a space in which a congregation could gather and be spoken to.

That the Uffizi tribuna was well-known and admired in eighteenth-century England is born out by the popularity of Johann Zoffany's painting of the Tribuna commissioned by Queen Charlotte in 1772 and still in the Royal Collection. Oliver Millar points out an early premonition of Zoffany's painting: a painting by Giulio Pignatta (1684–1751) dated 1715 at Narford Hall, Norfolk, which shows Sir Andrew Fountain of Narford in the Uffizi tribuna.17 Fountain (1676–1753) was a well-known collector and connoisseur18 and was an intimate friend of Cosimo III, grand duke of Tuscany. Narford Hall itself had an 'octagon closet' containing a collection of Raphael Waren19 which may well have been in imitation of the Uffizi tribuna.

Furthermore, Colin Campbell included a plate illustrating the gardens at Narford in the third volume of Vitruvius Britannicus (1725).20 The garden temples may have been designed by Fountain himself. But Campbell (who had introduced the tribune into his 1715 first volume of Vitruvius Britannicus) was obviously acquainted with Fountain and his circle and through them (if not through his own knowledge of Italy of which we know almost nothing) could certainly have been acquainted with the form of the Uffizi tribuna.

A second meaning of the term tribune was the Roman usage to indicate an apse in a basilica. This included a raised platform. The Architectural Publications Society Dictionary gives several examples of the use of the term tribune to describe a semi-circular recess behind a choir: S. Clemente, Rome, S. Miniat0, Florence, S. Zeno, Verona. At S. Lorenzo, Rome the tribune of Bishop Pelagius dating from the sixth century was raised above floor level and surrounded by ten half-buried fluted marble columns. This ancient meaning may well have had some bearing on the use of the term by Robert Adam and Sir John Soane, both of whom were familiar with Roman remains and would be quick to adopt a term with such a splendid archaeological pedigree. The various French definitions of the word as pulpit, tritorium or organ loft21 seem to have had little if any bearing on English usage.

Finally, there is a link with Palladio's design for the villa Capra, always a popular model for eighteenth-century architects, which may well be the inspiration for Robert Adam's round columnar tribune proposed for Luton Hoo. Although Palladio did not himself refer to the central 'sala rotunda' as a tribune, Bertotti-Scamozzi's description did:

'Esaminando la Sala rotunda . . . le pareti della medesima sala sono dipinti; e la Tribuna e riccamente decorata de Statue . . .'22

17 For an account of this painting see o. millar: Zoffany and his Tribuna [1967].
18 He is attacked by pope in Donizet, iv, li.347.
19 j. neale: Sats, Ser.1, Vol. II.
20 Plate 95.
21 [1786 edition], p.7, Vol. II.
22 As given in the Encyclopédie [1757-65].

IRVING LAVIN

Pietro da Cortona Documents from the Barberini Archive

With the Collaboration of Marilyn Aronberg Lavin

THE PURPOSE of these notes is to present new documents from the Barberini Archive, now in the Vatican Library, that have so far come to light concerning paintings by Pietro da Cortona and copies thereafter. The selection includes only documents referring to easel paintings. Other material from the archive relating to Cortona will be included by Mrs. Lavin in her forthcoming publication of the seventeenth-century inventories of the Barberini collections.

A painting from the Barberini collection, now in the Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio, represents a haloed monk in a white habit kneeling before the Virgin, who appears on a cloud; two angels in the lower left foreground, one of them covered by a swath of red drapery, play with a cardinal’s hat, and in the landscape at middle distance a small chapel is seen with two monks in the same habit (Fig.24).1 The work has rightly been identified with a published inventory reference of 1631, which established the attribution to Cortona, and a terminus ante quem.2 We can now add the actual payment by Cardinal Francesco to Cortona, from which we learn that he received one hundred scudi for the work in August 1629, and that it was intended for the Camaldolite hermitage at Frascati (Doc. 1; see Appendix). The hermitage had been founded in 1607, and the painting was doubtless to be the Cardinal's contribution to the decoration of its church.3

The documents are also of interest because they point to what appears to be a deliberate ambiguity in the painting's iconography. In the early records the kneeling figure is

1 G. briganti: Pietro da Cortona, Florence [1962], No.21, pp.175f.
2 Un quadro atto h7 e il 34 [i.e., 156 by 122 cm; with frame – see below] con la Madonna sopra le nube e quattro angeli che tengono un cappello cardinale con una cornice dorata di mano del Sig. Pietro da Cortona (o. pollak: Die Kunstätigkeit unter urban III, 2 vols., Vienna, etc. [1927–31], I, No.966, p.335).
3 A frame for the painting was made by September 1630, and measured 7 by 34 (see the first part of Doc. 2). Present dimensions without frame: 147 by 113 cm.
4 For a summary history of the hermitage, see P. T. lugano: La congregazione camaldolese degli eremitati di Monteconora, Rome – Frascati [1968], pp.321ff.
24. The Virgin with a Saint of Camaldoli, by Pietro da Cortona. Canvas, 147 by 113 cm. (Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio.)

25. Rest on the Flight into Egypt, by Pietro da Cortona. Copper, 47 by 38 cm. (Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Munich.)

26. Xenophon Sacrificing to Diana, by Pietro da Cortona. Canvas, 210 by 309 cm. (Formerly Barberini Collection; present whereabouts unknown.) Photo Alinari.

described only as ‘a saint of Camaldoli’, whereas in Barberini inventories of the later seventeenth century he is said to be St Romuald, founder of the Camaldolite order. This identification is impossible, however, since Romuald was never a cardinal. In fact, there are good reasons to suppose that the earlier, generic descriptions expressed the real subject of the painting, which was later suppressed or forgotten.

There was one, and only one, Camaldolite saint who was a cardinal – Peter Damian (1007–1072), Romuald’s great follower and biographer. The cardinal’s hat was one of his attributes. A noteworthy fact of Damian’s career, moreover, was his having resisted and eventually renounced the dignity of the purple to return to the hermitic life. The painting seems to allude to this episode by the location of the cardinal’s insignia at a distance below and away from the saint, who disregards them to concentrate upon the Virgin. Furthermore, Peter Damian was an important propagator of the veneration of the Madonna, particularly the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin, the Officium parvum Beatae Mariae Virginis, one of the most familiar services in the liturgy. The book held by the saint in Cortona’s painting has very much the appearance of a breviary. It is worth noting, finally, that the eighteenth-century canvas that now decorates the altar of St Peter Damian in the Camaldolite church at Frascati, imitates Cortona’s picture with minor though significant changes.

Nevertheless, the subject cannot be interpreted simply as St Peter Damian receiving the office from the Virgin. Peter Damian was also a bishop (of Ostia) and the episcopal mitre and crosier are normally part of his accoutrements. The habit worn by the monk in Cortona’s painting – a relatively short cape fastened at the neck with a piece of wood – is specifically that of the Congregation of Monte Corona, the branch of the Camaldolite order to which the hermitage at Frascati belongs. The Monte Corona congregation was founded in the early sixteenth century by the Blessed Paul Giustianini (1476–1528), and the painting seems to allude to him as well. Paul Giustianini was not a cardinal, but he was noted for having followed Peter Damian in his disdain for this honour. When his friend and disciple Peter Quirini was being considered for a cardinality by Leo X, Giustianini urged him to resist the appointment to the utmost, and to yield, as had Peter Damian, only if threatened with excommunication.

In the preface to a selection he made from the works of Peter Damian, Giustianini himself singles out for praise Damian’s renunciation of the purple. Subsequently the advice he gave to Quirini was cited as evidence of his own humility. The monks shown in a small, isolated chapel in the background of the painting seem to refer to Giustianini. His reform, which involved a return from cenobitism to the original hermitic tradition of the order, began when he retired with a Camaldolite follower to a little chapel in the wilderness. Finally, the book held by the monk in the painting might be interpreted as alluding to the rule Giustianini composed for his reform. Suggestive as these overtones are, however, the figure is not Paul Giustianini: he never became cardinal, and he was not particularly associated with the Virgin.

It seems evident that the painting is a carefully worked out conflation of the founder of the Monte Corona congregation and his model, Peter Damian. This composite imagery justifies the early documents’ description of the subject as, simply, the Virgin with a saint of Camaldoli. The picture illustrates in general terms the Camaldolite ideal of hermitic devotion, renunciation, and humility.

In all likelihood the occasion for the commission was the centennial of the death of Paul Giustianini (28th June, 1528). Why was it necessary to honour him in such an indirect way, and why did the painting not reach its destination? The answer to both these questions may lie in a famous bull issued by Urban VIII in 1625, as part of a rigorous reform and codification in matters pertaining to the cult. Among other provisions, the bull prohibited haloed images of persons who were not canonically beatified or sanctified, exception being made for those whose cult dated from time ‘immemorial’. In a bull of 1634 this period was defined as not less than 100 years, which, taking the decree of 1625 as the terminus, disqualified Giustianini. In 1652 the decree of 1634 was established as the terminus. But the validity of haloed images of Giustianini was still being questioned later in the century, and he has yet to be canonically beatified. Perhaps Cardinal Francesco kept the painting for himself just because he liked it; but it is also possible that even the veiled reference to Paul Giustianini was, on second thought, considered inappropriate.

13 See Vouet’s St Bruno receiving the rules of his order from the Virgin of 1620, in Naples (w. a. CREELLY: The Painting of Simon Vouet, New Haven – London [1963], No.76, pp.183f., fig.9).
14 For this and what follows, see Sommario cronologico dei documenti pontifici riguardanti la congregazione eremitica camaldulense di Monte Corona (1315–1905), Frascati [1908], pp.195f.
15 There was a major controversy over precisely this issue in the case of the Beata Ludovica Albertoni, who died in 1533 (cf. Benedict XIV, Opera Omnia, Prato [1839f.], II, pp.148ff., 167).
16 Cortona’s composition is reflected in two later paintings showing Peter Damian kneeling with a book before the Virgin, and in them the ambiguity is reduced or eliminated. One of these decorates the altar of St Peter Damian in the church of the hermitage at Frascati, probably the same altar for which Cortona’s painting was destined: it evidently dates from the late eighteenth century, when the church was restored. Here the habit has been changed so that it no longer refers specifically to the Monte Corona congregation; the monk now wears a surplice trimmed in red, as an added reference to his status; and to the scene in the background is added a row of separate cells, the standard Camaldolite monastic plan. The initials F. J. D. appear on the step in the foreground.
17 The other painting, by Benedetto Gennaro (1633–1715), is in the Episcopio at Faenza. It was commissioned by the Faentine prelate Giacomo Laderchi,

---

6 See n.16 below.
7 This was my view until Mr Brian D’Argaville of Toronto proposed the Blessed Paul Giustianini as an alternative. I am most grateful for the suggestion, which, as will emerge, sheds considerable light on the meaning of the painting.
8 The Monte Corona habit was also used by Antiveduto Grammatico in his painting of the Vision of St Romuald on the high altar of the church of the Camaldolite hermitage at Frascati (lll. in Bibliotheca sanctorum, XI, (cols. 377–8)).
10 The relevant correspondence between Quirini and Giustianini is published in Annales Camaldulensis, 9 vols., Venice [1755–73], IX, cols. 572ff.
PIETRO DA CORTONA DOCUMENTS FROM THE BARBERINI ARCHIVE

The best known canvas by Cortona owned by the Barberini was the Xenophon sacrificing to Diana, which was sold to Hitler during World War II and has since disappeared (Fig. 26). It was described as one of the artist's most celebrated works in the biographical letter written by his nephew, Luca Berrettini, to Ciro Ferri in 1679. One of the factors that must have contributed to its fame was a large engraving after the painting by Pietro Aquila, which bears a dedication to Olimpia Barberini, Princess of Palestrina. But it was probably this dedication that gave rise to a false interpretation of the subject of the work, a misdating by nearly a quarter of a century, and a correspondingly radical misconception of its position in Cortona's development.

Olimpia Giustiniani was the niece of Innocent X and her marriage in 1653 to Maffeo Barberini, Prince of Palestrina and grand-nephew of Urban VIII, sealed the reconciliation of the bitter feud between Innocent and the heirs of his predecessor. Fabbrini in his pioneering monograph on Cortona offered an ingenious explanation of the painting as an allegory of the reconciliation, and his interpretation, with the date 1653, was thereafter universally applied to the work, which thus became a cornerstone of Cortona's late style.

In fact, the painting existed by 15th June, 1631, on which date a woodcarver was paid for making a frame for it (Doc. 2, second part). The elaborately carved frame measured 350 by 240 cm; the painting itself 210 by 309 cm. There can be no question that another work was involved since only one painting by Cortona answering the description appears in the seventeenth-century Barberini inventories.

Once the spell of Fabbrini's iconographical dating is broken, the stylistic phase of which the painting properly belongs becomes clear. On the one hand, comparison with an analogous work of Cortona's late maturity, the Caesar and Cleopatra at Lyons (Fig. 27), painted a decade before the traditional date of the Xenophon, reveals fundamental differences. The format of the Lyons picture is taller, the eye level is lower, the main figures are fewer and larger. The illumination is more unified, and large areas of light and dark establish strong oblique axes. The lateral architectural elements are placed at drastically different depths, and create a powerful diagonal thrust into space.

On the other hand, the Xenophon shares with the Rape of the Sabines in the Capitoline (Fig. 28), datable before 10th June, 1631, the very features that contrast with the later work. The scene, which is viewed from a certain height, includes many relatively small figures distributed in a friezelike arrangement across the long canvas. Small patches of light and dark are woven into a uniform pattern through the whole composition. The buildings on either side are placed at nearly the same distance from the picture plane, leaving an opening into the distance between them. As the documentary evidence indicates, the two pictures must be virtually contemporary.

The last painting we shall deal with is a small (47 by 38 cm) Rest on the Flight into Egypt, painted on copper, now in the Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen in Munich (Fig. 25). The work was first published by Voss with an attribution to Ciro Ferri, but was ascribed unequivocally to Cortona by Brignati, who dated it c.1643. Brignati's insight is confirmed by a document of Cardinal Antonio's dating December 1639; it records that a painting had been made by Cortona on copper measuring about 45 cm, which represented a Madonna with Christ and an angel offering flowers in a landscape (Doc. 4). In the Munich picture, while the angel bears fruit, the Christ Child holds flowers in his left hand. The subject is treated in a rather unusual way for the period, which corresponds well with the description: there is only one angel, and Joseph is relegated to the background, where he is scarcely noticeable. The painting does not appear in the seventeenth-century Barberini inventories, and this suggests that it was given away at an early date.

In fact, the Munich picture formed part of the collection of the Elector of Mannheim since at least the eighteenth century.

who wrote an exhaustive biography of Peter Damian, and who lived in Rome. Here, among other changes, the episcopal insignia are added, and an attempt is made to recreate the habit of Fonte Avellana, to which Damian belonged, a dark outer garment over a white tunic. (Reproduced in A. SAVOILE: 'Le immagini faentine di S. Pier Damiani con cenni ad alcune nom Faentine', in Biblioteca Cardinale Giottano Ciocognani, vol. 5, Studies on San Pier Damiano in onore del Cardinale Amleto Giovanni Ciocognani, Faenza [1961], fig. 6.)

17 BRIGANTI: Pietro da Cortona, No.120, pp.254ff.
18. A. CAMPOBI: Lettere artistiche inedite, Moderna [1866], p.314.
19 A copy of the print is in the Gabinetto delle Stampe, Rome (44 K 9; Inv. 696/2).
21 For some reason Cortona himself does not seem to have been paid until many years later; at least, no early payment for the work has come to light, and this would explain the peculiar terms of a payment to him in 1667 of 200 scudi for a scene of a sacrifice, of which he was required to give no account (Doc. 9).
22 I am indebted to Ettore Sestieri for the dimensions of the painting, which do not seem to have been recorded in the modern literature.
24 BRIGANTI: Pietro da Cortona, No.92, pp.233ff. The Caesar and Cleopatra, along with the Finding of Romulus and Romus in the Louvre (ibid., No.91, pp.216ff.) and the Augustus and the Sibyl in Nancy (ibid., No.104, p.243), formed part of the collection assembled by Philippe de la Vrillère in Paris. With good reasons Brignati dated the former two of these works to the year 1643 and suggested that the Barberini were the intermediaries in the commission, since a reduced replica of the Romulus and Remus was in the collection of Don Urbano Barberini. Both hypotheses are supported by a document of April 1644, in which Cortona's nephew, Lorenzo Berrettini, is reimbursed for the gift of the Romulus and Remus (Doc. 5) and another of November, 1650 in which Giuseppe Miliati is paid for a copy of this picture (Doc. 6).
26 Ibid., No.90, pp.29ff.
28 Information courtesy Dr Rolf Kultzen of the Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen. In a letter received after the manuscript of this article was completed Dr Kultzen kindly supplied the following additional information, confirming the early attribution of the Munich painting to Cortona and its arrival in Germany before the year 1718: 'Zurückliegt erscheint das Bild... in dem gedruckten "Verzeichnis der in der königlichen Kabinett zu Mannheim befindlichen Malereien" (Mannheim, 1756) unter der Nr. 159 als Pietro da Cortona. Unter denselben Namen nennt es auch Johann von Goel in "De Nieuwe Schooburg etc." ("Graevenhage, 1721") II, p. 595, wo das Bild in eine Liste aufgenommen wird, die dem durch Kurfiirst Johann Wilhelm (gestorben 1715) festgelegten Bestand der Düsseldorfer Gemäldeausstellungen inventarisiert. Da sich unser Bild nun nicht in der Düsseldorfer Akademie, sondern in Düsseldorfer Schloss befand, wurde es von dem Nachfolger Johann Wiliamum im 21. Oktober 1730 — wiederum als einer Arbeit Cortonas — nach Mannheim überführt. Dies erhielt aus einem Inventar der aus dem Düsseldorfer Schloss nach Mannheim überführten Kunstgegenstände vom 21. Oktober 1750 (Badisches General-Landesarchiv, Karlsruhe, Nr. 77/995, fol. 420; Nr. 187). Das Bild muss demnach vor dem Tode von Kurfiirst Johann Wilhelm ins Düsseldorfer Schloss gelangt sein...'
Arthur Hughes: Arthurian and related subjects of the early 1860’s

ARTHUR HUGHES is probably best known for his paintings of contemporary life, such as April Love, Home from Sea and The Long Engagement, but a large part of his output consists of ‘costume pieces’ and more overtly imaginative subjects. The best of these, and the ones which were most admired by his contemporaries, were painted in the early 1860’s. Hughes was attracted by Malory and the Arthurian legends when he became involved in the decoration of the Oxford Union in 1857, with Rossetti, Morris and friends, and by the publication of Tennyson’s Idylls of the King two years later. The subject he was allotted for the murals was The Passing of Arthur, for which he executed what was apparently one of the most competent designs in the series. All that remains now are some unpublished fragments of his studies for the three Queens – expressive, and, for Hughes, surprisingly tense in line and feeling (see Fig.29). The climax of his treatment of this sort of subject, however, was to come three years later.

References to Hughes’s The Knight of the Sun (Fig.30) as one of his most perfect achievements, such as is made by Malcolm Bell in his entry on Hughes in the Dictionary of National Biography, must have puzzled many, for except for a brief appearance in the sale rooms this picture has not been seen since it was exhibited at Manchester in 1911,1 a highly finished water-colour in the Ashmolean has for some time been thought to be of this subject, and two contemporary descriptions of The Knight of the Sun bear this out. The art correspondent of the Athenaeum wrote on 31st March 1860:

‘Mr Arthur Hughes proposes to send to the Royal Academy a picture, representing a knight wounded to death, borne home by his squires, followed by attendants bearing his arms. The time is sunset; and the warrior seems taking a farewell of life and day at once.’2

1 Ford Madox Brown and the Pre-Raphaelites, 1911 (251); put up for sale in November 1953.