] Rona Goffen,
who unaccountably identified the blindfolded cupid as Anteros and his standing
brother as Eros, suggested that the meaning is deliberately ambiguous, evoking
the teasing uncertainties of love. [17] More recent scholars have tended to side with
Panofsky in interpreting Venus in this context as a tutelary deity of marital love and
conjugal chastity; [18] and in this case, the Gallery’s picture may be assumed
similarly to have been painted (or at least, acquired) to celebrate a marriage. As
noted by Miguel Falomir, [19] however, the arrow here gives the message an ironic
twist and reminds its viewers that the blind passion of Eros represents an ongoing
threat to marital bliss.
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**fig. 1** Titian, *Venus Blindfolding Cupid*, c. 1565, oil on canvas, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Scala / Ministero per i Beni e le Attività culturali / Art Resource, NY

**fig. 2** X-radiograph, Workshop or Follower of Titian, *Venus Blindfolding Cupid*, c. 1566/1570 or c. 1576/1580, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection
NOTES

[1] For the “Elements,” see Provenance, note 1; the Stowe inventories up to 1780 (see Provenance, note 3) describe the picture as “Venus binding the eyes of Cupid, and the Graces offering a Tribute.” By the time of the 1797 inventory, the picture is described rather as “Titian’s mistress (as Venus),” implying that the mutilation took place between these dates. As suggested by Colin Anson (see Fern Rusk Shapley, Catalogue of the Italian Paintings [Washington, DC, 1979], 1.504, 505–506 n. 4, and correspondence in NGA curatorial files), the picture was probably cut to make room for newly acquired pictures on the same wall. In the 1740 sale of Jervas’s pictures (see Provenance, note 1), the dimensions are given as 5 feet 7 inches by 6 feet 6 inches. Since this height is clearly much greater than that of the Gallery’s picture, it must be that the recorded dimensions include a frame of c. 19 inches (48.3 cm) wide. In that case, the original dimensions of the picture (c. 118.5 cm × c. 175.3 cm) would have been close to those of the Borghese picture (118 cm × 185 cm).


[9] Giorgio Tagliaferro, in *Le botteghe di Tiziano* (Florence, 2009), 239, favors the first interpretation; Nicholas Penny (letter to Peter Humfrey of Nov. 17, 2001, on file) inclines toward the last.


[13] The female figure, seen in three-quarter view from the back, turning her head to face the spectator and raising a silver dish above her head, corresponds, for example, to the *Salome* of c. 1555 (Prado, Madrid); the figure also holding up a container, and with its face seen in sharp foreshortening, reappears in the Vienna version of the *Danaë* (Kunsthistorisches Museum) and elsewhere. The evolution of Titian’s composition, from the so-called *Allegory of Alfonso d’Avalos* of c. 1531–1532 (Louvre, Paris) to the Borghese *Venus Blindfolding Cupid*, is analyzed through their many variants by Kristina Herrmann Fiore, “L”*Allegoria

*Venus Blindfolding Cupid*

© National Gallery of Art, Washington
TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The medium-weight, twill canvas has clearly been cut at the right, where there is no sign of the cusping distinctly visible along the other three edges. In addition, fracture damages in the paint indicate that at some time well after the painting was completed, the right edge was folded over to serve as a tacking edge, making the painted dimensions even smaller. At the time of the painting’s last lining, this edge was opened out, and fabric inserts were added to the other three edges to extend them as well. All of the edges were filled and inpainted.

The support was prepared with a thin white ground. The x-radiographs [fig. 1] have revealed a number of alterations to the design, the most striking of which involved coniugale’ di Tiziano del Louvre e le derivazioni, connesse con ‘Venere che benda Amore,’” in Tiziano: Amor sacro e amor profano, ed. Maria Grazia Bernardini (Milan, 1995), 411–420; and Jaynie Anderson, in Tiziano: Amor sacro e amor profano, 435–436.


moving Venus’s left forearm from a position more closely resembling that in the version in the Borghese Gallery [fig. 2]. There is also a suggestion of a different décolletage to Venus’s dress, and her neck and shoulders have been worked over several times. The disembodied arm on the right is painted over an area that in the Borghese version is filled by the bow, hand, and, farther down, the sleeve of yet another figure. Traces visible on the surface of the paint and in the x-radiographs indicate that the Gallery’s painting once included them as well. Since the hand of Venus travels over the red skirt, and paint from the gray sleeve can be detected on the tacking edge that was made after the painting was cut down, it is unlikely that the cropped figure is a later addition.

The painted surface of the disembodied arm is badly abraded, suggesting that it was overpainted when the canvas was cut and was rediscovered during a later restoration. The painting suffers from abrasion and wear overall. The blue paint in much of the sky has degraded, [1] resulting in the current patchy white and blue state. The painting was treated by Mario Modestini in 1948 and again in 1955.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Mary Bustin
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PROVENANCE

Charles Jervas (or Jarvis) [1675?-1739], London; (his sale, at his residence, London, 11-20 March 1739, 8th day, no. 543, as by Titian);[1] purchased by Richard Temple, 1st viscount Cobham [1675-1749], Stowe House, Buckingham;[2] by inheritance to

fig. 1 X-radiograph, Workshop or Follower of Titian, Venus Blindfolding Cupid, c. 1566/1570 or c. 1576/1580, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection

fig. 2 Titian, Venus Blindfolding Cupid, c. 1565, oil on canvas, Galleria Borghese, Rome. Scala / Ministero per i Beni e le Attività culturali / Art Resource, NY

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] In 1989, the painting was analyzed with x-ray fluorescence spectroscopy (XRF) by the NGA Scientific Research department (see report dated August 11, 1989), but the blue pigments in the sky were not included in this analysis.

Venus Blindfolding Cupid
© National Gallery of Art, Washington
his sister, Hester Temple Grenville, 1st countess Temple [d. 1752], Stowe House; by inheritance to her son, Richard Grenville-Temple, 2nd earl Temple [1711-1779], Stowe House;[3] by inheritance to his nephew, George Nugent-Temple-Grenville, 1st marquess of Buckingham [1753-1813], London and Stowe House; by inheritance to his son, Richard Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-Grenville, 1st duke of Buckingham and Chandos [1776-1839], London, Stowe Park, and Avington Park; by inheritance to his son, Richard Plantagenet Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-Grenville, 2nd duke of Buckingham and Chandos [1797-1861], (Buckingham and Chandos sale, by Christie's at Stowe House, 15 September 1848, no. 422);[4] purchased by Peter Norton, London, who apparently sold the painting back to the Buckingham and Chandos family; the 2nd duke's son, Richard Plantagenet Campbell Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-Grenville, 3rd duke of Buckingham and Chandos [1823-1889], Stowe House; probably by inheritance to his daughter, Mary, 11th baroness Kinloss [1852-1944], Stowe House and Scotland; (Kinloss sale, at Stowe House, 5 July 1921, no. 1697)[5] apparently bought in by the family); probably by inheritance to her daughter, the Hon. Mrs. Thomas Close Smith [1886-1972, née Caroline Mary Elizabeth Morgan-Grenville], Boycott Manor, Buckinghamshire, by 1944,[6] (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi [1878-1955], Florence and Rome); sold 1950 to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York; gift 1952 to NGA.

[1] As "Venus hood-winking Cupid, the Elements offering Tribute," by Titian; see A Catalogue of the Collection of Pictures, Prints and Drawings late of Charles Jarvis, Esq., London, 1740: 8th day's sale, 18, no. 543. The sale catalogue identifies the deceased owner as the Principal Painter to Kings George I and George II, and explains that the nearly 600 pictures in his collection were "chiefly collected by him, in a series of Forty Years, in Rome, Lombardy, Venice, France and Flanders, and from the Cabinets of many of the English Nobility." See also Fern Rusk Shapley, Catalogue of the Italian Paintings, National Gallery of Art, 2 vols., Washington, 1979: 1:506 n. 12, and the correspondence from Colin Anson in NGA curatorial files.

[2] See the MS copy of the Jervas sale catalogue in the National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum, London (MSL/ 1938/ 867), f. 58, where the buyer is identified as Lord Cobham, and the price paid as £16.10s. See also Lord Cobham's Account Book, 1736-41, Huntington Library, San Marino, California, Stowe Papers.
(H.E.H. ST130), entry for March 20, 1739/1740: “To a large picture bought at Mr Jarvise’s Sale by Mr Squib as by Bill £17-1-0,” quoted by Shapley 1979, 1:506 n. 12, and in the correspondence from Colin Anson in NGA curatorial files.

[3] Stowe: A Description of the House and Gardens, London, 1763, and subsequent editions. As recorded by Colin Anson, “The Picture Collection at Stowe,” Apollo 97 (June 1973): 597 n. 2, the catalog of the Stowe collection went through fifteen editions between 1759 and 1832, and had to be constantly revised to take account of the rehanging of the pictures. For the various rooms at Stowe in which the Venus Blindfolding Cupid is recorded, see Shapley 1979, 1:505-506 n. 4, and the correspondence from Colin Anson in NGA curatorial files.


EXHIBITION HISTORY

1979 Paintings of Italian Masters from the Collections of U.S.A. Museums, State Hermitage Museum, Leningrad; Pushkin Museum, Moscow; The Kiev Museum of Western and Eastern Art, 1979, no catalogue (organized by the Armand Hammer Foundation, Los Angeles).
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Usually and reasonably dated to circa 1555, the picture is widely accepted as the finest surviving version of a composition known in at least 30 variants executed by Titian’s workshop. It is also usually regarded as the earliest in the series, but following evidence presented in greater detail elsewhere, [1] it will be argued that the Gallery’s picture was preceded by an autograph version painted for the Spanish crown, now lost, but known in a copy by Rubens now in the collection of the Museo Nacional Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid. Further, it will be argued that this earlier version, which is first definitely recorded in 1552/1553, may well be identical with a Venus painted by Titian in 1545 for the emperor Charles V. Key evidence for supposing that the Gallery’s picture postdated the lost picture recorded by Rubens is provided by the pentimenti visible in the x-radiographs [fig. 1] and infrared reflectograms [fig. 2]. [2]

An older x-radiograph of 1971, which was studied in detail by Fern Rusk Shapley, [3] was already also of exceptional interest in revealing the double portrait underlying the Venus composition (see Technical Summary). Shapley compared the double portrait with the so-called Allegory of Alfonso d’Avalos of circa 1532 (Musée du Louvre, Paris) and suggested that it may similarly have represented an allegory on youth, beauty, and love. This interpretation was partly dependent, however, on the probably mistaken assumption that the male figure, like that in the Louvre picture, was wearing armor, and there may have been no allegorical content. Giorgio Tagliaferro suggested that the double portrait was begun by the young Paris Bordone when he was an assistant in Titian’s workshop, on the basis that such compositions are more characteristic of this painter than of Titian himself. [4]
Examples by Bordone, however, are all much later than the likely period of his association with Titian, around 1520, and it is highly improbable in any case that the master would have kept an unfinished work by a former assistant for another 30 years. More plausible is the conclusion by Shapley that the abandoned double portrait dated from only shortly before Titian reused the canvas for the Venus composition.

The picture is first certainly recorded in the will of the Venetian nobleman Cristoforo Barbarigo in 1600 (see Provenance). Barbarigo is known to have acquired Titian’s house at Biri Grande in Venice from his son Pomponio Vecellio in 1581, five years after the painter’s death, and it is usually assumed that at the same time Barbarigo acquired a group of paintings by Titian left in the house. Although Charles Hope has cautioned against a too-ready acceptance of such an assumption, he admits that it is likely that Barbarigo did acquire the Venus from Pomponio, together with three other pictures now in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg, at around the same time. [5] It remains a matter of debate why Titian should have retained a high-quality picture such as the Venus in his own possession for 20 years after it was painted. Perhaps the artist painted it on speculation, with an eye to selling it eventually to a suitable customer. Or perhaps he saw an advantage in keeping it in his own house at Biri Grande, where it could have prompted visitors to order similar pictures for themselves, or it could have served as a model for replication by members of the workshop, or both. It may be no accident, as pointed out by Wolfgang Braunfels, [6] that not only the Venus, but at least one other picture retained by the painter and then apparently sold by his son Pomponio to Cristoforo Barbarigo, the Saint Mary Magdalen (Hermitage, Saint Petersburg), was among his most popular and frequently replicated compositions.

In any case, there is widespread scholarly agreement that the Venus is not a very late work and that for stylistic reasons it is datable to the mid-1550s. As first pointed out by Stephan Poglayen-Neuwall, [7] it shows close parallels with the great mythologies painted by Titian for Philip II in the 1550s: the Venus and Adonis of 1553–1554 (Prado, Madrid; see Venus and Adonis for illustration), and the Diana and Callisto and Diana and Actaeon of 1556–1559 (jointly owned by the National Gallery, London, and the Scottish National Gallery, Edinburgh). In all these works, although Titian’s handling of paint has become much looser than in his earlier career, selected details, such as jewelry, remain relatively precise, and in some passages the brushwork continues to evoke the specific textures of velvet, fur, metal, and, especially, flesh. By the mid-to-late 1560s, in a picture such as the
Galleria Borghese Venus Blindfolding Cupid (see Venus Blindfolding Cupid for illustration), textures have become more generalized, the brushwork has become more broken, and areas of strong local color have become further reduced. It is true that Titian’s style and pictorial technique were never uniform and could vary from one work to another, as well as from one decade to another. But even a relatively precise late work, such as the Tarquin and Lucretia of 1568–1571 (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge), is characterized by an iridescent shimmer that transcends the tactile sensuousness still very much evident in the Gallery’s Venus.

All this applies to the principal figure and her draperies, but it is less true of the more sketchily painted cupids and striped cloth at the lower right. Jodi Cranston has argued that the broad handling at the right was intentional, and was part of the painter’s expressive purpose, but did not note any difference between the left and the right sides. [8] As suggested above, however, the execution of the right side is decidedly weaker, and the anatomy of the foremost cupid is poorly articulated, so that his left wing is too planar and (unlike the other wing) awkwardly sprouts from his shoulder, instead of from his shoulder blade. If, indeed, an assistant was largely responsible for completing the right side of the composition, it cannot be excluded that this was done contemporaneously with Titian’s work on the left side. Yet it seems much more likely that Titian left the right side unfinished, [9] and that the assistant brought it to completion in the 1560s, or even after the painter’s death, for the purpose of selling the picture. It was pointed out in this context by Tamara Fomichova that the motif of the cupid presenting Venus with a garland is otherwise known only in Titian’s works of the mid-1560s, such as the versions of the Venus and Cupid with a Lutenist in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, and in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. [10]

The complex task of surveying and listing the many known versions of the Venus composition was undertaken in 1934 by Poglayen-Neuwall. [11] The author convincingly concluded that the Gallery’s picture is the only surviving example of autograph quality, dismissing the claims of earlier writers, such as Hugo von Kilény and Erich von der Bercken, that it is inferior to the variant formerly in the Nemes collection (now Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne); [12] at the same time, he argued that two other versions, now lost, are also likely to have been autograph. One of these, known in a workshop replica in the Hermitage (usually but not necessarily correctly attributed to Orazio Vecellio) [fig. 3], was recorded by Anthony van Dyck in his Italian Sketchbook [fig. 4]. [13] Like the Gallery’s picture, it showed Venus in the Pudica pose, nude to the waist, with two cupids standing on
her couch; but unlike in the present work, both the cupids supported the mirror, while the more prominent one turned his head toward the spectator. Carlo Ridolfi records in the house of Niccolò Crasso in Venice a “very rare Venus, admiring herself in the mirror, with two cupids,” [14] which the owner had inherited with other pictures by Titian from his grandfather of the same name; and it is often assumed that this is the picture copied by Van Dyck, on his visit to the city in the autumn of 1622. It is not, however, necessary to infer from this evidence either that Crasso’s picture or the original of Van Dyck’s drawing (if a different work) was of autograph quality. Nor is there any reason to think that this version of the composition predated the gallery’s Venus. [15]

The other version of the composition identified by Poglayen-Neuwall as probably autograph is the one recorded in a memorandum sent by Titian to Philip II on December 22, 1574, in which it is described as “Venus con amor gli tien il specchio” (a Venus with a cupid holding a mirror). [16] This picture, which belonged to the Spanish royal collections until it was carried off by Joseph Bonaparte in 1813 and lost, is recorded in a copy by Rubens [fig. 5]. [17] The Pudica pose is identical to that in the Washington and Crasso versions; but Venus instead wears a chemise and her legs are bared, and there is only one cupid (as Titian’s letter states), who looks toward Venus in near-profile and stands on a stone plinth rather than on her couch.

It has been traditionally assumed that the version for Philip II is identical with a “Venere ignuda” sent by Titian to Spain in 1567. [18] This title is equally likely, however, to refer to a recumbent Venus, and Philip’s Venus with a Mirror may be more plausibly identified with “Una venere que se sta mirando en un espejo que lo tiene Cupido” (A Venus admiring herself in a mirror held by Cupid), which is recorded as early as 1553 in an unaccountably neglected inventory of Philip’s paintings. [19] Hope had already argued that the lost picture for Philip is likely to have preceded the Gallery’s version, on the grounds that Titian only sent original inventions to the king and that the x-radiographs of the Washington picture show that Titian started by showing Venus in a chemise and with bare legs, as in the Philip II version, but then introduced alterations. [20] The latter argument is a strong one, as indeed was sensed by Shapley, who was forced to argue, somewhat perversely, that the work for Philip “was already envisioned” by Titian while working on the Gallery’s picture. [21] But Hope’s observation was widely dismissed, because like every other scholar, he accepted the identity of the Venus pictures recorded in the letters of 1567 and 1574, and he accordingly assigned an
unconvincingly late date of post-1567 to the Washington version. Now that it is clear that Rubens’s copy records a lost picture that was earlier, not later, the evolution of the design becomes more comprehensible, from one to two cupids, and from Venus dressed in a chemise to Venus naked to the waist. The existence of a voluminous cloak in the underlying male portrait could then have prompted the impulse for the painter’s decision to introduce into the Washington picture the swathes of red velvet that cover her previously bared legs. [22] Having formulated these revisions in the Washington picture, the painter then evidently used it as the basis for all the many other variants of the composition. In this connection it may further be noted that the original shape and position of the cupid’s wing revealed by the infrared reflectogram at 1.5 to 1.8 microns corresponds closely to those recorded in Rubens’s copy. Similarly, the evidence of the infrared reflectogram that the other cupid originally presented the goddess with laurel leaves is consistent with the above-mentioned observation by Fomichova that the motif of the garland does not occur in Titian’s works until the mid-1560s.

The inclusion in the Spanish royal inventory of 1552/1553 of what was almost certainly the earliest version does not in itself negate Hope’s assumption that the composition was invented for Philip (at that time still crown prince). Yet there is no mention of such a work in any of the ample correspondence between the painter and the prince, whereas Titian is known to have painted a Venus for his father, the emperor Charles V, in 1544–1545, and to have brought it with him to the imperial diet at Augsburg in 1548. It has usually been supposed that this lost Venus was of the full-length, recumbent type and was the prototype for Titian’s various variations on this theme from the early 1550s onward. Yet there is no sound evidence for this supposition, and it is altogether more likely that this picture was identical with the Venus with a Mirror recorded in the possession of Philip by 1552/1553, and later copied by Rubens. [23]

In a letter of October 5, 1545, the imperial ambassador to Venice, Don Diego de Mendoza, wrote to the emperor saying that the artist had just painted for him a quadro di fantasia, “which people say is the best thing he has ever done.” [24] Titian’s subject—the pagan goddess of love at her levée or toilet, gazing at herself in a mirror, and assisted by one or two cupids—was indeed his own invention, yet it is also one rich in cultural resonance. Despite the contemporary trappings of the red velvet wrap and the mid-16th-century coiffure in the Gallery’s version, the figure is unmistakably identifiable as Venus, not only because of the presence of a winged cupid with a quiverful of arrows, but also because of her Pudica pose. It
has often been observed that Titian could have seen one of the most celebrated antique examples of the Pudica type, the Medici Venus (Uffizi, Florence), on his visit to Rome in 1545–1546, but as pointed out by Francesco Valcanover, the painter would already have known a Hellenistic version then in the Grimani collection in Venice, and now in Venice’s Museo Archeologico. [25] It is also possible, as suggested by Harold Wethey, that the painter knew some antique gem, bronze, or terracotta representing Venus at her toilet. [26] and as noted by Guy de Tervarent, a mirror is mentioned as an attribute of Aphrodite by Philostratus the Elder. [27] The figure of Venus with a mirror had a long history in medieval art, in which the goddess was portrayed in overwhelmingly negative terms, as embodying the vices of feminine vanity and luxury. [28] An echo of this moralizing tradition is still to be found in Venetian painting of the early Renaissance period, in Giovanni Bellini’s allegorical panel of circa 1490 (Vainglory?; Accademia, Venice); but Bellini’s nude and Venus-like Woman with a Mirror of 1515 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), the iconography of which in some respects anticipates the Venus with a Mirror, already reveals a response to Titian’s own Woman with a Mirror of circa 1513–1514 in the Louvre (see Allegory of Love for illustration). This early masterpiece has been the subject of a number of differing interpretations in recent art-historical literature; and although in this case the young woman at her toilet and in déshabillé is clearly not intended to represent Venus, most writers have detected close thematic links between this picture and the Venus of 40 years later. Elise Goodman-Soellner, for example, has seen the Woman as embodying the feminine ideal celebrated by Petrarchan love poetry, and has similarly seen the color harmonies chosen for the Venus, with their concentration on reds, whites, and golds, as closely and deliberately corresponding to those evoked by poets in praise of their mistresses. [29] Cathy Santore, for whom the Woman represents a courtesan, suggested that the Venus likewise portrays a courtesan in the guise of Venus; for the author the mirror in both cases retains its medieval significance as a symbol of lasciviousness. [30] Christaan Hart Nibbrig also interpreted the mirror in moralizing terms, but as a vanitas, referring to the transience of life and beauty; but as pointed out by Petra Schäpers, such an allusion is incompatible with the image of the immortal goddess of love. [31]

For Rona Goffen, the subject of the earlier Louvre picture concerns the erotic balance of power in the male-female relationship; and although the lover is no longer physically present in the Venus, his “intimate surrogate” remains there in the form of the red velvet wrap, which the author identified as the coat of a man. [32] Although this identification cannot be sustained, [33] it is certainly true that the
eye contact made between the image of Venus in the mirror and the spectator further enhances the already substantial erotic appeal of the picture, by suggesting that she is aware of his presence and is preparing herself for his arrival. Following Jan Bialostocki and Valcanover, and in common with Schäpers, Goffen also referred to the relevance of the paragone debate for the interpretation of the two pictures, and on the use of mirrors by a number of other 16th-century Venetian painters, including Giorgione and Savoldo, to demonstrate that the art of painting could rival that of sculpture in its ability to show the human figure from more than one angle.

Developing this idea, Irina Artemieva has interpreted the picture as a self-conscious manifesto by Titian of his own art, painted in the wake of the aesthetic debates of the 1540s and 1550s concerning the paragone not just between sculpture and painting, but also between disegno and colorito, and between the rival artistic traditions of Rome and Venice. For Artemieva, the Venus with a Mirror serves as a visual counterpart to the aesthetic principles enunciated by Lodovico Dolce in his Dialogo della pittura, published in 1557; and she accordingly argued that the date of the picture should be narrowed down to this very year. This interpretation offers an alternative explanation of why a high-quality and iconographically apparently highly innovative painting remained in the painter’s possession for some two decades and was sold only after his death. Artemieva’s argument is weakened, however, by the evidence that the Gallery’s picture is an elaboration of a composition devised some years earlier for the emperor (or at least, for Prince Philip) and by the probability that the right side was painted by an assistant.

Many scholars have commented on the fascination that the Venus with a Mirror, together with its many variants, has held for subsequent painters, from Titian’s compatriot Veronese, to leading European artists of the 17th century. Particularly influential was the now-lost version in the Spanish royal collection, which provided an essential point of departure both for Rubens, in his Venus at the Mirror of 1613–1614 (Sammlungen des Fürsten von Liechtenstein, Vaduz), and for Velázquez in his Toilet of Venus (“Rokeby Venus”) of 1647–1651 (National Gallery, London).

Peter Humfrey
March 21, 2019
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**fig. 1** X-radiograph, Titian, *Venus with a Mirror*, c. 1555, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Andrew W. Mellon Collection

**fig. 2** Infrared reflectogram, Titian, *Venus with a Mirror*, c. 1555, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Andrew W. Mellon Collection
**fig. 3** Workshop of Titian, *Venus with Two Cupids in front of a Mirror*, 1560s, oil on canvas, The State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg. © The State Hermitage Museum / Photo by Vladimir Terebenin

**fig. 4** Anthony van Dyck, after Titian, Leaf from *Italian Sketchbook*, with *Venus with a Mirror*, 1622/1623, brush drawing in brown wash, touched with pen and brown ink, The British Museum, London. © Trustees of the British Museum

*Venus with a Mirror*
© National Gallery of Art, Washington
**fig. 5** Peter Paul Rubens, *Venus and Cupid*, c. 1606–1611, oil on canvas, Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid. © Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid

### NOTES


[2] Infrared reflectography was performed using a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with an H astronomy filter.


[5] Charles Hope, “Tizians Familie und die Zerstreuung seines Nachlasses,” in...
Venus with a Mirror

© National Gallery of Art, Washington


[27] Guy de Tervarent, Attributs et symboles dans l’art profane, 1450–1600 (Geneva, 1958), 1:324. The passage from Imagines 1.6 was previously used by Titian as a source for his Worship of Venus of 1518–1519 for Alfonso d’Este (Prado, Madrid).

53–82; Jodi Cranston, *The Muddied Mirror: Materiality and Figuration in Titian’s Later Paintings* (University Park, PA, 2010), 25, with references.


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The support is a coarse, medium-heavy-weight twill-weave fabric with original selvages comprising the left and right edges. It has been lined to two additional fabrics, and the tacking margins were removed from the top and bottom edges.

X-radiographs [fig. 1] reveal an extensive underpainted design beneath the present composition, depicting a three-quarter-length portrait of a woman and man; the top edge of the underpainted composition corresponds to the right edge of the present composition. The red drapery covering Venus’s knees appears to have formed the jacket of the male figure in the underlying composition and was left exposed to form part of the new composition.

It appears the support was prepared with a thin ground, though it is difficult to characterize, due to the underlying portrait. Titian used a combination of thick, pastose paint and transparent glazes. The red and blue draperies were created by applying colored glazes over a white underpainting.

The x-radiographs, complemented by infrared reflectograms at 1.5 to 1.8 microns [fig. 2], also reveal a number of pentimenti in the present composition. The red drapery at one time covered only Venus’s lower torso, leaving her lower thigh, knee, and upper calf prominently exposed. Under the red drapery, she originally wore a white chemise, which she held up to her chest, leaving her right breast exposed. Adjustments were made to the position of her left elbow, to the fingers grasping the red drape, to the left leg of the foreground cupid, and possibly also to his right leg. It also appears that his fingers originally curved around the top edge of the mirror, where now they are hidden by it. Cupid’s upper torso has been reworked to such a degree that the x-radiographic image is very blurred. Infrared reflectography has additionally revealed that the cupid at the back originally crowned the goddess with laurel leaves rather than with a wreath and that the more prominent wing of the foreground cupid, which was originally somewhat larger and more arched, has been shifted to the left. The painting, which is preserved in generally fair visual condition, was treated in 2011 to remove discolored varnish and retouching; beyond repair, however, is the badly damaged left hand of the foremost cupid. The green drape in the upper left corner, presumably painted in copper resinate, has also browned, while the blue drape held by the cupid has similarly discolored.
Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Sarah Fisher, Catherine Metzger, Elizabeth Walmsley, and Joanna Dunn

March 21, 2019
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fig. 1 X-radiograph, Titian, Venus with a Mirror, c. 1555, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Andrew W. Mellon Collection

fig. 2 Infrared reflectogram, Titian, Venus with a Mirror, c. 1555, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Andrew W. Mellon Collection

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with an H astronomy filter.
PROVENANCE


[5] Mellon purchase date and date deeded to Mellon Trust is according to Mellon collection records in NGA curatorial files and David Finley’s notebook (donated to the National Gallery of Art in 1977, now in the Gallery Archives).
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2007 Der späte Tizian und die Sinnlichkeit der Malerei / Tiziano maturo e la sensualità della pittura, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna; Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice, 2007-2008, no. 2.5, repro. (shown only in Vienna).

2009 Titian, Tintoretto, Veronese: Rivals in Renaissance Venice, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Musée du Louvre, Paris, 2009-2010, no. 30 (no. 29 in French catalogue), repro.
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This portrait is known in at least four other contemporary versions or copies: in the Chrysler Museum, Norfolk, Virginia [fig. 1]; [1] in the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg [fig. 2]; [2] in the Seminario Vescovile, Padua; [3] and in the Koelikker collection, Milan. [4] According to John Shearman, x-radiographs have revealed that yet another version was originally painted under the Titian workshop picture Titian and His Friends at Hampton Court (illustrated under Andrea de’ Franceschi). [5] Of these versions, the Gallery’s picture is now generally accepted as the earliest and the finest, and before it entered the Kress collection in 1954, the identity of the sitter, established by Victor Lasareff in 1923 with reference to the Hermitage version, has never subsequently been doubted. [6] Lasareff retained a traditional attribution to Tintoretto, and Rodolfo Pallucchini and W. R. Rearick upheld a similarly traditional attribution to Tintoretto of the present version. [7] But as argued by Wilhelm Suida in 1933 with reference to the Chrysler version (then in Munich), and by Fern Rusk Shapley and Harold Wethey with reference to the present version, an attribution to Titian is more likely. [8] Consistent with the latter attribution is the frequent identification of the picture with a documented portrait of Cappello by Titian, recorded in a eulogistic letter and sonnet sent by Pietro Aretino to the sitter’s nephew Niccolò Molin on Christmas Day 1540. [9]

Vincenzo di Niccolò Cappello (1469–1541) was a member of a Venetian patrician family, several of whose members pursued distinguished careers in the navy. [10] Vincenzo himself served five times as Capitano Generale da Mar, an achievement
that is noted in the inscription QUINQUIES DUX on the Chrysler version of the portrait. His authority as a naval commander also brought him political honors and responsibilities: in 1504 he was knighted by Henry VII of England; from 1515 to 1519, he was governor of Famagosta in Cyprus; in 1522 he was nominated as ambassador to the papal court; in 1539 he was made procurator of San Marco. His high reputation and popularity at home suffered a setback following his defeat by the Turks at the battle of Prevesa, off Epirus, in 1538, but in the final, difficult years of his life, he also found a stout public defender in Pietro Aretino, whose letter of 1540 lavishes praise on his military valor in the glorious defense of the Christian religion. Aretino also mentions the majesty of aspect conveyed by Titian’s portrait; by showing Cappello in full armor and grasping the baton of command, this was clearly designed to express the authority of a venerable military leader who had passed a lifetime in the faithful service of the Venetian state. Under the terms of his will, a full-length standing statue of Cappello was placed above the main portal of his parish church of Santa Maria Formosa. Executed by Domenico di Pietro Grazioli da Salò, it again shows the admiral holding a baton, but this time dressed in a military costume all’antica. [11]

Cappello’s celebrity as a military commander led to a demand for painted portraits of him, from both within and beyond Venice. In 1560, for example, the magistracy of the Procuratia de Supra paid for a portrait for its office in the Piazza di San Marco, a work that was still recorded there by Fulgenzio Manfredi in 1602 and Giovanni Stringa in 1604. [12] At least a decade earlier, the eminent humanist Paolo Giovio must have acquired a portrait for his celebrated gallery in Como, and as the owner pointed out, the sitter was portrayed in the very armor that he had worn at the Battle of Prevesa. [13] Giovio’s picture was clearly based on the original by Titian, since a bust-length copy of it, inscribed VINCENTIUS CAPPELLO, made on commission from Grand Duke Cosimo I by his court painter Cristofano dell’Altissimo, remains in the Uffizi in Florence. A woodcut version by Tobias Stimmer is also included in the 1575 Basel edition of Giovio’s Elagia Virorum Bellicae Virtutis Illustrium. [14] As pointed out by Lasareff, the Como version of Giovio’s portrait of Cappello—and hence also the original—must have been painted before 1552, the date of Giovio’s death. [15]

Lasareff, who identified the Hermitage version (fig. 2) as the original, and who also assumed that it was painted in the sitter’s lifetime, concluded that it was one of Tintoretto’s earliest works. But other critics who have upheld the attribution to Tintoretto have forgotten Lasareff’s firmly established terminus ante quem of 1552.
In particular, Rearick suggested a date of circa 1572/1575, contemporary with a number of other official portraits by Tintoretto of Venetian admirals, including the Sebastiano Venier (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and the Tommaso Contarini (Musée de la Ville, Narbonne). Unlike these sitters, Cappello had died 30 years earlier, and Rearick saw his portrait as a posthumous commission by his family, as part of an effort to rehabilitate his memory. In support of this theory, Rearick quoted a will of 1601 dictated by Vincenzo di Domenico Cappello, nephew and heir to Vincenzo di Niccolò, in which he speaks of four family portraits. These were named as of his grandfather Niccolò, by Palma; of himself and his father, by Titian; and of his uncle Vincenzo, by Tintoretto. For Rearick, the first of these portraits is perhaps identifiable with a full-length portrait of Niccolò Cappello at Chatsworth, attributed by Bernard Berenson to Palma Giovane (in which case, it, too, would be posthumous); the pair by Titian must be lost; and the last, by Tintoretto, is identifiable with the present picture.

Rearick did not, however, develop the stylistic comparison with the portraits of admirals by Tintoretto that he considered similar to the Vincenzo Cappello; and, in fact, although these may be seen as deriving from it, the resemblances remain superficial. Characteristic of Tintoretto’s treatment of highlights are the rapid slashes of unblended white paint that criss-cross the sitter’s armor in the Sebastiano Venier, whereas the more varied brushwork and richer range of textural effects in the Vincenzo Cappello are equally characteristic of Titian. The portrait by Tintoretto mentioned in the will of 1601 was probably instead a copy or variant of the present picture, which by this date had already passed out of the family’s possession. A likely candidate, in fact, for Tintoretto’s version of Titian’s original is provided by the picture now in the Chrysler collection (fig. 1), in which the much finer, more linear treatment of the hair and beard, the unblended white highlights of the cloak, and the taller dome of the balding head, all seem typical, despite the contrary opinion of Suida and Bertina Suida Manning, and of Robert Echols and Frederick Ilchman, of the younger master.

Confirmation that the Gallery’s picture precedes these other known versions is provided by the design changes revealed in the x-radiograph [fig. 3]. This is not necessarily, however, to conclude that it is identical with the portrait of 1540 recorded by Aretino. Comparison with Titian’s portraits of this period—including the Cardinal Pietro Bembo of 1539/1540 and the Ranuccio Farnese of 1541–1542, which hang close to it in the National Gallery of Art—show that they are compositionally more compact and pictorially more precise, while the very broad
The brushwork of the Vincenzo Cappello implies a date of a good decade later. If the present picture indeed dates from the 1550s—as was already implied by Diane H. Bodart [19]—its composition is nevertheless likely to have followed, or to have been elaborated from, that of the lost original of 1540, especially since the sitter died in the following year, and there would have been no opportunity to paint a portrait with a new composition from life. Titian was likely to have been aided in this task by his workshop—as already concluded respectively by Tamara Fomichova and Stefania Mason Rinaldi—which would then have been entirely responsible for the versions in the Hermitage (fig. 2) and Padua, [20] and also for the one in Milan. It remains an open question whether the version owned by Paolo Giovio was based on the lost original of 1540 or the present version, but in the latter case the Washington portrait would have to date from before 1552.

As pointed out by Lasareff, the composition of the Gallery’s picture, like that of its presumed prototype, develops that of Titian’s Francesco Maria della Rovere (Uffizi, Florence) of 1536–1538, in which a military commander is similarly portrayed standing in knee-length, wearing gleaming armor, holding a baton in his right hand, and in front of a shelf displaying his helmet and further batons. In pose and accoutrements, the Vincenzo Cappello may also be compared with several of Titian’s portraits of Eleven Caesars, painted for the duke of Mantua in 1536–1540 (lost, but recorded in the engravings of Aegedius Sadeler). It is natural that Titian, commissioned to paint a Venetian military hero in or just before 1540, should have adapted a formula recently devised for similarly martial images for the dukes of Urbino and Mantua. In turn, it provided the inspiration for Venetian warrior portraits of the later 16th century, including Tintoretto’s Sebastiano Venier, Veronese’s Agostino Barbarigo, and Palma Giovane’s Niccolò Cappello. [21]

Peter Humfrey
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COMPARATIVE FIGURES
**fig. 1** Here attributed to Jacopo Tintoretto, *Vincenzo Cappello*, c. 1570/1575, oil on canvas, Chrysler Museum, Norfolk, Gift of Walter P. Chrysler, Jr.

**fig. 2** Here attributed to Workshop of Titian, *Portrait of Admiral Vincenzo Cappello*, c. 1560/1570, oil on canvas, The State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg. © The State Hermitage Museum. Photo by Pavel Demidov
NOTES

[1] Published by Wilhelm Suida, Tizian (Zurich and Leipzig, 1933), 81–82, 160–161, 184, pl. 143, when in the Schnackenberg collection, Munich; sold Sotheby’s, London, Nov. 28, 1956, no. 19 (with confused provenance).


Aidan Weston-Lewis (Edinburgh, 2004), 124, 432 n. 6; and A. Perissa Torrini, in Titien: Le pouvoir en face (Milan, 2006), 136 (with an attribution to Tintoretto).


[11] Domenico’s statue is usually dated to soon after Cappello’s death in 1541, but as pointed out by Martin, it could equally date from the 1550s or later. See Thomas Martin, Alessandro Vittoria and the Portrait Bust in Renaissance Venice (Oxford, 1998), 40 n. 55.

It is recorded in the second room of the Procuratia de Supra by Fulgenzio Manfredi, *Dignità Procuratoria di San Marco di Venetia* (Venice, 1602); and Giovanni Stringa, in Francesco Sansovino, *Venetia città nobilissima et singolare* (1581) ... et hora con molta dilienza corretta, emendata, e più d’un terzo di cose nuove ampliata dal M. R. D. Giovanni Stringa (Venice, 1604), 217r. The painter is not mentioned either by the document or by Stringa; according to Manfredi most of the portraits in the room were by Tintoretto, but a few were by Titian. Hadeln reasoned that on balance of probability, this version of the portrait was by Tintoretto. Detlev von Hadeln, “Beiträge zur Tintorettoforschung,” *Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* 32 (1911): 43–44.


[18] Wilhelm Suida, *Tizian* (Zurich and Leipzig, 1933), 81–82; Bertina Suida Manning, “Titian, Veronese and Tintoretto in the Collection of Walter P. Chrysler, Jr.,” *Arte veneta* 16 (1962): 49–50; Robert Echols and Frederick Ilchman, in *Titian, Tintoretto, Veronese: Rivals in Renaissance Venice* (Boston, 2009), 284 n. 60. Although the Chrysler portrait may well be identical with that mentioned in the will of Vincenzo di Domenico Cappello...
in 1601, it is equally possible that it is the one commissioned in 1560 for the Procuratia de Supra, and recorded there by Manfredi (1602) and Stringa (1604) (see Entry note 12). Both writers mentioned that Cappello is shown, as in the Chrysler picture, with five batons of command rather than the three shown by Titian.


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The support is a moderate-weight twill fabric. It has been lined. The paint is fractured around the edges of the painting, and the x-radiographs show only faint evidence of cusping along the top and bottom edges. This indicates that the original support was trimmed slightly, though probably not significantly.

The ground, applied with a trowel, is now tan in color, but presumably was originally white. The x-radiographs [fig. 1] and examination with infrared reflectography [1] reveal that the sitter’s proper left shoulder and arm may have extended farther to the right. Since the sitter’s shoulders could not possibly have been so broad, this suggests that the composition originally may have been conceived with the sitter’s body facing front. The x-radiographs also reveal a puzzling series of forms beneath the mantel at the right edge and a narrow sash hung down from the sitter’s waist.

The figure was held in reserve, with the background elements painted around him. The underpainting was executed in an exceptionally broad, vigorous, and rapid manner, with strong brushmarking, but the face was more smoothly modeled in the upper paint layers. The artist used a deep red glaze to create the shadows of the folds of the cloak.

The paint layer is not well preserved, and the impasto has been flattened by lining. There is generalized abrasion throughout, with severe abrasion in the background.
at the top right and bottom left. In the face, the shadowed eye is abraded and repainted. There is a 32-centimeter vertical line of paint loss through the bottom center of the painting.

Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Carol Christensen and Joanna Dunn
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TECHNICAL COMPARATIVE FIGURES

fig. 1 X-radiograph, Titian and Workshop, Vincenzo Cappello, c. 1550/1560, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Samuel H. Kress Collection

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with an H astronomy filter.
PROVENANCE


[1] The picture was first certainly recorded in the Hamilton Palace sale of 1882, but the most important part of this collection was inherited by the 10th Duke of Hamilton from his father-in-law, William Beckford. An inventory of Beckford’s collection at Lansdown Crescent, Bath, of 1844 includes in the Great Drawing Room an item described as a “Portrait of a Spanish Admiral in armour holding a Baton, Tintoretto” (Bodleian Library, Oxford, Beckford Papers, c.58, 13 September 1844; information kindly provided by Jeannie Chapel). Since the Gallery’s picture was attributed to Tintoretto in the sale of 1882, it is likely that it corresponds to the Beckford picture: see Fern Rusk Shapley, Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection: Italian Schools, XV–XVI Century, London, 1968: 181-182; Fern Rusk Shapley, Catalogue of the Italian Paintings, 2 vols., Washington, 1979: 1:485–488, and the correspondence between Fern Rusk Shapley and R.E. Hutchison, Keeper, Scottish National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh, March-April 1967, in NGA curatorial files. When in Venice on his Grand Tour in 1780, Beckford particularly admired the work of Tintoretto, and it is possible that he acquired the picture then. See Jeannie Chapel, “William Beckford: Collector of Old Master Paintings, Drawings, and Prints,”

As a possible alternative early provenance, it is worth noting that the inventory of the collection of Bartolomeo della Nave, Venice, acquired by the Marquess of Hamilton in 1638, includes an item described as "A Picture of General Capello Pa 2 & 1 Titian." Hamilton (later 1st Duke) was an ancestor of the 10th Duke; and although the bulk of the ex-Della Nave collection was sold to the archduke Leopold Wilhelm after Hamilton’s execution in 1649, it is possible that this particular picture remained in the family until the 19th century. (This possibility is not disproved by a marginal note on the inventory, implying that the ex-Della Nave portrait of Cappello passed from the Hamilton collection to that of the Duke of Devonshire, since as pointed out by Ellis Waterhouse, “Paintings from Venice for Seventeenth-Century England,” Italian Studies 7 (1952): 7, these marginal notes are highly unreliable.) On the other hand, there is no trace of anything corresponding to the Gallery’s picture in the various Hamilton inventories of the 17th and 18th centuries; see Waterhouse 1952, 7, and the Shapley-Hutchison correspondence cited above. Furthermore, the dimensions given in the Della Nave inventory (2 x 1 palms = c. 44 x 22 cm) do not correspond; and although the measurements given in the inventory are often very inaccurate, the reference here appears to be to a much smaller picture.

Shapley 1979, 1:485-488, also hypothetically identified the Gallery’s picture with one recorded by Ridolfi, a work by Titian then in the collection of Senator Domenico Ruzzino in Venice: “Il ritratto di Vicenzo Cappello General di Mare, in arme brunite tocche con belle osservationi di lumi, nelle quale reflette il manto purpureo, che gli attraversa alle spalle, affiliato co’ globbi d’oro, celebratissimo per il soggetto e per l’Autore;” Carlo Ridolfi, Le maraviglie dell’arte, ovvero Le vite de g’illustri pittori veneti, e dello stato (Venice, 1648), ed. Detlev von Hadeln, 2 vols., Berlin, 1914-1924: 1(1914):200. But the reference to the fixing of the cloak with “globbi d’oro” does not correspond to the present picture, and suggests rather the arrangement seen in Palma Giovane’s later portraits of Niccolò Cappello (Stefania Mason Rinaldi, Palma il Giovane: L’opera completa, Milan, 1984: 80, no. 57; 101, no. 207).
See letters of 14 March and 24 April 1967 from Fern Rusk Shapley to Mr. R.E. Hutchison (from the correspondence cited in note 1), in NGA curatorial files. The painting was included in a Wildenstein bill of sale for fourteen paintings (copy in NGA curatorial files), dated February 10, 1954; payments by the Foundation continued to March 1957.

EXHIBITION HISTORY

1883 Exhibition of Works by the Old Masters, and by Deceased Masters of the British School. Winter Exhibition, Royal Academy of Arts, London, no. 180, as by Tintoretto.

1894 Exhibition of Venetian Art, The New Gallery, London, 1894-1895, no. 219, as by Tintoretto.

1997 Venezia Da Stato a Mito [Venice: From a State to a Myth], Fondazione Giorgio Cini, Venice, 1997, no. 22, repro., as by Tintoretto.
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ENTRY

The picture has been the subject of debate with regard both to its subject and its authorship. Titian and his Venetian contemporaries painted a large number of pictures representing beautiful young women in a portraitlike format, but it is often unclear whether such pictures are meant to be recognizable portraits of real members of contemporary society or idealized images of anonymous beauties—or, indeed, whether part of their allure lay in the very ambivalence of their status (see also *Allegory of Love*). Among Titian’s works of his midcareer, the *Young Woman* of circa 1546 in Naples (Capodimonte) and the *Lady with a Fan* of circa 1555 in Dresden (Gemäldegalerie) both appear to be portraits since both wear fashionable contemporary dress. Yet the sitter of the so-called *Bella* of 1536 (Pitti, Florence), who is similarly richly dressed in the height of fashion, was famously described by the picture’s first owner, the duke of Urbino, simply as “the woman in a blue dress”; [1] and the same model becomes even more anonymous—and eroticized—in the various versions of the *Bella*, in which she is shown in a state of undress, partly draped in a fur cloak (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna; Hermitage, Saint Petersburg). The present picture has been fancifully identified in the past as a portrait of Titian’s daughter Lavinia, or alternatively as Caterina Cornaro, or as Giulia Gonzaga. [2] While Fern Rusk Shapley rightly rejected these identifications as without foundation, she still implicitly accepted that the picture portrays a particular woman and retained the traditional title of *Portrait of a Lady*. [3] Yet as she also recognized, the fact that the figure is shown in semiundress, with loose, untied hair and sleeves, and a richly jeweled but obviously informal gown, invites comparison with a number of other compositionally related pictures by Titian and

Titian  
Venetian, 1488/1490 - 1576  

**Woman Holding an Apple**  
c. 1550  
oil on canvas  
overall: 97.8 × 73.8 cm (38 1/2 × 29 1/16 in.)  
framed: 123 × 99.4 × 9.8 cm (48 7/16 × 39 1/8 × 3 7/8 in.)  
Samuel H. Kress Collection  1939.1.292
his workshop in which a female figure is shown in fancy dress or undress and holding an attribute-like object. Relevant examples quoted by Shapley include the Young Woman with a Vase (Gemäldegalerie, Dresden), the Young Woman in Turkish Dress (John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, Sarasota), and the Young Woman with a Cat (in 1931 in a private collection in New York); [4] and to these several more examples have been added in a recent survey of the compositional type by Paul Joannides and Rupert Featherstone. [5]

Shapley, following Detlev von Hadeln, [6] considered that such pictures represent portraits of courtesans. As recent studies have shown, however, while Venetian “beautiful woman” pictures may frequently reflect courtesan culture of the period, there is no evidence that real courtesans had themselves portrayed in this way. [7] Rather, such pictures may be interpreted as idealized images of female beauty, designed to appeal to the romantic and erotic longings of a male owner. As pointed out by Philip Rylands with reference to a comparable portrayal by Palma Vecchio of a Woman Holding an Apple (private collection, Paris), the attribute of the fruit carries inevitable connotations of female sexuality, [8] which in the case of the Gallery’s picture are heightened by the figure’s state of undress and her responsive gaze out at the spectator. This is not to exclude the suggestion by Harold Wethey that the apple, together with the garland of flowers in her hair, is also meant to carry some mythological or literary significance. [9] Indeed, her costume and attributes correspond remarkably closely to the figure of one of the Three Graces in the foreground of an 18th-century copy in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, after a lost version of Titian’s Venus Blindfolding Cupid.

Critics have varied greatly in their assessment of the quality of the picture. Wilhelm Suida, Bernard Berenson, Rodolfo Pallucchini, and Francesco Valcanover all accepted it as an autograph work by Titian. [10] But Oskar Fischel assigned it to Titian’s workshop, while Hadeln and Wethey considered it to be a poor imitation of Titian by a later follower. [11] This last judgment is certainly too harsh, especially when the poor condition of the picture is taken into account and when it is compared with the similar, but weaker Titianesque images of women just mentioned. The recent reassertion, in fact, of the autograph status of the present work by Giorgio Tagliaferro, and by Joannides and Featherstone, may be accepted as fully justified. [12]

Although Tagliaferro suggested a dating of the picture to the later 1550s, the slightly earlier dating to circa 1550/1555 suggested by Suida, Pallucchini, and Valcanover is probably more accurate. Indeed, a dating for stylistic reasons to the
later 1540s cannot be excluded, [13] especially since, as was pointed out by Joannides and Featherstone, the ultimate prototype of the series was almost certainly Titian’s *Portrait of a Lady as Saint Catherine of Alexandria*. [14] Although this picture is now lost, it is recorded in a copy in the Uffizi, Florence, which is inscribed on the reverse with the date of 1542—a probably accurate record of that of the original. The composition of the Gallery’s picture follows that of the *Saint Catherine* quite closely, while anonymizing and eroticizing its model, and it is likely that it in turn became the prototype for the series of *Belle* executed by, or in collaboration with, the workshop. [15] There is good evidence to show that at least one of these pictures, *A Young Woman Holding Rose Garlands* (Wellington Collection, Apsley House, London), took the *Woman Holding an Apple* as its starting point, since technical analysis presented by Joannides and Featherstone has shown that the figure’s black overgown was painted over a lighter and looser green garment, exactly as in the Gallery’s picture. At the same time, the authors cautioned against concluding that the picture of the highest quality necessarily preceded all the other variants in the series, since it cannot be excluded that the master might on occasion decide to produce an autograph variant of a design previously realized in collaboration with his assistants.

Peter Humfrey
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NOTES


86.


[8] Philip Rylands, *Palma Vecchio* (Cambridge, 1992), 92. The writer convincingly identified the picture, which he dated to circa 1516–1518, with an item described in the posthumous inventory of Palma’s possessions (1528) as “1 quareto de un retrato de una d. de q.2 in ca., con vesta de veludo cremesin con un pomo in man.” Despite the figure’s respectable dress, and the description of the picture as a “retrato,” its status as a portrait of a particular woman must remain a matter of debate.


[12] Giorgio Tagliaferro and Bernard Aikema, with Matteo Mancini and Andrew John, *Le botteghe di Tiziano* (Florence, 2009), 266–267; Paul Joannides
Painted on a single piece of fine-woven fabric, the picture measured 45 1/4 by 35 1/4 inches when in the Wilbraham collection (see the photographs in the catalog of the exhibition at the Burlington Fine Arts Club, London, 1915, plate 12, and in Wilhelm Suida, Tizian [Zurich and Leipzig, 1933], p. CXCVII). The present lack of weave distortion indicates that the picture has been cut down on all four edges; yet for visual reasons, it is most unlikely that the original canvas was much larger. Documentation from a treatment that took place in Paris in 1929, including photographs, indicates that strips from another painting, each four to five inches wide, had been added to all four edges. These additions were removed or reduced during the 1929 treatment. [1] The canvas retains extensions of irregular widths, which have a different preparatory layer structure from the original. These are probably remnants of the earlier additions. The painting’s exact original dimensions remain unclear.

The painting was prepared with a very thin layer of porous material, probably gesso, laid on the fabric; it barely fills the interstices of the fabric weave and cannot be seen on top of the threads. A layer of gray lies under the background and flesh tones, while white underlies the green gown. The picture has an incomprehensible, blocky form in a material that is opaque to x-radiography (probably lead white) at the top and a band of the same material at the bottom of the present composition. Although no underdrawing has been detected, in November 2015 a tracing of the composition was laid over the probably slightly variant version in the Wellington
Collection, Apsley House, London: A Young Woman Holding Rose Garlands, attributed to Titian and a collaborator. While the scales of the respective heads match closely, and the contours of the proper right side of the face correspond exactly, other contours show a much looser correspondence, as if the master had shifted some sort of simple tracing during the process of transfer. The paint layer is extensively damaged, with abrasion and loss throughout and a good deal of retouching. In addition to the 1929 treatment, the Samuel H. Kress Collection National Gallery of Art Condition and Restoration Record reports that Stephen Pichetto “relined, cleaned, and restored [the painting] in dry color and damar” in 1937–1939, and in 1955 Mario Modestini “revived color” and applied varnish. [2]

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Catherine Metzger and Joanna Dunn
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TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Duveen Brothers Records, accession number 960015, Research Library, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles: Series II.A, Files regarding works of art, reel 158, box 303: Weyden, van der–Zurbarán, folder 7: Wilbraham Collection. This treatment was probably accomplished by Madame Helfer, because she restored many paintings in Paris for Duveen Brothers.


PROVENANCE

Probably Michel Particelli d'Hémery [1596-1650], Paris; by inheritance to his son-in-law, Louis Phélypeaux de La Vrillière [1599-1681].[1] George Wilbraham, M.P. [1779-1852], Delamere House, near Northwich, Cheshire, by 1829.[2] probably by inheritance to his son, George Fortescue Wilbraham [1815-1885], Delamere House, by 1883.[3] probably by inheritance to his son, Major Hugh Edward Wilbraham,

[1] As first pointed out by Christel Haffner in an unpublished dissertation of 1983, the picture is almost certainly identical with one listed as item 66 in the posthumous inventory (1650) of Particelli, Superintendent of Finance under Louis XIV of France: “Item une autre tableau du Tissien representant une dame venitienne plus qu’à demy corps tenant une grenade” (Another picture by Titian, representing a Venetian woman holding a pomegranate, longer than half-length). When it was inherited soon afterwards by La Vrillière, it was described as “portrait d’une femme tenant une pomme en ses mains ayant une guirlande de fleurs su sa tête” (portrait of a woman holding an apple in her hands, and with a garland of flowers on her head). See Mickaël Szanto, “Venise, Reni et la romanité. La collection de tableaux de Michel Particelli d’Hémery (1650),” in Venise & Paris 1500–1700: La peinture vénitienne de la Renaissance et sa réception en France, ed. Michel Hochmann, Geneva, 2011: 224, 259, 274.

[2] The painting was lent by G. Wilbraham to an exhibition at the British Institution in 1829.

[3] The painting was lent by G.F. Wilbraham to an exhibition at the Royal Academy in 1883.

[4] The painting was lent by H.E. Wilbraham to an exhibition at the Burlington Fine Arts Club in 1914.

[5] The painting was seen at Wilbraham’s by Duveen agents in 1927, per the Duveen “Scout book,” but at that time Wilbraham indicated he was not interested in selling his pictures. He had changed his mind by October 1928, and received the court order necessary to make the sale on 14 January 1929 (Duveen Brothers Records, accession number 960015, Research Library, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles: Series I.D, General business records, reel 71, box 201: Scouts’ books, folder 1: England, "Things seen"; Series II.A, Files regarding works of art, reel 150,


House invoices, 1935-1944; copy in NGA curatorial file.

EXHIBITION HISTORY

1829 British Institution, London, 1829, no. 161, as Titian's Daughter.

1883 Exhibition of Works by the Old Masters and by Deceased Masters of the British School; including a special selection from the works of John Linnell and Dante Gabriel Rossetti. Winter Exhibition, Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1883, no. 191, as Caterina Cornaro, Queen of Cyprus.

1915 The Venetian School. Pictures by Titian and his Contemporaries, Burlington Fine Arts Club, London, 1915, no. 19, pl. XII.


1940 Italian Renaissance Portraits, M. Knoedler & Co., New York, 1940, no. 21, repro., as Presumed to be Portrait of Giulia di Gonzaga-Colonna, Duchess of Trajetto.


BIBLIOGRAPHY


1941 *Preliminary Catalogue of Paintings and Sculpture*. National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1941: 197-198, no. 403, as *Portrait of a Lady (Giulia di Gonzaga-Colonna ?)*.

1942 *Book of Illustrations*. National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1942: 247, repro. 198, as *Portrait of a Lady (Giulia di Gonzaga-Colonna ?)*.


260.
BIOGRAPHY

The son of a stonemason, Veronese was trained in his native city of Verona under the local painters Antonio Badile and Giovanni Francesco Caroto. Probably of equal significance for his formation was the mentorship of another compatriot, the distinguished architect Michele Sanmicheli, into whose biography Giorgio Vasari (1568) inserted a brief account of Veronese's earlier career. His earliest independent works, dating from around 1546, were painted for local patrons in Verona, and in 1552 he undertook an important commission for Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga, the Temptations of Saint Anthony, for the cathedral in Mantua (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Caen), a work that reflects the influence of the court artist Giulio Romano (Roman, 1499 - 1546). Already by 1550–1551, however, Veronese was working for the Venetian patrician families of the Soranzo and the Giustinian. For the former he executed fresco decorations (surviving only as fragments) for their villa near Castelfranco, designed by Sanmicheli, an experience that was to stand him in good stead in his future career as a large-scale decorator in Venice, including as a painter of ceilings. For the Giustinian he painted his first Venetian altarpiece, for the family chapel in San Francesco della Vigna (in situ), a work that in its composition pays obvious homage to the leading painter in the city, Titian (Venetian, 1488/1490 - 1576). Soon afterward, in 1553, he was invited to participate in the ceiling decoration of a series of council chambers in the Doge's Palace, and about two years later he finally settled in Venice. Responsible for devising the iconographic program of the ceiling of the Sala del Consiglio dei Dieci was the eminent humanist and cleric Daniele Barbaro, and this association led to Veronese being commissioned circa 1560 to decorate the Barbaro Villa at Maser, near Castelfranco, again following a program devised by Barbaro. The early support of a network of wealthy and influential patricians meant that the course of Veronese's career ran much more smoothly than that of his rival Jacopo Tintoretto (Venetian, 1518 or 1519 - 1594), and the award of a golden chain for his contribution to the decoration of the Biblioteca Marciana reading room in 1557 was only one in an
almost uninterrupted series of public successes in his adoptive city.

In 1555 he began his decade-long association with the church of San Sebastiano, with a succession of large-scale paintings commissioned by the prior, his compatriot Fra Bernardo Torlioni. The decoration of the ceiling of the sacristy was followed by that of the ceiling of the nave, of the upper walls of the nave (in fresco), of the organ shutters, and of the chancel, with two large wall paintings and the high altarpiece. During the years 1562–1563, Veronese executed another major commission for a monastic patron, the huge Wedding Feast at Cana for the refectory of San Giorgio Maggiore (Musée du Louvre, Paris). An almost equally grand banquet scene, the so-called Feast in the House of Levi (Accademia, Venice) incurred the disapproval of the Inquisition, and Veronese’s appearance before its tribunal in 1573 represents one of the very few setbacks of his career. But he evidently remained in favor with the secular authorities, since soon afterward he was awarded the major share in the redecoration of the Collegio and Anti-Collegio of the Doge’s Palace (1575–1577). Probably in 1582 he was covictor with Francesco Bassano of the competition to paint the Paradise in the Sala del Maggior Consiglio—a work, however, that he did not live to execute. In the field of large-scale public works, Veronese was equally in demand as a painter of altarpieces and of large-scale wall and ceiling decorations. He also painted large-scale canvases for villas and palaces, usually with religious but sometimes also secular subjects, such as the masterly Family of Darius before Alexander of circa 1565 for the noble Pisani family (National Gallery, London). He was also active as a painter of mythologies, allegories, and portraits. Before the death of Titian in 1576, Veronese does not seem to have received many commissions from beyond the Veneto, but thereafter he came to the attention both of Philip II of Spain, and, more fruitfully, the emperor Rudolf II in Prague.

Already by the time of his early maturity Veronese had developed his own, highly distinctive style. This is nowhere better illustrated than in the Wedding Feast at Cana, with its magnificent display of handsome figures, luxurious fabrics, and noble, classicizing architecture. The color range is typically light, with pale shadows, and textures are rich and sensuous. The composition is animated by a slow rhythm, but even in subjects with a more pronounced narrative, effects of drama remain moderate. Except for a gradual darkening of his palette after about 1570, his mature style never underwent any radical alteration, and this essential stylistic consistency over several decades, together with his habit of producing variants of his own most successful compositions, sometimes creates problems of
dating. Problems of attribution are less serious, except toward the end of his career, when he made increasing use of the assistance of various members of his family, including his brother Benedetto Caliari (Venetian, 1538 - 1598), and his sons Carlo (Carletto) Caliari (Venetian, 1567/1570–1592/1596) and Gabriele Caliari (Venetian, 1568 - 1631). It was the task of these relatives to produce a faithful imitation of their master’s style, which they perpetuated for a decade or more after his death, sometimes inscribing their works with the collective signature “Heredes Pauli” (Heirs of Paolo).
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The critical consensus that this is a copy, of inferior quality, of Veronese’s Portrait of Agostino Barbarigo in the Cleveland Museum of Art [fig. 1] is certainly correct. [1] It is further confirmed by the underdrawing, of a type uncharacteristic of the master, revealed by the infrared reflectogram. The fact that the Gallery’s version is slightly longer in format than the Cleveland picture prompted W. R. Rearick to suggest that the latter originally showed the sitter in full length. [2] The Cleveland portrait has indeed been cut at its lower edge, as well as down both sides, [3] and the visual evidence suggests that, as in the Gallery’s copy, the picture originally included the sitter’s right hand, clasping his baton of command. Arguably lending support to Rearick’s suggestion is another copy of the portrait that appeared on the New York art market in 1997, since although of mediocre quality, it shows the sitter in ankle length. [4] Yet apart from the fact that full-length independent portraits of Venetians remained rare throughout the 16th century, it is significant that in this case the copyist has shifted the position of the arrow from the horizontal to the diagonal, as if to accommodate it to an elongated format. On balance, it seems likely that the sitter was always meant to be shown in half-length; indeed, the Washington picture, although itself trimmed on all four sides, may provide a fairly accurate idea of the original format of the Cleveland original, as well as confirm that the now very abraded area of the sky to the right was once streaked with clouds. Insofar as it is possible to judge from its own damaged condition, the rather hard, unpictorial handling of the surfaces in the Gallery’s picture suggests that it was not executed under Veronese’s supervision in his shop, but by a later
follower, perhaps in the 17th century.

The sitter of the Cleveland portrait was convincingly identified as the Venetian admiral Agostino Barbarigo (1516–1571) by Gyorgy Gombosi in 1928 and independently by Francis M. Kelly in 1931. [5] Barbarigo was killed at the naval battle of Lepanto in October 1571, when he was shot in the left eye by a Turkish arrow, and he was immediately proclaimed to be a heroic martyr, who had played a central role in achieving victory for the allied Christian fleet. In his posthumous portrait, Veronese accordingly showed him in armor, displaying the instrument of his death like a saint with his attribute. It is easy to imagine that in the years and decades following the battle there was considerable demand among Barbarigo’s family and admirers for replicas of the portrait. Another version, reduced to a bust (Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest), was attributed by Rearick to Veronese’s younger brother Benedetto Caliari, but was accepted as an autograph Veronese by John Garton. [6]
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fig. 1 Veronese, Portrait of Agostino Barbarigo, after c. 1571, oil on canvas, Cleveland Museum of Art, Gift of Mrs. L. E. Holden, Mr. and Mrs. Guerdon S. Holden, and the L. E. Holden Fund 1928.16

NOTES


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The relatively coarse fabric support has been lined, and the tacking margins have been removed. The x-radiographs reveal slight cusping only on the left edge, indicating that the painting has been cropped on all four sides, but the left side is probably closest to the original edge of the composition. A vertical seam 7 centimeters from the right edge forms part of the original support. The smaller section of fabric on the right is made up of two pieces of fabric joined with a horizontal seam.

The canvas was prepared with an off-white ground, covered with a transparent brown imprimatura. Infrared reflectography at 1.1 to 2.4 microns [1] revealed an underdrawing outlining all the main contours of the figure. It also showed a drawing of a different male head to the left of the sitter, rotated 90 degrees. Dark paint strokes visible with infrared reflectography indicate that this earlier figure was depicted standing and wearing a long robe. The x-radiographs show that originally Barbarigo’s armor was crossed with a broad ribbon.

[3] As confirmed by Jon L. Seydl, curator at the Cleveland Museum of Art; see also John Garton, Grace and Grandeur: The Portraiture of Paolo Veronese (London and Turnhout, 2008), 99. Photographs taken prior to conservation in 1975 (for example, the one reproduced in Remigio Marini, Tutta la pittura di Paolo Veronese [Milan, 1968], 111) show the picture with added strips at both sides and below—with the sitter’s hand included—as well as with repainted clouds in the sky. These additions may, however, have accurately recorded lost areas that were original.

[4] Sotheby’s, New York, Oct. 17, 1997, lot 156, with an attribution to the Circle of Tintoretto. An equally mediocre, full-length derivation at Schloss Ambras, Innsbruck (for which see Francis M. Kelly, “A Problem of Identity,” Connoisseur 87 [April 1931]: 213), employs Veronese’s portrait of the head, but the body is obviously an invention.


The paint surface has been badly abraded by overcleaning in the past, and the appearance of the picture is also severely compromised by extensive and insensitive retouching of tears in the original canvas.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Michael Swicklik and Ina Slama
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[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with H, J, and K astronomy filters.

PROVENANCE

Henry Doetsch [1839-1894], London; (his estate sale, Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 22 and 24-25 June 1895, no. 43, as by Tintoretto); David L. Einstein [1839-1909], London;[1] his son, Lewis D. Einstein [1877-1967]; gift 1957 to NGA.

[1] Ellis Waterhouse supplied the information about the elder Einstein's purchase of the painting at the Doetsch sale in a note dated 22 July 1980, in NGA curatorial files. A red wax seal on the reverse of the painting has not yet been identified; the seal has an unmarked shield surmounted with the profile head of an antlered deer and to the left of the shield, the impressed numbers "129."
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This is one of a group of relatively small-scale Annunciations by Veronese and his workshop, which by common consent date to the last decade of the painter’s career. An obvious point of reference is provided by the large altarpiece in the Escorial, which Veronese signed and dated in 1583 [fig. 1]; and although it is not such a close replica of the altarpiece as another, smaller version, formerly in the Kisters Collection, Kreuzlingen, [1] the Gallery’s picture shares many features of composition with that in the Escorial. As in the altarpiece, the Angel Gabriel points upward to a vision of God the Father surrounded by clouds and angels; between the figures of God the Father and the Virgin, kneeling at her prie-dieu, is another blaze of light, containing the Dove of the Holy Spirit; and in both pictures the architectural setting includes a tall fluted column behind Gabriel and a marble balustrade, which closes off the paved foreground and leads to a view of the Virgin’s hortus conclusus, or enclosed garden. Most of these compositional elements are clearly derived from Titian’s Annunciation of circa 1536, now lost, but recorded in the well-circulated engraving of 1537 by Gian Jacopo Caraglio [fig. 2] (and, probably more accurately, in a workshop copy in Galashiels, Scotland). [2] In the Gallery’s picture, Veronese has added a number of details traditionally associated with the iconography of the Annunciation, including the view of the Virgin’s thalamus, or bedchamber, on the right, and the crystal carafe in front of her, symbolic of her purity. The cat, here seen crouching in front of the balustrade, occasionally also appears in scenes of the Annunciation, but it is not clear whether in the present case any symbolic allusion is intended. [3]
There exists some critical disagreement about the chronological relationship between the Escorial Annunciation and the present picture, and also on the extent of workshop collaboration in the latter. Critics who have insisted on the high, autograph quality of the painting include Rodolfo Pallucchini and Teresio Pignatti; [4] others, however, including Daniel Catton Rich, Edoardo Arslan, Remigio Marini (proposing the intervention of an assistant such as Benedetto Caliari or Francesco Montemezzano), Richard Cocke, and Fern Rusk Shapley (downgrading her own previous assessment), have judged it to be essentially a shop product. [5] Indeed, while the intervention of the master is evident in the energetic brushwork and rich scumbling, especially the execution of the God the Father group and the background is more perfunctory and may be regarded as the work of an assistant. Pallucchini proposed a dating to circa 1580/1583, apparently because he justifiably regarded the altarpiece as a work of collaboration and considered it logical that what he regarded as the finer painting should precede the less fine. He was followed in this opinion by Pignatti in 1976. [6]

In his monograph of 1995, however, Pignatti described the Escorial altarpiece as the first in the series of Veronese’s late Annunciations, an apparent change of opinion that seems fully justified. The Escorial picture was commissioned as part of the multipaneled retablo for the high altar of the royal basilica; [7] and although it was never in fact incorporated, it was clearly painted according to strict instructions regarding subject and dimensions and according to precise information about its intended placing at the bottom left of the ensemble. Commissioned to paint a large Annunciation for King Philip II of Spain, Veronese would have found it natural to draw inspiration from Titian’s version of half a century earlier. Although he would have known this picture only in the form of Caraglio’s engraving, Veronese would have been perfectly aware that Titian had sent the original to Spain as a diplomatic gift to Philip’s mother, the empress Isabella. [8] By drawing a parallel between his own version of the Annunciation and that by his recently deceased colleague, he would have been paying a gracious compliment to both Titian and Philip, while also perhaps angling to inherit his predecessor’s mantle as preferred painter of the Spanish monarch. Then, having met the terms of a major foreign commission, it would have been equally natural for Veronese to have maximized on his invention by producing a number of smaller versions, of greater or lesser quality, for the local market. No longer bound by the intended context of the Escorial altarpiece, Veronese adopted a squarer picture field for the Gallery’s picture and showed the light coming from the left rather than from the liturgical south. The pose of the
Angel—moving forward, as in Titian’s prototype, rather than balletically hovering in the left corner—may also reflect the change of context and function.

In keeping with the officially sanctioned belief that the city of Venice came into existence on the Feast of the Annunciation in the year 421, the image of the Virgin Annunciate traditionally formed a central element of Venetian political iconography, most notably in the Annunciation group represented in the mid-14th century by Guariento on either side of his monumental fresco depicting the Coronation of the Virgin in the Sala del Maggior Consiglio in the Doge’s Palace. In a study of Veronese’s series of Annunciations of the 1580s, Daniel Arasse found it no coincidence that the subject should have found particular success in the context of private devotion in the decade following the destruction of Guariento’s fresco by fire (1577) and coinciding with a particularly terrible outbreak of the plague (1575–1577). [9] The author argued that the Venetian authorities, while replacing the Coronation with Tintoretto’s Paradise in the council chamber, actively encouraged the more intimate subject of the Annunciation in the context of private devotion. He also argued that in the post-Tridentine period, the Virgin Mary was more actively promoted as a protector against the plague than the traditional plague saints Sebastian and Roch, and that the dignified, noble style of Veronese was regarded as more appropriate to Marian iconography than that of other leading Venetian painters, such as Tintoretto or Bassano. Although interesting, these arguments remain somewhat speculative, and Arasse did not mention the commission from Philip, which surely provided the most significant stimulus for Veronese’s preoccupation with the subject of the Annunciation in the 1580s.

From the time of its earliest known record, at the Carignan sale in Paris in 1742, until its sale at Christie’s in 1785, the Annunciation was paired with a Noli Me Tangere by Veronese of the identical format and dimensions. [10] Since the latter picture has now disappeared, it is difficult to judge whether the two were always intended as pendants. Although their respective subjects are not closely linked, their compositions, involving two figures in close psychological interaction but without physical contact, could have been complementary.
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fig. 1 Veronese, *The Annunciation*, 1583, oil on canvas, Real Monasterio de San Lorenzo, Escorial, Madrid. Album / Art Resource, NY

fig. 2 Gian Jacopo Caraglio, after Titian, *The Annunciation*, 1537, engraving, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Rosenwald Collection

NOTES

[1] For the ex-Kisters picture, see Terisio Pignatti and Filippo Pedrocco, *Veronese* (Milan, 1995), 2:448. The authors described it as a preparatory
modello for the Escorial Annunciation, but it seems rather to represent a derivation from the altarpiece, executed by a member of Veronese’s workshop.


[3] According to George Ferguson, Signs and Symbols in Christian Art (New York, 1954), 17, a cat in a representation of the Annunciation may allude to the Devil, who is put to flight by the Incarnation of Christ, or it may refer to a legend that told of a cat giving birth in the stable where Christ was born.


[8] For the circumstances of the gift, see Harold Wethey, The Paintings of Titian (London, 1969), 1:70. Titian’s painting, which was later kept at the royal palace of Aranjuez, was destroyed about 1814 during the Peninsular War.


[10] See Provenance, note 1. As pointed out by Burton Fredericksen (message to Peter Humfrey of Feb. 4, 2009), the two were sold as parts of the same lot at the Carignan, Conti, Poullain, and Vaudreuil sales (see Provenance), while at the Christie’s sale of 1785, the Noli Me Tangere appears as the following lot (no. 80).
X-radiographs reveal that strips respectively measuring 7.3 centimeters and 6.4 centimeters wide have been sewn to the original fabric support at the top and bottom. All of the fabrics are plain weave, but these added strips are coarser than the relatively fine main support fabric and were certainly later additions; they were already present by 1781, however, when the composition was engraved. [1] The painting has been lined, and the tacking margins on the left and right edges have been opened up and incorporated into the picture plane.

Microscopic examination has confirmed that the canvas was primed with a dark, reddish-brown ground, and this is visible to the naked eye beneath the thinnest paint layers. The paint was applied fluidly with vigorous brushstrokes.

The rather thick varnish has discolored, obscuring the vibrancy of the original palette. The extensive retouching that covers mild abrasion to the paint and numerous small repairs has similarly discolored.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Jia-sun Tsang
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[1] By Le Grand (in reverse) in François Basan, ed., Collection de cent-vingt estampes, gravées d’après les tableaux & dessins qui composoient le cabinet de M. Poullain (Paris, 1781), pl. 78.

PROVENANCE

Victor Amédée, 3rd prince de Carignan [1690-1741], Paris; (his estate sale, Hôtel de Soissons, Paris, 30 July 1742 and days following, unnumbered lots, bought in); (his estate sale, Hôtel de Soissons, Paris, 18 June 1743 and days following, no. 101); purchased by Thibaut for Louis François I de Bourbon, prince de Conti [1717-1776], Paris; (his estate sale, Palais du Temple, Paris, 8 April 1777 and days following, no. 104); purchased by Jacques Langlier for Antoine Poullain [d. 1780], Paris; (Poullain estate sale, Hôtel de Bullion, Paris, 15-21 March 1780, 3rd day, no. 4); (Jean Baptiste Pierre Le Brun, Paris); Joseph Hyacinthe François de Paul de Rigaud, comte de...
Vaudreuil [1740-1817], Paris; (his sale, Hôtel de Bullion, Paris, 24-25 November 1784, 2nd day, no. 6); (J.P.B. Le Brun, Paris and London); (Le Brun sale, Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 18-19 March 1785, 2nd day, no. 79); Welbore Ellis Agar [1735-1805], London; by inheritance to Welbore Felix Agar and Emmanuel Felix Agar; purchased with the entire Agar collection by Robert Grosvenor, 1st marquess of Westminster [1767-1845], Eaton Hall, Cheshire, England;[1] by inheritance to his son, Richard Grosvenor, 2nd marquess of Westminster [1795-1869], Eaton Hall; by inheritance to his son, Hugh Lupus Grosvenor, 1st duke of Westminster [1825-1899], Eaton Hall; by inheritance to his grandson, Hugh Richard Arthur Grosvenor, 2nd duke of Westminster [1879-1953], Eaton Hall; (Westminster sale, Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 4 July 1924, no. 58); (Buttery, London). (Julius Böhler, Munich and Lucerne); sold 17 February 1925 to Julius H. Haass [d. 1931], Detroit; by inheritance to his wife, Lillian Henkel Haass, until at least 1949.[2] (Newhouse Galleries, New York). (Frederick Mont, Inc., New York), from at least 1956; sold 14 February 1957 to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York;[3] gift 1959 to NGA.

[1] The details of the ownership by Carignan, Conti, Vaudreuil, and Agar were provided by Burton Fredericksen, then Director of the Getty Provenance Index, in letters of 10 August and 16 December 1987 to Suzannah Fabing (in NGA curatorial files). In the first five sales listed, the painting was paired with a pendant depicting L’Apparition de notre Seigneur à la Magdeleine (or Noli Me Tangere). As pointed out by Fredericksen in a message to Peter Humfrey of 4 February 2009, the two were sold as parts of the same lot at the Carignan, Conti, Poullain, and Vaudreuil sales, while at the Christie’s sale of 1785, the Noli Me Tangere appears as the following lot (no. 80).

The NGA painting is listed in François Basan, ed., Collection de cent-vingt estampes, Paris, 1781, a volume of 120 engravings after paintings that had belonged to the recently deceased “M. Poullain, Receveur Général des Domaines du Roi.” Jean Habert discusses the passage of an Annunciation by Veronese from the Carignan to the Conti and Poullain collections, with further bibliography, without, however, identifying it with the NGA painting. In all these collections the Annunciation was paired with a Noli Me Tangere, identified by Habert with the version in the Musée de Grenoble (inv. MG7); but while the two works are consistent stylistically, the latter work is of a horizontal format (67 x 95 cm), whereas in the sale catalogues they are listed as of identical format and

The Annunciation
© National Gallery of Art, Washington

The painting was published in the catalogue of a planned sale of the Agar collection (Christie, Manson & Woods, London, 3 May 1806, no. 34), but Grosvenor purchased the entire collection prior to the sale.

[2] The original bill of sale is in NGA curatorial files, sent by the Haass’s daughter, Constance Haass McMath, with a letter of 12 February 1962 to NGA curator Perry Cott. Mrs. Haass lent the painting to a 1949 exhibition in Detroit.

[3] Betty Mont wrote to Guy Emerson of the Kress Foundation on 5 November 1956 that they had “a lovely ‘Annunciation’ by Paolo Veronese” in their studio. The invoice from Frederick Mont & Company to the Kress Foundation, for four paintings including the Veronese, is dated 14 February 1957; three payments for the group were completed in September of the same year. (Copies of the letter and invoice are in NGA curatorial files.)
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The subject is taken from Exodus 2:3–10. According to the biblical account, the infant Moses was placed by his mother in a basket and hidden beside the river, to escape the edict of the king of Egypt that all the male offspring of the Israelites should be slain at birth. The basket was discovered by the king’s daughter when she came to the river to bathe with her maidservants. Seeing the princess take pity on the child, Moses’s sister Miriam, who had been keeping watch from a distance, approached and offered to find a nurse for him; in this way, Moses was saved and brought up by his own mother. Veronese imagined the event in contemporary terms and showed the princess wearing a magnificent robe of gold and silver brocade and copious jewelry, surrounded by a courtly entourage that includes a dwarf. In the immediate foreground, an African servant holds the now-empty basket. The kneeling woman holding the baby is presumably Miriam, and the older woman preparing to wrap him in a cloth is his mother. In the left middle ground, two other servants, apparently unaware of the remarkable discovery, have undressed to their shifts and are preparing to bathe in the river. Although in Christian tradition Moses was often interpreted as a prototype for Christ, Veronese did not seem to be concerned here with the possible theological, political, or moral implications of the story, but treated it, as observed by Kurt Badt, simply as a poetic idyll. [1]

Together with a near-identical composition in a private collection, [2] the picture is a close variant of Veronese’s masterly The Finding of Moses in the Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid (57 × 43 cm) [fig. 1]. The Prado picture is not dated, but it is one of a number of versions of the subject painted by Veronese and his workshop that
scholars agree are datable to the early 1580s. [3] These other versions, all of which are considerably larger than those in the Prado and Washington and are painted in a horizontal rather than vertical format, include the picture in the Gemäldegalerie, Dresden, originally from the Palazzo Grimani at the Servi, Venice; that in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lyon; [4] that in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Dijon; and that in the Galleria Sabauda, Turin, which was painted for Carlo Emanuele I of Savoy between 1582 and 1584. [5] The chronology of these and other versions, in which the workshop clearly played a substantial role, is a matter of some controversy. Terisio Pignatti and Filippo Pedrocco, for example, argued that the Prado picture is the first of the series, on the grounds of its supreme quality; [6] for Howard Coutts, the Turin picture is the earliest, because the subject is likely to have been chosen by Carlo Emanuele for its dynastic implications, which would then have become less relevant as Veronese repeated it for the Venetian market; [7] for Richard Cocke, the first was the one in Dijon, because the double vista in the background resembles that of the Rape of Europa (Doge’s Palace, Venice), which he dated to the early 1570s; [8] and for W. R. Rearick, the earliest was a now-lost painting of vertical format, recorded in a chiaroscuro woodcut of 1741 by John Baptist Jackson [fig. 2] and in a copy by Sebastiano Ricci (Royal Collection, Hampton Court), because he interpreted a sheet of studies in the Morgan Library, New York [fig. 3], datable for external reasons to 1581, as preparatory to this lost version. [9] According to Rearick, Veronese then developed some of the ideas adumbrated on this sheet in the Prado picture, which he saw as a small-scale, highly refined variant of the lost work, painted immediately afterward, and in advance of the series of horizontal compositions, most of which were executed with extensive shop assistance. His implied dating to circa 1581/1582, in any case, remains consistent with that already proposed by Pignatti and Rodolfo Pallucchini. [10]

None of these arguments on the chronological order are binding, however, nor is the relationship between the Gallery’s picture and that in the Prado entirely clear. Once account has been taken of the slight enlargement of the former along all four of its edges (see Technical Summary), its dimensions are virtually identical to those of the Prado version (58 × 44.5 cm). Comparison between them reveals a number of minor differences, most obviously in the costume of the princess: in the fabric of her gown, in her waistline and neckline, and in her crown. Further, in the Gallery’s version, her companion wears a striped gown, and the details of the city and hillside in the left background are different. While some scholars have judged the Gallery’s picture to be an autograph replica of equal quality to the Prado original, [11] a persistent tradition regards the former as the weaker and later of the two. [12]
Particularly severe in her verdict was Beverly Brown, for whom the Gallery’s version is a copy made in the workshop by an executant who did not always understand the master’s intentions and whose alterations were consistently for the worse. [13] She interpreted the x-radiograph as showing that the copyist transferred the design mechanically from the original [14] and pointed to a number of unsatisfactory details in the execution, such as the coarsening of the princess’s features, the transformation of two of the fingers of her companion’s left hand into folds of drapery, and the elimination of the tree against which the foremost of the bathers steadies herself. Yet the recent treatment has revealed that in at least some of these instances, the unsatisfactory appearance was the result of later overpaint; [15] and from the evidence of infrared reflectography at 1.5 to 1.8 microns [fig. 4], [16] it is even possible to argue that the design of the Gallery’s version precedes that of the Prado. In particular, the fact that the servant and dwarf at the right were painted over the striped fabric of the figure behind them suggests that the pair was newly invented for the Gallery’s version, rather than simply representing a copy after the Prado picture. Furthermore, while the pointing gesture of the princess in the upper right of the Morgan sheet does indeed relate to the lost version recorded by Jackson and Ricci, it is just as valid to interpret the initial figure group on the left of the sheet, in which the princess’s costume features diagonal bands across her chest, as directly preparatory to the Washington version. [17] In both the lost and the Prado versions, by contrast, she wears a currently fashionable bodice, and in the latter picture, she does not raise her left knee to step forward, but simply stands. On the other hand, the x-radiographs of the Washington painting [fig. 5] also show that originally the princess’s dress more closely resembled the one in the Prado version. This cross-fertilization of ideas between the two versions may even imply that they were executed together, side by side, [18] and that it is a mistake to insist on the chronological priority of one over the other. In any case, it has been observed that the departure from contemporary fashion in the princess’s dress in the Washington version, with the diagonal bands under the breasts, should not be interpreted as the result of any misunderstanding but as a deliberate attempt to invest the costume with a suggestion of the antique. [19] While, therefore, on balance the Prado version may be regarded as the finer and more sensitively executed picture, the Gallery’s version may also be regarded as substantially autograph. Perhaps, if the former was painted on commission, the latter, as was first suggested by Remigio Marini, was retained in the workshop as a basis for future variants. [20] In support of this suggestion, Brown has pointed out that at least two of these variants—one in the
collection of Robert Haagens, Walpole (MA) in 1973, and the other on the art market in Lucerne in 1945 [21]—show features peculiar to it and not present in the Prado version.
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**fig. 1** Veronese, *The Finding of Moses*, c. 1580, oil on canvas, Museo Nacional del Prado. © Photographic Archive Museo Nacional del Prado

**fig. 2** John Baptist Jackson, after Veronese, *The Finding of Moses*, 1741, chiaroscuro woodcut in buff, light brown, light violet gray, and dark gray, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Rosenwald Collection

**fig. 4** Infrared reflectogram, Veronese, *The Finding of Moses*, c. 1581/1582, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Andrew W. Mellon Collection
NOTES


[2] Published by Diana Gisolfi, “Collaboration and Replicas in the Shop of Paolo Veronese and His Heirs,” *Artibus et Historiae* 28, no. 55 (2007): fig. 4, as “Paolo Veronese Shop.” From the author’s reproduction, however, this looks as if it may be an 18th-century copy of the Gallery’s picture.


Terisio Pignatti, Veronese (Venice, 1976), 1:90, 146; Rodolfo Pallucchini, Veronese (Milan, 1984), 126, 184.


David Alan Brown has orally suggested that the picture may be by the same
The picture is painted on a relatively finely woven fabric, which remains in good condition. The painting has been lined, and the tacking margins have been removed. The x-radiographs [fig. 1] show additions of approximately 1.5 centimeters, which are not original, around all four edges. The ground is a dark, reddish-brown color, and from microscopic examination, it appears that the execution of the sky and background preceded that of the foreground and that hand as the Holy Family with Saint Mary Magdalen and a Female Donor in the Louvre, Paris (no. 140), where it is attributed to the workshop of Veronese.


[16] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with an H astronomy filter.

[17] For the Morgan drawing, see John Marciari in Rhoda Eitel-Porter and John Marciari, Italian Renaissance Drawings at the Morgan Library and Museum (New York, 2019), 249–251. I am grateful to John Marciari for showing me his entry in advance of its publication. For more on the relationship between the Morgan drawing, the Prado’s version, and the Gallery’s painting, with particular attention to findings from the technical analysis, see Joanna Dunn and John Marciari, “Paolo Veronese's Finding of Moses: A Reassessment,” in Facture, vol. 4, Series, Multiples, and Replicas, ed. Daphne Barbour and Suzanne Quillen Lomax (Washington, DC, forthcoming).

[18] As suggested by Joanna Dunn of the department of conservation, NGA.


reserves were left for the figures. The paint was applied fluidly and relatively quickly, with variations in thickness from the very thin shadows to a moderate impasto in the highlights. X-radiographs and infrared reflectography at 1.5 to 1.8 microns [1] [fig. 2] show that no reserve was left for the two figures at the right and that they were painted over the striped robe of the servant behind them, as if they were not part of the original design. The x-radiographs also show changes to the princess’s dress; originally, it more closely resembled the one in the Prado version of the painting.

The painting is in good condition apart from some staining in the sky. It was treated between 2008 and 2011, at which time extensive retouching that covered the additions and extended approximately 2 centimeters into the picture plane was removed. This revealed a tree on the left side that had been painted out, probably when the additions were added.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Michael Swicklik and Susanna Griswold and the treatment report by Joanna Dunn
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PROVENANCE

Louis Michel Vanloo [1707-1771], Paris; (his sale, Paris, 14 December 1772, no. 2); purchased by (Augustin Ménageot, Paris) through Denis Diderot [1713-1784], Paris, for Catherine II, empress of Russia [1729-1796], Saint Petersburg;[1] Imperial Hermitage Gallery, Saint Petersburg; purchased November 1930 through

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Santa Barbara Focalplane InSb camera fitted with an H astronomy filter.

[1] The title page of the 1772 Vanloo sale catalogue indicates the sale was to be "à la fin de Novembre" (at the end of November), but the listing by Frits Lugt (no. 2083 in volume 1 of Fritz Lugt, Répertoire des Catalogues de Ventes Publiques, 4 vols., The Hague, 1938-1964), refers to his no. 2086, which indicates the Vanloo sale took place 14-17 December. The details of Ménageot's role in the sale to Catherine II are outlined in a letter of 19 January 1997 from Dr. Nicole Willk-Brocard, and her article "Augustin Ménageot (ca. 1700-1784), Marchand de Tableaux. Quelques Jalons," Gazette des Beaux-Arts (April 1998): 161-182 (both in NGA curatorial files).

[2] Mellon purchase date and date deeded to Mellon Trust are according to Mellon collection files in NGA curatorial records and David Finley's notebook (donated to the National Gallery of Art in 1977, now in the Gallery Archives).
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The picture is first unambiguously recorded in 1723 as above the door to the campanile in the church of Santa Croce, Belluno (see Provenance). This is unlikely, however, to have been its original position, and it was probably painted for the side wall of the nearby chapel of Saint Lucy, to complement an altarpiece consisting of a triptych of gilded wooden statues. The displacement of Veronese’s painting was probably necessitated by the commission of the local Bellunese painter Giovanni Fossa (1645–1732) to decorate the chapel with a new scene of the saint’s martyrdom, probably in fresco. The circumstances of Veronese’s commission are undocumented, but the body responsible for supervising the extensive redecoration of the church in the late 16th century, often employing painters from Venice, was a leading local devotional confraternity, the Compagnia della Croce. [1] The likelihood that the Compagnia played a major role in the commission is confirmed by Carlo Ridolfi, who listed among Veronese’s works “E per la Compagnia della Croce di Cluidale la figure di Santa Lucia” (And for the
Saint Lucy was a virgin martyr of Syracuse, who was put to death at the beginning of the 4th century during the persecutions of the emperor Diocletian. According to the account of her life given in the *Golden Legend*, numerous unsuccessful attempts were made to force her to abjure her Christian faith. Whole teams of oxen were unable to drag her to a brothel. In exasperation, the Roman governor commanded that she be burned at the stake, but before this could happen, one of his henchmen plunged his sword into her throat. She remained alive long enough for a priest to arrive to administer the last rites. While alluding to the episodes of the burning and the oxen in the sketchily executed background, and including on the far left the half-cropped figure of Lucy’s mother, Eutychia, Veronese conflated in the right foreground the two aspects of the story that would have been of particular interest to post-Tridentine religion: Lucy’s martyrdom and her reception of the sacrament of the Eucharist. Even as she sacrifices her life for the love of Christ, she is seen accepting that the soul’s salvation is achieved only through the sacraments of the Catholic Church; while the executioner bends over her almost tenderly to perform his brutal task, she gazes in tearful rapture at the Eucharistic wafer. As pointed out by Beverly Brown, Veronese’s affective emphasis on the redemptive power of the Eucharist may have been inspired by the description of Lucy’s martyrdom in Lorenzo Surio’s *De Probatis Sanctorum Historis*, published in Venice in 1575. But as Brown also noted, Surio said that the executioner stabbed the saint in the abdomen, whereas Veronese, adapting the iconography of Saint Justina, showed her being stabbed in the breast.

The picture is not dated, but ever since its first public display at the *Italian Art and Britain* exhibition in 1960, there has been general agreement that it is an autograph work of high quality, datable to the last decade of Veronese’s life, between circa 1582 and his death in 1588. Analyzing the x-radiographs [fig. 1] and the pentimenti they reveal, Brown has drawn attention the spontaneity of the design process. Rodolfo Pallucchini, Alessandro Ballarin, and Brown have dated the picture to the earlier part of the decade, to circa 1580/1582, whereas Terisio Pignatti and Filippo Pedrocco, as well as W. R. Rearick, have seen it as a very late work of circa 1585/1586. In favor of the latter dating is the dusky color range and the picture’s very close stylistic similarity to the documented *Miracle of Saint Pantaleon* of 1587 (San Pantalon, Venice), in which a vested priest similarly ministers to a suffering victim with deep compassion.
Brown has noted two early copies, both probably dating from the earlier 17th century: one, a small oval on panel, in the Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice, formerly in the monastery of San Michele in Isola; and the other, larger and less faithful, in an English private collection. Brown also traced the inspiration of the painting on later Venetian painters, such as Sebastiano Ricci and Giovanni Battista Tiepolo.
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fig. 1 X-radiograph, Veronese, The Martyrdom and Last Communion of Saint Lucy, c. 1585/1586, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Gift of The Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation and Alisa Mellon Bruce Fund

NOTES


The picture is painted on a plain-weave, medium-weight fabric, consisting of three pieces, the largest of which is joined to the two smaller ones along a horizontal seam running approximately 39 centimeters above the lower edge. A vertical seam in Saint Lucy’s robe joins the two smaller pieces of fabric. The painting has been lined, and although the original tacking margins are now missing, it appears to be close to its original dimensions. The paint was applied fluidly over an off-white preparation, thinly in the darker areas, more thickly in the light colors, and more thickly still in the highlights. The x-radiographs [fig. 1] show extensive pentimenti as in the positions of Saint Lucy’s head and outstretched hand, in the hand of the kneeling figure, in the area above Lucy’s cap, in the architecture above the executioner’s head, in the man in the background sitting on the well, and elsewhere. There are several old tears in the original fabric support; the most prevalent ones are located in Saint Lucy’s neck, in the head and scarf of the left-most figure, and in the blue garment of the kneeling figure. The surface is somewhat abraded, and the thinly painted architecture has darkened, in a way that


compromises the spatial relationship of foreground to background. The painting was treated in 1982 before it entered the collection.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination report by Jia-sun Tsang
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fig. 1 X-radiograph, Veronese, *The Martyrdom and Last Communion of Saint Lucy*, c. 1585/1586, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Gift of The Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation and Ailsa Mellon Bruce Fund

PROVENANCE

The picture is first certainly recorded in the pastoral visitation of the church undertaken by Bishop Rota in 1723: “Vicino all’altar di Santa Lucia sopra la porta del campanile ... una bellissima pittura del Martirio di Santa Lucia dipinta da Paolo Veronese” (near the altar of Saint Lucy above the door to the campanile ... a very beautiful painting of the Martyrdom of Saint Lucy by Paolo Veronese) (quoted in Mario Dal Mas and Attilio Giacobbi, Chiese scomparse di Belluno, Belluno, 1977: 104). It is again recorded in the church in 1780 by Lucio Doglioni, Notizie istoriche e geografiche della città di Belluno e sua provincia: Con dissertazioni due dell’antico stato, e intorno al sito di Belluno (1780), rev. ed., Belluno, 1816: 36. These references confirm that Ridolfi was referring to the present picture in his laconic mention of a “figura di Santa Lucia” by Veronese in Santa Croce. See Carlo Ridolfi, Le maraviglie dell’arte, overo Le vite de gl’illustri pittori veneti, e dello stato (Venice, 1648), ed. Detlev von Hadeln, 2 vols., Berlin, 1914-1924: 1(1914):317; and Peter Humfrey, “The Provenance of Veronese’s Martyrdom of St Lucy in Washington,” Arte veneta 43 (1989-1990): 89–90. The church was demolished in 1830.

The picture is described with some precision in an inventory of paintings from suppressed religious foundations sent by the superintendent of paintings in Venice, Pietro Edwards, to Milan between 1808 and 1811 as “Il Martirio di Santa Lucia nell’atto di essere comunicata” (The martyrdom of Saint Lucy as she is taking communion) (see Vittorio Malamani, Memorie del Conte Leopoldo Cicognara, 2 vols., Venice, 1888: 2:378). The picture was probably initially destined for the Brera Gallery in Milan, but like many others it was selected by the viceroy Eugène de
Beauharnais for his own collection, and was then sold off after the collapse of the Naopoleonic regime in 1813/1814.

[3] Indice e descrizione dei quadri del Sig. Generale Conte Teodoro Lechi di Brescia esistenti nella sua casa in Milano, Milan, 1814: no. 49; Fausto Lechi, I quadri delle collezioni Lechi in Brescia, Florence, 1968: 184, no. 107, with the information that the Napoleonic general Lechi, a former companion-in-arms of Eugène de Beauharnais, acquired the picture in Milan.

[4] The sale to James Irvine is recorded by Fausto Lechi, I quadri delle collezioni Lechi in Brescia, Florence, 1968: 184, no. 107. In a letter of 10 July 1827, Irvine wrote to Forbes: “I forgot to say that the P. Veronese is the best of several he (Lechi) has got, but the subject will not perhaps please you. The saint is receiving the sacrament while the executioner is plunging a dagger in her breast, but it is less shocking than such subjects generally are.” Then, after visiting Brescia in September to conclude the purchase, he sought to provide more reassurance: “The Paul Veronese exceeded my expectation on seeing it down, and I think it may be called his finest work and much superior to all the others in this collection” (letters of 10 July and 24 October 1827, in private family papers; see Peter Humfrey, in The Age of Titian: Venetian Renaissance Art from Scottish Collections, ed. Aidan Weston-Lewis, exh. cat., Royal Scottish Academy, Edinburgh, 2004: 192). Sir William died in the following year without ever seeing the collection that Irvine had assembled for him, and it was in vain that the latter tried to elicit some enthusiasm for it from Sir William’s son and heir, Sir John Forbes. See William Buchanan, William Buchanan and the 19th Century Art Trade: 100 Letters to His Agents in London and Italy, ed. Hugh Brigstocke, London, 1982: 29-30.
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1814 Indice e Descrizione dei Quadri del Sig. Generale Conte Teodoro Lechi di Brescia esistenti nella sua Casa in Milano. Milan, 1814: no. 49.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location(s)</th>
<th>Pages/Repros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Romani, Vittoria</td>
<td>Tiziano e il tardo rinascimento a Venezia: Jacopo Bassano, Jacopo Tintoretto, Paolo Veronese</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>304, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Rosand, David</td>
<td>Véronèse</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>236-237, color repro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Biferali, Fabrizio</td>
<td>Paolo Veronese tra Riforma e Controriforma</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>2013: 101-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Harris, Neil</td>
<td>Capital Culture: J. Carter Brown, the National Gallery of Art, and the Reinvention of the Museum Experience</td>
<td>Chicago and London</td>
<td>2013: 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Zamperini, Alessandra</td>
<td>Paolo Veronese</td>
<td>San Giovanni Lupatoto, Verona</td>
<td>2013: 265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The story of Rebecca at the well comes from Genesis 24:11–22. The aged Abraham, wanting a wife for his son Isaac, sent his senior steward (usually identified as the Eliezer of Damascus mentioned in Genesis 15:2) to his homeland of Mesopotamia to find a suitable woman. Tired after his long journey, the steward stopped at a well outside the city of Nahor and prayed for guidance. Rebecca came out of the city to draw water from the well, and when she offered it to the old man and his camels, he recognized her as the appointed bride and presented her with the betrothal jewels of a gold earring and two bracelets. In Veronese’s depiction, the jewels are offered by a kneeling servant, while the city of Nahor is represented in the right background.

First recorded in 1613, in the posthumous inventory of Charles de Croy, 4th Duke of Arschot, at the Château de Beaufort in the Spanish Netherlands, the picture once formed part of a series of ten paintings by Veronese and/or his workshop, five of which show scenes from the Old Testament and five from the New. [1] Of the other
nine, seven are now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (Hagar and the Angel, Esther before Ahasuerus, The Flight of Lot, Susanna and the Elders, Christ and the Samaritan Woman [fig. 1], Christ and the Adulteress, Christ and the Centurion); one is in the Castle Museum, Prague (Adoration of the Shepherds); and one (The Flight into Egypt—or more probably, a Rest on the Flight) is lost. [2] An eleventh canvas, The Washing of the Disciples’ Feet, also in Prague, is sometimes, but inconclusively, associated with the series. [3]

As well as being complementary in their subject matter, the ten canvases are nearly identical in size and shape and were clearly commissioned as a cycle for a particular building; on the evidence of style, scholars are agreed that they date from the 1580s, the last decade of the painter’s life. [4] The identity of the patron, however, remains a mystery; furthermore, it is far from clear whether the series was originally destined for a secular building—some princely residence or private palace—or for a church or convent. Sergio Marinelli preferred the secular option and even raised the possibility that the series was commissioned for a royal palace, such as the Escorial. [5] Friderike Klauner, by contrast, identified the site as some religious building in Venice; and this view is made more plausible by the demonstration by Hans Aurenhammer that another series of canvases by Veronese and his workshop with subjects drawn from the Old and New Testaments was originally painted for the sacristy of the Servite conventual church of San Giacomo della Giudecca. [6] In this connection it may be noted that the protagonists of the majority (but not quite all) of the canvases are women, in a way that would have been appropriate for a nunnery. Yet whatever the original destination, the paintings cannot have remained in place for long—indeed, for some reason they may never have been installed—since they had already reached the Netherlands within two decades of Veronese’s death. In any case, as suggested by Beverly Brown, they may well have already been for sale in Venice in 1588 and been bought by Arschot, [7] and although she was mistaken in supposing that the 4th Duke was ever in the city, it remains perfectly possible that the paintings were acquired by his father, Philippe, 3rd Duke, who briefly visited in 1588, and who died there in 1595, on his return from a pilgrimage to Loreto. [8] Another possibility, raised by Klara Garas, is that the canvases are arguably identical with a group of pictures by Veronese that was unsuccessfully offered in 1606 to the German prince Ernst von Schaumburg by the painters Josef Heintz and Hans Rottenhammer. [9] In this case, the paintings would have remained either in their original destination or unsold between Veronese’s death in 1588 and 1606, and the 4th Duke of Arschot would have acquired them between this date and his

Rebecca at the Well
© National Gallery of Art, Washington
death in 1612, perhaps through the same intermediaries.

In the absence of certain information about the original destination of the series, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions regarding the choice of subjects. As noted by Brown, some of the Old and New Testament scenes can be arranged in typologically matching pairs, and the Gallery’s picture finds a natural pendant in the Christ and the Samaritan Woman, in which the scene is likewise set beside a well, from which a beautiful young woman draws water and gives it to her unknown guest to drink. Just as in the Old Testament scene Abraham’s steward recognizes Rebecca by this act as the wife promised to Isaac by God, so in the corresponding New Testament scene (John 4:6–42), the Samaritan woman—at a well founded by Rebecca’s son Jacob—recognizes Christ as the Messiah. [10] Since both scenes are lit from the left, it might further be inferred that they were intended to hang beside one another in their original setting. Yet most of the other subjects cannot be paired off in this way, and as noted above, while a majority of them has a female protagonist, in a way that might be interpreted as appropriate as a positive or negative model for a community of nuns, a subject such as Christ and the Centurion would have no place in such a scheme. Brown also noted that most of the canvases repeat subjects, poses, and compositions previously used by Veronese, and in the end it may be that the choice of subjects was determined as much by practical convenience as by any strict iconological program.

Although some scholars, including Alessandro Ballarin, Remigio Marini, and Rodolfo Pallucchini, [11] have regarded the series as autograph, or substantially autograph, works by Veronese, there exists a long tradition for judging them to be products of the master’s workshop: Franz Wickhoff, for example, gave them to Veronese’s close follower Francesco Montemezzano (1555–c. 1602). [12] Any assessment of the quality of the Gallery’s picture is complicated by its present badly abraded condition and its many inexpert retouchings. Yet it is clear that the execution of the landscape and vegetation must always have been perfunctory, with even the yellow drapery on the foreground servant poorly handled, and Brown was certainly correct to insist that the Rebecca is not as refined as Veronese at his best. [13] Brown suggested that the figure of Rebecca follows, in reverse, a design used for her counterpart in another version of the subject, in the collection of the Earl of Yarborough. This picture, however, is of even weaker quality, so the relationship of the two compositions to each other, to a third version of the subject (Château de Versailles), and to an autograph preparatory drawing showing figures and camels (private collection, England) remains to be clarified. [14]
The reuse of existing designs might also explain why the figure of Rebecca appears somewhat small in relation to the male figures, and why, as observed by Kurt Badt, [15] the psychological and dramatic potential of the story is not properly realized.
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fig. 1 Veronese and Workshop, Christ and the Samaritan Woman, c. 1585, oil on canvas, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. © KHM-Museumsverband

NOTES


[2] For these paintings, see Terisio Pignatti and Filippo Pedrocchi, Veronese (Milan, 1995), 2:466–472. Brown has convincingly matched up the individual paintings with the sometimes vague descriptions in the Arschot inventory of 1613, in Beverly Louise Brown, “The So-Called Duke of Buckingham Series,” in Nuovi studi su Paolo Veronese, ed. Massimo Gemin (Venice, 1990), 231. Klauner argued that there never was a Flight into Egypt, in Friderike Klauner,

[3] The reason for associating the picture with the series is that like the others (except for the apparently lost *Flight into Egypt*), it belonged to the Duke of Buckingham and is of similar size and format. Friderike Klauner, “Zu Veroneses Buckingham-Serie,” *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 44 (1991): 107–109, also found it integral to her theological interpretation of the series. It may be noted, however, that the picture is not mentioned in the Arschot inventory of 1613, and that it was originally narrower than the other canvases and may have been widened to conform with them. Brown has suggested that a 12th picture by Veronese, *The Anointing of David* (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), which was likewise owned by Arschot and later by Buckingham, also belonged to the series, but this suggestion was rejected by Klauner, and by Pignatti and Pedrocco, because of its different style and format. See Beverly Louise Brown, “The So-Called Duke of Buckingham Series,” in *Nuovi studi su Paolo Veronese*, ed. Massimo Gemin (Venice, 1990), 234–239; Friderike Klauner, “Zu Veroneses Buckingham-Serie,” *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 44 (1991): 119 n. 24; Terisio Pignatti and Filippo Pedrocco, *Veronese* (Milan, 1995), 2:466.


negotiate for the purchase of the paintings. It is worth noting, however, that his host in Venice in 1595 was the wealthy merchant Carlo Helman, whose family, originally from Cologne, had close dealings with Titian, and who is likely to have been well informed about the Venetian art market. See Valentina Sapienza, in Der späte Tizian und die Sinnlichkeit der Malerei, ed. Sylvia Ferino-Pagden (Vienna, 2007), 347.


[10] Beverly Louise Brown, “The So-Called Duke of Buckingham Series,” in Nuovi studi su Paolo Veronese, ed. Massimo Gemin (Venice, 1990), 235. Friderike Klauner, “Zu Veroneses Buckingham-Serie,” Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte 44 (1991): 113–114, agreed with this typological pairing, but suggested that further theological allusions in the Rebecca were intended. She pointed out, for example, that Rebecca was often interpreted as a type for the Virgin Mary (and hence also as a symbol of the church), and the well as a symbol of baptism and eternal life. According to Augusto Gentili, detailed arguments for the typological pairing with the Samaritan Woman were presented in 2010 by Lucia Casellato, who also argued that the series as a whole was intended for a feminine audience. See Augusto Gentili, “Veronesianna cum figuris: Almanacco 2000–2015. Parte prima,” Venezia Cinquecento 23, no. 46 (2013): 55–60.


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The picture was painted on a plainly woven, relatively coarse fabric, with three horizontal seams and one vertical seam. The vertical seam runs the entire height of the painting and is located approximately one-tenth from the right edge. One horizontal seam is located approximately one-third of the height of the painting from the bottom edge. It runs the entire length of the painting, including the area to the right of the vertical seam. The second horizontal seam is located approximately one-quarter of the height of the painting from the top edge. It runs from the left edge to the vertical seam. The topmost seam runs on a diagonal starting two inches from the top edge on the left to the center of the top edge. The painting has been lined, and cusping visible in the x-radiographs along the side edges indicates that the painting retains its original dimensions in the horizontal direction. The top and bottom edges have had their tacking margins flattened out, resulting in a slight expansion of the picture surface in the vertical direction. A thin imprimatura of warm brown was applied to a heavy white ground, and analysis of the paint application around the edges of the figures suggests that these were painted first, before the background. The paint was applied fluidly and relatively quickly, with its thickness varying from very thin in the darker areas of the background to moderately impasted in the highlights. The surface shows extensive abrasion and has suffered from a very heavy-handed lining, resulting in a general flattening, particularly of the impastos. The original paint is disfigured in places by careless retouchings.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Michael Swicklik and Joanna Dunn


[14] For this drawing and its relationship with the Versailles picture, see Richard Cocke, Veronese’s Drawings (London, 1984), 238–239; for its relationship with the Yarborough picture, see W. R. Rearick, in The Art of Paolo Veronese (Cambridge, 1988), 196. In the latter work, 180–181, Rearick also discussed the evolution of Veronese’s various paintings of Rebecca at the Well with reference to a picture at Burghley House, which he dated to 1584.

PROVENANCE


[1] The picture is listed, together with its companion-pieces by Veronese, in the posthumous inventory of 1613 of the duke's collection in his castle of Beaufort in Hainaut, no. 52: "Une pièce encoire sur thoille du susdit maistre, longue et large, et ces molures commes les précédentes, contenant la représentation d'une femme aiant les bras demy nud avecq ung vieillard, ung nein, ung moriaume et plusieurs chamaux" (A picture on canvas by the aforementioned master [Veronese], of the same dimensions and framing as the others, showing a woman with half-bare arms, an old man, a dwarf, a moor, and several camels). See Alexandre Pinchart, "La collection de Charles de Croy, duc d'Arscot, dans son château de Beaumont," Archives des Arts, Sciences, et Lettres 1 (1860): 164. Before the series was bought by the Duke of Buckingham in 1619, other English collectors, including the Earls of Somerset and Arundel, were alerted by their agents that they were available for purchase. See Philip McEvansoneya, “Some Documents Concerning the Patronage and Collections of the Duke of Buckingham,” Rutgers Art Review 8 (1987): 29 n. 18; Beverly Louise Brown, “The So-Called Duke of Buckingham Series,” in Nuovi studi su Paolo Veronese, edited by Massimo Gemin, Venice, 1990: 231-232; Philip McEvansoneya, “Italian Paintings in the Buckingham Collection,” in The Evolution of English Collecting: The Reception of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods, edited by Edward Chaney, New Haven and London, 2003: 320. Charles de Croy's widow was his second wife and his first cousin once removed; they were married in 1605 and she died in 1661.


BIBLIOGRAPHY


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Editor(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pages/Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Marini, Remigio. Tutta la pittura di Paolo Veronese</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>1968: 122 no. 224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Gallery of Art


In keeping with a well-established iconography, the penitent, half-naked saint is shown contemplating a crucifix and about to mortify his flesh by beating his breast with a stone. Prominently visible are his attributes of a tame lion, the Bible he translated into Latin, and the memento mori symbols of a skull and an hourglass.

While the generic style is clearly that of Paolo Veronese, there exists some critical disagreement both on the extent of the master’s involvement and on its place in his career. Following Wilhelm Suida and Bernard Berenson, Terisio Pignatti and Rodolfo Pallucchini accepted the picture as autograph; [1] but Richard Cocke called it a workshop piece, and Fern Rusk Shapley conceded that it is weaker in quality than Veronese’s altarpieces of the same subject from Santa Maria degli Angeli, Murano (now in San Pietro Martire), and Sant’Andrea della Zirada, Venice (now in the Gallerie dell’Accademia). [2] Although the present appearance of the picture is compromised by its poor condition, details, such as the weak drawing of the saint’s right foot and the awkward conjunction of the lion and the saint’s left leg, do indeed seem to indicate that it is by a studio assistant. This assistant may perhaps be most plausibly identified as Paolo’s younger brother Benedetto Caliari (1538–1598), who is already recorded as a collaborator on the paintings at San Sebastiano in the 1550s, and who became Veronese’s primary artistic heir after his death in 1588. [3] Benedetto’s own artistic personality is usually submerged.
beneath that of his brother, but the Gallery’s picture shares a number of stylistic traits with two of his best-attested independent works: the *Washing of the Disciples’ Feet* and the *Christ before Pilate* (both Gallerie dell’Accademia, Venice), painted in the late 1570s for the now-demolished church of San Niccolò ai Frari. In particular, the treatment of the drapery in the *Saint Jerome* closely resembles that in the foreground draperies of the *Washing of the Disciples’ Feet*: hard, shiny, and planar; and in both works, the musculature, too, falls into similarly stylized patterns.

The attribution of the present picture to an assistant, perhaps Benedetto, rather than to the master himself in turn affects any assessment of the date. Whereas Pignatti and Pallucchini placed the picture close to the Murano *Saint Jerome* of 1565, Shapley and Annalisa Perissa Torrini argued for a rather later date, close to the Sant’Andrea version, which is generally agreed to date from circa 1580. This later dating is the more convincing: apart from the fact that the lion is closely repeated from its counterpart in the finer Sant’Andrea altarpiece, the Gallery’s picture shares with this work the planar pose of the saint and the twilit, atmospheric landscape, both of which contrast with the Murano version, with its clear projection of firmly modeled forms into space. The saint’s profile also closely resembles that of other elderly figures by Veronese of about this time, such as the foremost king in the Hermitage *Adoration of the Magi* of circa 1580–1582. A likely date, therefore, is one close to that of Benedetto’s two paintings of the late 1570s for San Niccolò ai Frari, or perhaps slightly later.

According to Suida, the work may be identical with “a little picture with Saint Jerome” by Veronese recorded by Carlo Ridolfi (1648), Marco Boschini (1664), and Anton Maria Zanetti (1733) in the passage leading to the sacristy in the church of San Sebastiano in Venice. This suggestion is not necessarily contradicted by the probable provenance of the Gallery’s picture from the collection of Sir Peter Lely in the late 17th century, since Zanetti could have been simply repeating the information of Boschini, without realizing that the picture had already been sold to England. Yet Ridolfi’s phrase “piccolo quadretto” seems to imply a picture considerably smaller than one measuring nearly four feet by three, and the identification remains doubtful.

Shapley recorded the existence of a coarse copy in the Museo Provincial, Gerona.
NOTES


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The support consists of a twill-weave, medium-weight fabric. The painting has been lined and the tacking margins have been removed, with consequent damage along all four sides. It also appears from x-radiographs and examination with a stereomicroscope that the ground is either very thin or nonexistent. The sky and background were apparently painted prior to the addition of the figure, and the paint was applied unusually thinly, with impasto restricted to the yellow highlights and some of the white on the saint’s drapery.

The paint surface shows medium to heavy abrasion throughout and numerous scattered losses. Conservation treatment in 1986 involved the removal of extensive discolored retouching and overpaint, followed by extensive inpainting to match areas of original paint. Also removed at this time was a small branch above the saint’s head, which was found to be a complete addition.

Peter Humfrey and Joanna Dunn based on the examination reports by Ann Hoenigswald, Jia-sun Tsang, and Carolyn Tallent

March 21, 2019

PROVENANCE

(Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Florence); sold 1954 to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York;[4] gift 1961 to NGA.

[1] The presence of the painting in this sale was brought to Fern Rusk Shapley's attention by Ellis Waterhouse (see his letter of 5 March 1959, in NGA curatorial files). The original sale catalogue consisted of a folded sheet of three closely printed pages, with no numbers assigned to the items in the lists; the sale consisted of paintings by artists other than Lely, drawings and pictures by Lely, and copies after Lely. The NGA painting is the fifth item on the first of these lists, described as "of Paul Veronese, St. Jerome, a whole figure with a Landskip [sic]," measuring in length 3 feet 6 inches and in "bredth [sic]" 2 feet 9 inches. See Brian Fairfax, A Catalogue of the Curious Collection of Pictures of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham...also A Catalogue of Sir Peter Lely's Capital Collection of Pictures..., London, 1758: 40, no. 5 (Fairfax numbered the lists); Charles Henry Collins Baker, Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters: A Study of English Portraiture before & after Van Dyck, 2 vols., London, 1912-1913: 2:144; "Editorial: Sir Peter Lely's Collection," The Burlington Magazine 83, no. 485 (August 1943): 185-188; Ellis K. Waterhouse, "A Note on British Collecting of Italian Pictures in the Seventeenth Century," The Burlington Magazine 102 (1960): 54. In support of the identification is the exact correspondence of the dimensions (42 by 33 inches), and the account of the provenance published in 1834 (see note 3).


[3] As pointed out by Burton Fredericksen (message to Peter Humfrey, 7 October 2008), the picture appears as no. 116 in the catalogue of Earl De Grey's collection, published in 1834, Catalogue of Pictures belonging to Thomas Philip Earl de Grey, at his house in St. James's Square. The entry states that the picture had been purchased at the Lely sale by the Earl of Kent.

[4] On 7 June 1954 the Kress Foundation made an offer to Contini-Bonacossi for 16 paintings, including the NGA painting which was listed as St. Jerome. In a draft of
one of the documents prepared for the count's signature in connection with the offer this painting is described as one "which came from my personal collection in Florence." The count accepted the offer on 30 June 1954; the final payment for the purchase was ultimately made in early 1957, after the count's death in 1955. (See copies of correspondence in NGA curatorial files.)
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The saint is identifiable as Lucy by the attributes she holds in her left hand, consisting of a martyr’s palm and a single eye (rather than the usual two) on a rod or stick. This latter attribute refers to a well-diffused legend about the saint, which told of how she plucked out her eyes because their beauty had attracted an unwelcome suitor, but God then restored them as a reward for her virtue and courage. Lucy consequently became a patron saint of sufferers from eye disease. [1]

The early history of the painting has recently been elucidated by Mauro Lucco, who recognized a painting in the church of San Francesco in Montagnana, near Padua, as a copy. [2] Since this copy was recorded in the mid-19th century by the local historian Giacinto Foratti on the side wall of the former Abriani Chapel in the Duomo of Montagnana, [3] Lucco convincingly deduced that the present painting was originally painted for this chapel, situated to the right (facing) of the chancel. The painting must then have been removed at the time of the refurbishment and rededication of the chapel in the 1720s and sold off, leaving the copy on the wall. As Lucco also pointed out, the figure of the kneeling donor almost certainly therefore represents a member of the Abriani family. From all of this, it may further be inferred that the original dedication of the chapel was to Saint Lucy and that the painting served as its altarpiece. [4]
Half a century later, in 1782, a subsequent owner of the painting, Vincenzo Ranuzzini, apostolic legate to Venice, sent it to his native city of Bologna, as an intended gift to Pope Pius VI; according to a letter announcing the arrival of the picture, the owner declared the donor to be a self-portrait of the artist. When publishing this letter, Fabio Chiodini compared the portrait with various other supposed portraits of the painter and expressed some sympathy with this identification. However, these supposed portraits represent very unreliable sources of evidence; and as Chiodini himself pointed out, the donor figure looks older than 60, the age at which Veronese died in 1588. Ranuzzini’s identification may be dismissed, in fact, as pure invention.

Represented in profile in the immediate foreground, in a gesture of prayer, and cut off at the waist by the lower edge of the picture, the donor figure conforms to a convention closely associated with Veronese’s native city of Verona, dubbed by André Chastel “le donateur ‘in abisso’” (the donor in the abyss). This convention, which found particular favor in the years circa 1470–1530, was adopted by the artist in one of his earliest works, the Bevilacqua-Lazise altarpiece of circa 1547–1548 (Museo del Castelvecchio, Verona) for the church of San Fermo Maggiore. Although even by this date it had become archaic, the painter or a member of his shop may well have revived it as late as the 1580s, perhaps in response to a specific request by the patron. In this connection it may be noted that the town of Montagnana is situated well to the west of Padua, on one of the main roads to Verona.

The striking disjunction of scale between the saint and the donor should not be interpreted as miscalculation, but as a deliberate means to express differing degrees of reality, contrasting the ideal, divine nature of the saint with the humble supplicant, living in the here and now. Indeed, the difference of scale is complemented by a contrast in the pictorial handling between the two figures, with the draperies of the saint executed broadly and freely, and the head of the donor painted much more minutely. Even so, the somewhat empty rhetoric of the saint and mechanical quality of the execution fall below the standard of Veronese himself, and ever since the picture entered the Gallery, there has been general critical agreement that it is at best a work of collaboration with the master, but is more probably by a member of the studio. A possible candidate, proposed by Remigio Marini, Rodolfo Pallucchini, and Terisio Pignatti and Filippo Pedrocco, is Veronese’s younger brother Benedetto Caliari (1538–1598), who is recorded as his assistant by 1556, and who continued to perpetuate the externals of his style for a
decade after his death. It is suggested here, however, that Benedetto was possibly responsible for the Gallery’s *Saint Jerome in the Wilderness*, datable to circa 1575/1585, in which case, the stylistically rather different *Saint Lucy* may be by another member of the family workshop and artistic heir, namely Paolo’s son Gabriele (1568–1631). [8] One of the very few surviving works definitely known to have been painted by Gabriele is the signed *Immaculate Conception* in the church of Liettoli di Campolongo, near Padua [fig. 1], a work in which the figure of Saint Anne is very close to that of Saint Lucy in her somewhat vacuous facial expression and stiff rhetorical pose. Furthermore, Veronese’s biographer Carlo Ridolfi, who was a friend of Gabriele’s son Giuseppe, noted that Gabriele painted “many portraits,” implying that he was a specialist in the genre, and perhaps even that his portraits—as here—were of a higher quality than his religious figures. The painting is unlikely, in any case, to date from before about 1585, as may be judged from the fractured highlights on the draperies, which may be interpreted as an attempt to approximate the handling of Veronese’s late works. Similarly, the donor’s collar may be related to male fashions of the 1580s and 1590s rather than earlier.

It would have been very natural for any patron in Montagnana to look to Veronese or to a member of the family workshop when commissioning an altarpiece. In 1555 the master had painted the *Transfiguration* for the high altar in the neighboring chancel of the Duomo (in situ), apparently through the agency of the Venetian patrician Francesco Pisani; and a decade later he had painted one of his greatest works, the *Family of Darius before Alexander* (National Gallery, London), for Francesco’s residence the Villa Pisani, just outside the city walls. [9] When commissioning their own, modestly scaled altarpiece in the 1580s or 1590s, the local Abriani family could evidently not hope to compete with such masterpieces, but it could perhaps aspire to derive from them some reflected glory.

Peter Humfrey
March 21, 2019

COMPARATIVE FIGURES
fig. 1 Gabriele Caliari, *Immaculate Conception*, c. 1560/1570, oil on canvas, Chiesa parrocchiale di San Lorenzo, Liettoli. Parrocchia di San Lorenzo di Liettoli (Pd)

NOTES

XXIII nella Pontificia Università lateranense (Rome, 1967), 8: col. 252.


[4] In a MS opinion of 1926 (NGA curatorial files, quoted by Fern Rusk Shapley, Paintings from the Samuel H. Kress Collection: Italian Schools, XVI–XVIII Century [London, 1973], 40; Fern Rusk Shapley, Catalogue of the Italian Paintings [Washington, DC, 1979], 1:528), Detlev von Hadeln suggested that the original site of the picture was the church of Santa Croce in Belluno, where Carlo Ridolfi in 1648 had recorded an image of Saint Lucy by Veronese. But it now turns out that Ridolfi was referring rather to the Gallery’s The Martyrdom and Last Communion of Saint Lucy, 1984.28.1.


TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The support is a tightly woven, medium-weight, plain-weave fabric. There is a vertical seam approximately 15 centimeters from the right edge. This smaller area is made up of three pieces of fabric joined with two horizontal seams. The support has been lined, but cusping around all four edges indicates that the painting retains the original dimensions.

The fabric was prepared with an off-white ground, covered by a transparent reddish-brown imprimatura. Infrared reflectography (Vidicon) [1] revealed no sign of underdrawing. The appearance of the paint surface is compromised by overall abrasion and scattered paint losses, resulting in a flattening of the forms. In the most abraded areas, the ground is visible to the naked eye. The face of the saint has been extensively retouched, and the position of the ear now appears spatially confused. Mario Modestini removed a discolored varnish and inpainted the painting in 1955. The varnish applied at that time has discolored.

Joanna Dunn and Peter Humfrey based on the examination report by Michael Swicklik

March 21, 2019

TECHNICAL NOTES

[1] Infrared reflectography was performed with a Hamamatsu c/1000-03 Vidicon camera and a Kodak Wratten 87A filter.

PROVENANCE

February 1925, no. 128); purchased by Kendal, possibly for (Count Alessandro Contini-Bonacossi, Rome and Florence); sold 1954 to the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, New York;[5] gift 1961 to NGA.

[1] E-mail from Mauro Lucco to NGA curator David Alan Brown, dated 22 January 2011, in NGA curatorial files. Lucco recognized a painting in the church of San Francesco in Montagnana, near Padua, as a copy of the NGA painting. Since the copy was recorded by the local historian Giacinto Foratti in the mid-19th century hanging on the side wall of the former Abriani Chapel, Lucco deduced that the NGA painting was originally painted as the altarpiece for this chapel, situated to the right (facing) of the chancel, and that the figure of the kneeling donor probably represents a member of the Abriani family. The painting must then have been removed at the time of the refurbishment and rededication of the chapel in the 1720s and sold off, leaving the copy on the wall. See Giacinto Foratti, Cenni storici e descrittivi di Montagnana, 2 vols., Venice, 1862-1863: 2(1863):124 (“Si rimarca pure sopra una parete un quadro, che rappresenta Santa Lucia, onde diede il modello Paolo Veronese. Era anche questo altare dei suddetti conti Abriani”).

Detlev von Hadeln suggested (in a 1926 manuscript opinion, in NGA curatorial files) that the painting was the one described in 1648 by Carlo Ridolfi as having been painted by Veronese for the church of Santa Croce in Belluno (Carlo Ridolfi, Le Maraviglie dell’arte, 2 vols., Venice, 1648: 1:303; Berlin edition, 1914-1924, ed. by Baron Detlev von Hadeln, 1(1914): 317). The same text is also found in Ridolfi’s earlier Vita di Paolo Caliari Veronese, Venice, 1646: 23. Citing Fiorio Miari (Dizionario storico-artistico-letterario bellunese, Bologna, 1843: 140), von Hadeln noted that the church was torn down in the early 19th century and that the painting had disappeared; he located it again in Contini-Bonacossi’s collection. It now turns out that Ridolfi was referring instead to NGA 1984.28.1, Veronese’s The Martyrdom and Last Communion of Saint Lucy.

[2] Fabio Chiodini, “Una sosta bolognese per una tela di Paolo Caliari e indizi per un possibile autoritratti dell’artista,” Arte Cristiana 93 (2005): 116-117. The painting was an intended gift to Pope Pius VI. Chiodini kindly shared with NGA his discovery of the previously unpublished document that recounts this transfer, which is in Ms. B 2382, pp. 270-271, Biblioteca Comunale dell’Archiginnasio, Bologna; see his e-mails of 13 and 30 September 2004, in NGA curatorial files.
[3] Lot number 108 is crossed out in the copy of the sale catalogue held by the library of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (copy in NGA curatorial files). The sale catalogue indicates that the painting was part of the property removed not from the earl’s Scottish seat of Ethie Castle near Arbroath, but from his English residence of Longwood, Winchester.

[4] This name is provided by the Getty Provenance Index, Getty Research Center, Los Angeles.

[5] On 7 June 1954 the Kress Foundation made an offer to Contini-Bonacossi for 16 paintings, including the Veronese. In the draft of a document prepared for the count's signature in connection with the offer this painting is described as one "which came from my personal collection in Florence." The count accepted the offer on 30 June 1954; the final payment for the purchase was ultimately made in early 1957, after the count's death in 1955. (See copies of correspondence in NGA curatorial files.)
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1957 Berenson, Bernard. *Italian Pictures of the Renaissance*. Venetian
2005  Chiodini, Fabio. “Una sosta bolognese per una tela di Paolo Caliari e indizi per un possibile autoritratti dell’artista.” Arte Cristiana 93 (2005): 115-120.
ENTRY

Although Jacopo Tintoretto, early in his career, often seemed to define himself in opposition to Titian, in his portraiture he was more conservative, and followed Titian’s models closely. [1] The Gallery’s painting belongs to a group of portraits by Tintoretto and his studio that adhere to a similar compositional formula derived primarily from Titian: a three-quarter-length, standing figure, with the body turned facing the viewer, with drapery and architectural forms in the background, often before a window with a distant view. These include the earliest dated example, the Gentleman Aged Twenty-Eight (Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart), inscribed with a date of 1548, in which the pose is virtually identical; and the Portrait of a Gentleman (Musée des Beaux-Arts et d’Archéologie, Besançon), undated [fig. 1]. The sitter in the Gallery’s portrait holds gloves, as in the Besançon painting. [2] His fur-trimmed robe is almost identical to the one worn by the subject in the portrait of Lorenzo Soranzo (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna), dated 1553, which is also extremely similar in pose, although the background there is much simpler. [3]

If, in contrast to these other portraits, the Gallery’s painting seems rather flat, the face lacking a sense of underlying facial structure and the brushwork lifeless, a possible explanation may be that Tintoretto’s distinctive hand has been obscured by the painting’s condition over the centuries. X-radiography [fig. 2] reveals strong, free brushwork that creates a sense of the skull beneath the skin, typical of
Tintoretto (and very similar to that revealed in the x-radiograph of his A Procurator of Saint Mark’s). The loss of shadows and glazes, coupled with overpainting in the forehead, cheeks, nose, and mustache, could have disguised spontaneity in the brushwork and flattened out contours that would have been more strongly conveyed in light and shadow. The darkened varnish obscures the folds of the cloak and the definition of forms, and it hides the manner in which the weave of the canvas catches the paint unevenly, a technique that Tintoretto often exploited to create effects of light and texture. If one imagines the painting with a blush of red glaze on the cheeks, a reflection of light on the forehead, and shadows under the eye and on the cheeks to define the forms, a potentially autograph portrait by Tintoretto begins to emerge. The painting has been accepted as such by most major scholars. [4] The picture’s present state makes it impossible to affirm that judgment with certainty, however, and the possibility of studio involvement in the face and figure must be entertained.

The landscape visible through the window in the upper left is much more detailed than the generic views in the Stuttgart and Besançon pictures. It may represent a specific location on the Venetian terraferma with which the sitter had associations, although even if this is the case it may not be topographically accurate. In any case, it has not been identified, and without other clues about the sitter, it may not be possible to do so.

Nevertheless, the landscape provides important clues about the creation of the painting. Its style and pictorial technique differ from those in the landscapes in other Tintoretto portraits, but resemble the background of the Crucifixion [fig. 3] now in the Museo Civico, Padua, which shows a similar approach to the definition of natural and architectural forms and is also rendered with a mixture of red and green tonalities. The landscape in the Crucifixion has been identified by the present author as the work of the Flemish painter Marten de Vos (1532–1603), who was in Venice at the very beginning of his career, from 1552 to 1556. According to Carlo Ridolfi, Marten insinuated himself into Tintoretto’s studio in order to learn the master’s methods and occasionally painted landscapes for him. (Although the Crucifixion is usually attributed to Tintoretto, the foreground figures have been identified by the present author as the work of Tintoretto’s associate Giovanni Galizzi.) [5] The landscape in the Gallery’s painting also shows similarities to those in paintings executed by Marten after his return to Antwerp, such as Laban Departs to Seek Eliezer (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rouen), dated 1569, and the Crucifixion [fig. 4] and Baptism of Christ in the chapel at the castle of Celle,
Hannover, of 1569. [6] The landscape in the Gallery’s portrait can be attributed on this basis to Marten, during his years in Venice, 1552–1556. Given the closeness of the portrait to Tintoretto’s dated Stuttgart (1548) and Vienna (Lorenzo Soranzo, 1553) portraits, the earlier years of the period seem most likely. [7]

The current title was adopted by the National Gallery of Art in 2018. There is no basis for the previous title identifying the sitter as a Venetian senator, for he is not depicted wearing the robes associated with that office. [8]

Robert Echols
March 21, 2019
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fig. 1 Jacopo Tintoretto, Portrait of a Gentleman, undated, oil on canvas, Musée des Beaux-Arts et d’Archéologie, Besançon. © Besançon, Musée des Beaux-Arts et d’Archéologie – Photo Charles Choffet

fig. 2 X-radiograph, Jacopo Tintoretto, with landscape by Marten de Vos, Portrait of a Man with a Landscape View, 1552/1556, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Chester Dale Collection
fig. 3 Attributed to Jacopo Tintoretto, with landscape by Marten de Vos, Crucifixion, 1552/1557, oil on canvas, Museo Civico, Padua

NOTES


[2] Paola Rossi, Jacopo Tintoretto: I ritratti (Venice, 1974), cat. nos. 17, 65. On the Stuttgart painting, see also Miguel Falomir, ed., Tintoretto (Madrid, 2007), 226–228, cat. no. 10. On the Besançon painting, see also Le Tintoret: Une leçon de peinture (Milan, 1998), 118, 119, repro. The pose of the sitter in the NGA painting is also extremely close to a supposed portrait of Jacopo Sansovino by Tintoretto, probably a studio work (Uffizi, Florence); Rossi, Jacopo Tintoretto, cat. no. 1; see also Titien, Tintoret, Véronèse: Rivalités à Venise (Paris, 2009), fig. 98. (Despite its inscription, this painting is unlikely to represent Sansovino, who was born in 1486, and would have been 60 in 1546, the earliest likely date for the painting. This painting clearly shows a much younger man and the features of the subject do not resemble those of

fig. 4 Marten de Vos, Crucifixion, 1569, oil on panel, Celle Castle Museum. © Residenzmuseum im Celler Schloss, Celle / Foto: Fotostudio Loeper, Celle
Sansovino as depicted by Tintoretto late in life. The inscription was probably added at some later date, reflecting the presence of architecture and sculpture in the portrait.)

[3] Paola Rossi, *Jacopo Tintoretto: I ritratti* (Venice, 1974), cat. no. 139; see also Miguel Falomir, in *Tintoretto*, ed., Miguel Falomir (Madrid, 2007), 266–269, cat. no. 25. X-radiography reveals that the Soranzo portrait was originally a portrait of a different sitter, inscribed MDLII/ANLXXV (1552/age 75 years). The face, but not the body and costume, was changed to represent Soranzo, the inscription altered to read MDLIII/AN.XXXV (1553/age 35 years), and the monogram of Soranzo, LS, added. The fact that Tintoretto could paint the young Lorenzo Soranzo in the same costume he had used for an elderly man raises the possibility that the almost identical costume in the Gallery painting is not particular to this sitter but was either painted from a studio prop or adapted from a sketch used in the Soranzo portrait (or even from the Soranzo portrait itself, possibly still in the studio).

[4] The only apparent dissent in the literature comes from Bernard Berenson, *Italian Pictures of the Renaissance: Venetian School* (London, 1957), 1:183. However, his assistant Nicky Mariano reported in a letter to NGA curator Michael Mahoney dated May 18, 1964, in NGA curatorial files, that the ascription of the picture to Tintoretto’s workshop was based on an error and that the painting “looks very fine.”


[8] Indeed, despite the Gallery’s previous title, most authors continued to use
TECHNICAL SUMMARY

The picture is on a single piece of medium-weight, plain-weave fabric. The painting has been lined, and truncated cusping along the margins implies that the picture has been trimmed slightly at the top and bottom and possibly at the right. The full proper left hand may originally have appeared in the painting. Microscopic examination indicates that there is a thin white ground overall, covered by imprimatura layers of various tones, varying from black under the sky and gray in the landscape to ocher under the head. X-radiographs show that the folds of the draped fabric at the right were originally in a somewhat different configuration. They also show an unexplained area of lead white extending from the top of the sitter’s head out to the left, descending across the wall and window casing and ending roughly at the edge of the fur collar, which may indicate that the head was reworked. A thicker area of lead white outlines the sitter’s head at the right and the structure of the sitter’s head was sketched in with bold strokes of lead white [fig. 1]. A pentimento of the sitter’s ear is visible with the naked eye. The paint is built up in layers, with wet-into-wet brushwork in many passages. The brushwork is free and employs mixtures ranging from dilute scumbles to pastose strokes to thin glazes.

The picture has suffered a large amount of flake loss along the right margin, as much as 6 inches into the picture, and a lesser amount at the top. There are smaller flake losses all around the picture, mostly in the lower half. The paint film overall is abraded, most visibly in the sky, landscape, and drapery highlights, where the dark underlayers are exposed, as well as in the cheeks, nose, and forehead of the sitter. These areas have been retouched and the sitter’s mustache has been thickened. Excessive pressure during the lining process has led to some weave enhancement. The thick varnish has become milky and discolored and obscures the reading of the costume. Numerous deeply discolored residues of earlier coatings are also evident.

A photograph from the 1927 sale catalog in NGA curatorial files shows that at that time the curtain was painted over as a dark, flat surface. Evidently the painting was
restored between 1927 and 1934, because the curtain is visible in a photograph in the 1934 auction catalog, indicating that the painting had been treated to reveal it. The painting has not been treated since acquisition.
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TECHNICAL COMPARATIVE FIGURES

fig. 1 X-radiograph, Jacopo Tintoretto, with landscape by Marten de Vos, *Portrait of a Man with a Landscape View*, 1552/1556, oil on canvas, National Gallery of Art, Washington, Chester Dale Collection
PROVENANCE


[2] The painting was lent by Nichols to the 1868 National Exhibition of Works of Art at Leeds.

[3] The painting was lent by Holford to the Royal Academy's Winter Exhibition in 1887.

EXHIBITION HISTORY

1868 National Exhibition of Works of Art, Leeds, 1868, no. 136a, as A Venetian Senator.[1]

1887 Exhibition of Works by the Old Masters. Winter Exhibition, Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1887, no. 139, as Portrait of a Man.
1894 Exhibition of Venetian Art, New Gallery, London, 1894-1895, no. 162, as Portrait of a Man.


EXHIBITION HISTORY NOTES

[1] Algernon Graves, A Century of Loan Exhibitions 1813-1912, 5 vols., London, 1913-1915: 3:1312, 1313, lists two additional loans of Tintoretto portraits made by R.S. Holford: 1867, lent to the British Institution, A Gentleman, no. 129; 1870, lent to the Royal Academy, A Portrait, 44 1/2 x 35 1/2 in., no. 50. Because of the ambiguity of the title and the similarity of dimensions between the NGA painting and Tintoretto’s Gentleman aged Twenty-Eight (Staatsgalerie, Stuttgart), which was also in the Holford collection at that time, it is not possible to determine which was lent.
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