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What should we understand today as the history of art? Certainly not something static. If all of history is a story, or a collection of stories [...], we must conclude that any one of its hypothetical revelations reaches us with the passing of a prolonged period of time. [...] objects [...] act among us, here and now, independent of the historical time and place in which they might have been made. [...] Nevertheless, there is no art without criteria of artistic value, and these change ceaselessly. Objects remain, but they behave in some respects as mirrors, as reflectors of other variables and of multiple meanings.


The system of art constitutes a complex structure in which various agents play a part. The material or intellectual creators of a product that comes to form part of this system lack, in and of themselves, the absolute capacity to decide how, when and why it will do so. Any possible physical modifications, coincidental or imposed, remain beyond their control, as do incidental assessments or reinterpretations, whether or not related to these modifications. Such aspects are decisive in a piece’s consideration as a work of art in historical-artistic discourse.

The role the art historian assigns to the agents of this system depends on specific methodological options, each of which has had —and still has today— a distinct historiographical development. The specific consideration of these agents, therefore, is in no way a modern discovery. Yet our era is characterised by a plurality of overlapping discussions concerning the artistic, and the visual in general, which has highlighted the importance of these transformative agents in determining the viewpoint from which we approach the comprehension of works of art, past and present, independent of our preconceived notions of them.

The attempt to objectify the artistic phenomenon, whatever type it may be, obliges us to keep these modifying elements in mind, but always in relation to the hypothesis and intellectual objectives advanced in each case. The degree of influence they can exert is neither universal nor uniform. Although judicial language has been employed here, with the expression necessary accomplices highlighting their essential cooperation —whether before, during or after the author’s part
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in the work— their presence does not obey any particular set of rules. While the law attempts to clarify our judgement of an accomplice's responsibility and level of involvement in the committing of a crime, it is less straightforward to theorise about complicity in the realm of the production of works of art. Its relevance, in fact, fluctuates in relation to the chosen methodology.

It seems important, however, to draw attention, in a general manner, to the decisive part that accomplices have played in the production and transmission of the work of art. This acknowledges the organic character of creation and of the discipline that studies it, whose objectives vary in tandem with its involvement in contemporary life. The art writer, when focusing on specific accomplices, updates the object by refreshing their vision of it. It could be said that, while it might be born from the evasive idea of recovering the past, art history acts upon the present through the acknowledgement of certain specific accomplices.

In this sense, as with any other historical discipline, it is obliged, by virtue of its legitimising character, to anticipate the public use to which it will be put. More than any other, the artistic object tends to be perceived as a sacred and immutable reality, the result of a single, ingenious determination, linked to timeless, transcendent aspirations that are beyond question. The accomplices—voluntary, imposed or unexpected—allow the explanation, in any given case, of the circumstances of this transformation, without in the least detracting from its grandeur or diminishing its power of seduction.

The works compiled in this volume tackle the roles of accomplices from diverse perspectives. The dossier begins with two articles highlighting the part specific ecclesiastics played in relation to the art of their day. A documentary discovery, namely the inventory of the Valencian Andreu García's assets in 1452, reveals this curious individual's interest in painting, an element that makes him a sort of accomplice while simultaneously hiding a yearning for a more central role, although it is his ties to artists of the era that prove to be of greatest interest. The work by Encarna Montero Tortajada, 'The Oligarch and His Brushes: a Biographical Sketch of the Presbyter Andreu García', deals fundamentally with his work as mediator between commissioners and artists. He is an example of those accomplices who intervene in the genesis of the production process.

On the other hand, the study by María Alegra García García, ‘Considerations on the Iconography of Don Juan Martínez Silíceo, Archbishop of Toledo (c.1477–1557)’, presents novelties concerning this individual’s iconography, through literary and visual sources, and re-examines his role in relation to the cultural elites of the period.

Felipe Pereda, in his article ‘The Art of Believing in Modern Spain’, tackles the concept of images as generators of contexts, as accomplices of a specific message particular to a given era. This vindicates the work of art’s role as a medium with its own narrative resources, challenging its subordinate consideration as a simple reflection of its environment. It attempts to overcome the widespread tendency to value images as mere persuasive instruments, highlighting their capacity to intervene in the intellectual process of creation. Based on the study of Castilian sacred images from the sixteenth century, it maintains that these function as ‘sites of credibility’, beyond their capacity to offer a visual interpretation of a text or dogmatic
principle. It concludes that these are no mere affirmations of faith, but specific responses to doubts that might arise in a particular religious practice.

Throughout the history of art, but especially in the Early Modern period — when, paradoxically, the myths of the solitary genius and the misunderstood bohemian creator were born — the process of creation took place in collusion with other colleagues, necessary accomplices in a task that identified and dignified them as a social group. Jesús Pedro Lorente’s study, ‘Two Artistic Colonies Designed as Urban Crowns by their Patrons: The Grand-Duke Ernst Ludwig in Darmstadt and Karl Ernst Osthaus in Hagen’, examines the question, scarcely asked in Spain, of the colonies of artists, where communities assembled with corporate interests of an aesthetic nature, in a form of mouseion. Space, here, becomes a singular accomplice which, to some extent, consecrates the entire process and aims to immortalise it in time.

Many of the factors we identify as accomplices are responsible for changes in the work of art’s meaning, whether as a result of a reflection on the object itself, or through their setting in a historical discourse defined by specific aesthetic and cultural values. This intervention is related to criticism, to the uses made of the pieces — in exhibitions and museums, which serve to reformulate the grand historiographical or media accounts of the role of art — and, above all, to their reproducibility and the possibility of their manipulation to other ends.

In the contemporary world, mediation is a structural, determinant and constitutive part of the development of the products of western modernity, as affirmed by Núria Fernández Rius and Núria Peist in their work ‘The Photographic and the Mediatory System. Artistic, Technical and Commercial Values during the Beginnings of Photography’. This work analyses the tensions of photographic language in the nineteenth century, from two reference points: firstly, from the society that utilises and promotes it, and, secondly, from the values of high culture, which place limits on the concept of art.

Museums, as well as the expository dialogues that dictate the selection and construct the story of the works exhibited within them, constitute one of the essential tools in the reception and critical interpretation of works of art. The article by Elena Marcén Guillén ‘Real Museum, Imaginary Museum’ traces a suggestive theoretical outline of this institution’s role in the interpretation of the work of art — affecting nothing less than its very nature — through various literary testimonies.

The work carried out by Vicenç Furió, ‘Fame and Prestige: Necessary and Decisive Accomplices in the Case of Hilma af Klint’, focuses specifically on an intriguing case study: the process of critical consolidation of this important Swedish artist, identified as a pioneer of abstract art. The article reflects on two types of contacts paramount to an artist’s recognition in the twentieth century: their personal and institutional relationships.

It appears, from the initial impression produced by these authors’ illuminating insights into this problem, so diverse and evasive, that the accomplice is an intruder, however much we might demonstrate that it is a necessary one. One might say it intervenes only to distort. We must not fall, however, into the relativism of a supposed manipulative role. As in a crime, the accomplice is always in agreement.
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Abstract
The documentation concerning the Valencian priest Andreu Garcia († November 1452) reveals a rather remarkable individual. Garcia was, from birth, a member of the local oligarchy. A presbyter recumbent in the cathedral, he also had contact with Carthusians, Observant Friars and probably Beghards (the books in his library suggesting this later link). He took part, too, as intermediary or as patron, in many artistic commissions involving the city’s most renowned artists and most illustrious clientele. In addition, he enjoyed close personal relationships with painters like Simó Llobregat, Jaume Mateu, Gonçal Sarrià and Joan Reixac. It appears, too, that he himself practised painting, judging by the items found in his home after his death.
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Resumen
La documentación referida al presbítero valenciano Andreu Garcia, muerto en noviembre de 1452, dibuja un perfil bien particular. Garcia fue miembro desde su nacimiento de la oligarquía ciudadana. Presbítero beneficiado en la Catedral, se relacionó también con la orden cartujana, con los franciscanos observantes y probablemente con los beguinos (los títulos de su biblioteca apuntan a una espiritualidad afín a estos grupos). Además, participó como mediador o como promotor en muchos encargos que implicaron a lo más granado de la menestralía artística local, y a los clientes más notables de la ciudad. Más allá de esto, mantuvo fuertes vínculos personales con varios artistas (sobre todo con Simó Llobregat, Jaume Mateu, Gonçal Sarrià y Joan Reixac), y parece ser que practicó él mismo la pintura, a juzgar por los enseres que se encontraron en su domicilio tras su muerte.
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ON OCCASION, FORTUNE SMILES upon one’s exploration of the archives, offering discoveries that provide full recompense for the hours dedicated to reading matters of little import. One document characterising this particular kind of luck is, without a doubt, the inventory of the Valencian ecclesiastic Andreu Garcia’s possessions, carried out in November 1452. The works and writings found in Garcia’s possession at the time of his death reveal two circumstances: the first is the priest’s practice of painting, and his interest in the figurative arts, given the substantial number of designs, paint recipes and panel drawings that appear among his belongings; the second is his multiple connections to renowned artists. This inventory, along with his will, auction and other previously published records, make up a unique documentary series that shines a powerful light on Valencia’s artistic activity between 1420 and 1450. Ultimately, this represents an important accumulation of clues concerning such matters as the circulation of drawings, the concretion of commissions through a mediator qualified for the task, and the nature of the relationships that united the patrons and artists of the era. The aim of this work is to present the insights the documentation offers into a character as substantial as Garcia.

Before exploring the contents of his will, inventory and auction in detail, it is worth briefly mentioning why Andreu Garcia would, even without these, have merited historiographical interest. The first time this priest, incumbent in the cathedral and the parish of San Martín, can be found linked in writing to a work of art is on January 12th, 1417, where he appears as a witness to the carpenter Jaume Spina’s contract for the choir of Portaceli. In October 1421, Garcia acts as mediator et conventor amicabilis between Bertomeu Terol—a cleric from Jérica—and Miquel Alcanyís, in the negotiations for an altarpiece dedicated to Saint Michael, modelled on a similar piece made for the Carthusian monastery of Portaceli (known today to be the work of Starnina). Garcia himself appears in the contract, listed as a witness,


7. Idem, p. 24. In 1401 Starnina signed a contract worth 900 sueldos with Francisco Maça, permanent vicar of...
and is recorded as paying the first instalment in Terol’s name. In 1422, the priest has to supervise, along with the pavorde Francesc Daries, the construction of the chapel that another pavorde, Joan de Prades, was having built in the convent of Santa María de Jesús, entrusted to the eminent master builder Francesc Baldomar.

In 1438, Garcia sketches the angels that Martí Llobet will carve for the cathedral’s choir, commissioned by the cofradía or brotherhood of Santa María de la Seu. On October 31st, 1439, the ecclesiastic pays Joan Reixac 330 sueldos for an altar cloth and painting for Portaceli.

On May 8th, 1440, he mediates in the agreement between the painter García Sarrià and the widow of the notary Joan Aguilar, for an altarpiece for her chapel in the church of the Order of Preachers; later, on July 14th, 1440, the altarpiece is newly commissioned, due to Sarrià’s death, this time to Joan Reixac: the project was completed as agreed in May, except for an iconographic change that was to be carried out in accordance with Andreu Garcia’s instructions.

On March 31st, 1441, the priest concludes negotiations with Jacomart —as he had been empowered to do by the council of canons— concerning a panel for the cathedral’s alms house door, which was to feature ‘as many paupers as can be painted seated at a table, with a canon dispensing alms, a chaplain, beadle and a servant, and the bishop seated in a chair at the head of the table in pontifical garb’.

Garcia, furthermore, is to provide the painter with the panel on which he will work. On April 12th of that same year, his presence is documented in a contract between the brotherhood of Santa María de la Seu and various embroiderers, with the aim of fashioning borders for a funerary pall; the design is to be supplied by Reixac.

In July 1443, the widow of the illuminator Simó Llobregat settles a debt of twenty-two libras and ten sueldos with our protagonist (this was, in fact, an old debt agreed previously by Llobregat himself and his mother). The debtor and creditor had met previously before the city’s civil court to defend their respective positions. From this meeting it emerges that, to ensure the repayment of the loan, Garcia held various objects belonging to the widow as collateral, among them ‘a book of examples of great illuminated letters’. In addition, Llobregat had illuminated three books and two Divine Offices for Garcia, without any agreement between priest and widow as to whether these works had been remunerated. On January 9th, 1444, Reixac
agrees to the completion of an altarpiece for Burjassot that Jacomart had already begun. For the lateral panels, he is to follow Andreu Garcia’s instructions, who will also oversee matters relating to the depictions of the Passion on the predella. Finally, on November 4th, 1448, Reixac takes on another, unspecified job for Garcia.

These, then, are the records linking the ecclesiastic with the commissioning or creation of artistic works, nearly all of them destined for important spaces (cathedral, Portaceli, monastery of the Order of Preachers, monastery of Santa María de Jesús) or created in the image of examples that were themselves important (the altarpiece of Saint Michael in Jérica). In the majority of these cases, Garcia appears as an intermediary between the commissioner and the contracted artisan, when not directly providing models for the piece in question (whether through written instruction or sketches he himself has drawn). In addition to these accounts, other information exists that ties the priest closely to some of the artists cited in the preceding paragraph. Apart from the many financial transactions Andreu Garcia arranged with well-known artists —which will be examined in detail in our analysis of his inventory— his role as guardian of the final wishes of various artists is remarkable: Simó Llobregat, Jaume Mateu, Gonçal Sarrià and Joan Reixac all trusted the priest to execute their will. In particular, in that of the illuminator Llobregat, dated August 5th, 1441, Garcia and Bernat Roselló, both being priests incumbent in the cathedral, appear as executors; the first (‘mossen Andreu Garcia, my priest and friend’, mossen being a medieval honorific used in the Kingdom of Aragón) would, in addition, become tutor to the testator’s children should his wife remarry and his mother pass away. Jaume Mateu, who arranged the fate of his belongings on July 4th, 1445, also selected Garcia to administer his will and testament, together with the respected citizen Vicent Granulles. Gonçal Peris de Sarrià made his will on September 23rd, 1451, once again naming the priest as executor (Garcia, moreover, had loaned him money for his upkeep, to the value of 100 sueldos: this element of financial dependence would appear repeatedly in the documentation concerning Garcia’s relationships with artists). Nor did the painter Joan Reixac, a witness to Sarrià’s will, forget Garcia when he set out his last wishes in 1448: the priest was once more selected as executor (this time alongside Bernat Garcia, another presbyter), and on Reixac’s death a painting was to be given him featuring Saint Francis receiving the stigmata ‘finished with oil from the hand of Johannes [This ‘Johannes’ appears often in the documents referring to Van Eyck]’, purchased by Reixac himself in Valencia for fifteen libras. The piece, however, would belong to Garcia only while he lived: on his death, it was to be sold, and the proceedings returned to the painter’s inheritance (this extreme never came to pass, as Reixac outlived Garcia by many years, but shows the presbyter’s appreciation of Nordic painting, whether or not this was indeed an original Van Eyck).

16. Sanchis Sivera, José: Pintores medievales..., p. 91.
The convergence, in a single person, of activities as noteworthy as those described above should already alert us to the importance of Andreu Garcia, a key figure in many of the artistic projects that took place in Valencia between 1417 and, at the earliest, 1452 (as will be demonstrated later, Garcia arranged various commissions in his will, through which his activity as artistic promoter would continue beyond his death). This pre-eminent position in the organising of artworks should be understood, in the first instance, through the priest’s evident connection to the cathedral, where he was incumbent in the chapel of San Bernardo. Yet this is a decidedly incomplete explanation of his person. Through studying the details revealed in his will, it is possible to complete Garcia’s biographical profile and to understand his capacity for mediation and his influence in the commissioning of works: he was incumbent not only in the Seu or cathedral, but also in San Martín; son of a family of rich merchants, brother to the Kingdom’s Custodian of Observant Friars, and cousin to a Mestre Racional, he was also related to the Çanou, Jordà and Sarsola families, as well as proxy to the Grande Chartreuse, the head monastery of the Carthusian order. This array of titles and familial links alone was sufficient to characterise the ecclesiastic, who died in 1452, as a true leader of the church. He formed part — as shall be seen — of a select elite with the capacity to promote artistic undertakings and the requisite taste to employ the foremost artists then present in Valencia.

Andreu Garcia’s parents were Ferran Garcia and Úrsula Jordà. The former, an eminent merchant active between 1388 and 1425, made his home in the parish of Santa Catalina. His most important activities involved censales (a variety of loan common at the time), materials, slaves and wheat. In addition to his position as ship-owner, he was the owner of a rice mill. Clues exist, furthermore, that link him to international commerce. In 1414, he entered into a two-year business arrangement with Antoni and Bertomeu Ros, with a starting capital of 6,100 libras (a record sum, according to Enrique Cruselles). Apart from this, Ferran Garcia is...
documented as proxy of the Royal Treasury in 1388\(^{25}\), Baile General (the functionary responsible for managing the royal assets) in 1409\(^{26}\), and administrator of the hospital of Los Inocentes in 1411\(^{27}\) (a position linked closely to the city’s merchant class, as Agustín Rubio Vela relates\(^{28}\)). This host of responsibilities explains the honour the city authorities bestowed upon the merchant in 1392, when, during the entrance of John I of Aragon and Violant of Bar, he held one of the reins of the queen’s horse\(^{29}\). Ferran Garcia recorded his last will and testament on May 18\(^{th}\), 1423, before the notary Antoni Pasqual\(^{30}\), and died on February 26\(^{th}\), 1424\(^{31}\). Andreu himself often had a hand in his father’s affairs: throughout the year of 1423, he appears as the creditor in various sums relating to the sale of flour and pastels\(^{32}\); months after his progenitor’s death, the priest settles debts with two bakers\(^{33}\); and in 1434 he receives a property as his father’s heir\(^{34}\). Through his maternal line, Garcia was grandson to Pere Jordà — as declared in his will, which will later be examined in detail— probably the same person who, under this name, is recorded as administrator of the work on behalf of Valencia’s prisoners in 1392 and 1399, and who left the role due to his advanced age\(^{35}\). This chronology agrees with that of a grandson dying in 1452; nor should it be overlooked that, from the final quarter of the fourteenth century, the administrators of this charitable institution came to be appointed directly by the Jurados or Judges\(^{36}\), which also reinforces the idea of a familial origin close to the city elites. In his own will, Andreu Garcia states that his grandfather was incumbent in the chapel of Santo Espíritu in the church of Santa Catalina, the parish to which his father also belonged and where, furthermore, various merchants with the surname Jordà are recorded as living at the time\(^{37}\). The presbyter charges his executors with commissioning a chalice, paten, altarpiece and missal for the benefice associated with the chapel. In his instructions, Garcia also

---

28. Rubio Vela, Agustín: ‘Infancia y marginalización. En torno a las instituciones trecentistas valencianas para el socorro de los huérfanos’, *Revista d’Història Medieval*, 1 (1990), pp. 122–128: the Hospital of Inocentes, founded in 1409 by ten citizens (just two years before Ferran Garcia’s stewardship), had a clear precedent in the almoina de les òrfenes a maridar (‘alms house of orphans to be married’); in both institutions, nobles and ecclesiastics were excluded (p. 127); in the Hospital of Inocentes, the role of administrator was rotating, and corresponded, for one year, to one of the ten lifelong diputats or deputies that governed the institution (p. 123, note 47).
30. Today there remain no protocols associated with Antoni Pasqual dated to 1423. Having revised the corresponding documentation [APPV, No. 829, Antoni Pasqual, 1423] no trace has been found of Ferran Garcia’s will. Nor has the possible inventory of February 1424 [APPV, No. 23248, Antoni Pasqual, 1424] been unearthed.
32. Idem, vol. 4, pp. 594–597 [the references are in ARV, *Protocolos*, No. 2422, Vicent Çaera: January 23\(^{rd}\), 26\(^{th}\) and 30\(^{th}\); February 27\(^{th}\), May 10\(^{th}\), December 18\(^{th}\) and 22\(^{nd}\), 1423].
33. APPV, No. 27184, Lluís Guerau, June 2\(^{nd}\), 1424, and July 18\(^{th}\), 1424.
34. APPV, No. 20702, Ambrosi Alegret, 14/8/1434: Andreu Garcia, as heir to his father, receives a house and vegetable garden from the widow of Pere d’Artés, merchant.
36. Idem, p. 130.
37. Examples include Lluís Jordà (1417–1435) and Pere Jordà (1425–1442), perhaps related to the ecclesiastic (Cf. Cruselles Gómez, Enrique: *Hombres de negocios...,* vol. 4, p. 17; for their location in the parish, see vol. 2, p. 702).
refers to his great-grandfather Bernat Canou, founder of the cathedral’s benefice of San Bernardo, the same post Garcia occupied (his will, in fact, dictates that chalice, paten, missal and liturgical apparel be created for this space in the cathedral: all these implements, save the missal, were to bear the emblems of Canou and Garcia). Sanchis Sivera notes that the chapel of San Bernardo was ceded in 1311 to Canou, Baile General of Valencia, who established the benefice that would later belong to his grandson. The latter would not only renovate the furnishings of this place of worship, but would also order the replacement of the chest of paschal candles that his predecessor had commissioned for the cathedral’s choir. It is easy, then, to understand Garcia’s honouring his grandfather’s memory to such an extent: in addition to being the first patron of his benefice, he must have been a true example to the family, as a royal official at the highest level, in the service of James I at least during the final chapter of his reign (it currently remains undetermined whether he was Andreu’s father’s maternal grandfather, or one of the two grandfathers of his mother, Ursula Jordà). In any case, Bernat Canou and Pere Jordà are the ancestors Garcia evokes when he sets out his final wishes, and with whom he deliberately links himself through the commission of artistic objects bearing emblems uniting his surname with that of his forebears.

Finally, before embarking upon a close scrutiny of his will, inventory and auction, it is worth mentioning that his brother, Jaume Garcia, was, in 1450, the Custodian of Observant Friars of the Kingdom of Valencia, with all the implications this would have in terms of spirituality —unlike the Conventual Franciscans, with whom permanent tensions existed in those years— and influence over the monastery of Santa María de Jesús, founded in 1428 (where, in fact, the priest supervised the construction of a chapel defrayed by pavorde Joan de Prades, as noted earlier), as well as other monasteries (Andreu Garcia’s inventory features a book from the monastery of Sant Esperit, founded in 1404 by María de Luna and belonging from the outset to the Observants).

The last wishes of the priest, Garcia, recorded before the notary Ambrosi Alegret on June 10th, 1450, perhaps precipitated by the plague that swept Valencia that
year\textsuperscript{42}, begin with an outright declaration of intent: that divine wisdom permits men to own earthly, transitory possessions, and to dispose of them as they see fit. If arranging the fate of one’s possessions is a matter none should take lightly, the question must be yet more troubling for one who does not, and should not, expect any blood descendant that might serve as his successor. Thus, with the pertinent witnesses called, ‘Andreu Garcia, priest incumbent in the Cathedral of Valencia and resident of that city’ prepares to set out his final testament, choosing as executors his brother Jaume Garcia, Custodian of the Observant Friars of the Kingdom of Valencia; 

\textit{micer} Jaume Garcia, a doctor of law; and the priests incumbent in San Martín, Pere Pellarananda and Bernat Garcia. If for any reason these were unable to carry out the inheritance, they would be replaced by the priests Pere Cercos and Joan Cucalo, and by the merchants Bona\textsuperscript{sic} fonat [sic], Lluís and Ramon Bereguer. Garcia establishes a very specific system of substitution: each priest and layperson will be replaced by an executor of equal status, in the order in which they appear in the document. Having given these individuals absolute power to manage any matter relating to his assets, the testator goes on to specify the details concerning his burial. He stipulates that his body, attired in the Carthusian habit, be buried in the cloister at Valldecrist, in the cemetery where his mother lay and where the monastery’s monks had reserved him a place. His mortal remains are to be accompanied there by four priests and two lay brothers, as well as an executor. Garcia also points out that Dom Francesc Maresme, the prior of the Grande Chartreuse and General of the Order, to whom he referred as ‘my lord and father’, has granted him the honour of monkhood (in fact, he insists that, at the very moment of his death, the executors send Maresme a letter with a copy of this privilege and notification of the date of his death). The presbyter decrees that the corresponding funeral rites be held in the cathedral as soon as possible: with these completed, the office for the dead should take place in the choir; and the following day, mass should be held at the high altar and absolution performed in front of the tomb housing his grandmother and grandfather, Bernat Çanou, before the door of the chapel of San Bernardo where Garcia is incumbent (as has been noted, the founder of this position was the same Çanou, the kingdom’s Baile General in the early fourteenth century). The priests that attend the liturgy will each receive twelve \textit{dineros}; to the cathedral’s choirboys, he assigns sixty \textit{sueldos} for ringing the bells on that day, in particular during the services held for his soul. The intercessory masses to be held in his name numbered a thousand, the dedication of the majority being painstakingly specified, to some extent representing a devotional map of Garcia’s personal religiosity. Services are dedicated to the Trinity, the Nativity, the Pilgrimage of the Virgin and Child in Egypt, the Ascension, the Holy Spirit, the Assumption, Saint Michael, the angels, Saint John the Baptist, Saint Andrew, the Conversion of Saint Paul, Saint Lawrence, Saint Catherine, Saint Mary of Egypt, the Eleven Thousand

Virgins, all the Saints of Paradise and Saint Amador. The remaining masses, assigned no particular dedication, were to be Requiem masses.

After arranging the matter of his burial and the funerary services that should be held for the salvation of the soul, Garcia goes on to ensure the continuity of the prebends founded by his family: both the lifelong one established by his father in San Martín and that instituted by his grandfather Pere Jordà in Santa Catalina. The presbyter declares that it falls to him to attend to these necessities, ‘given that my brother and my sister are in religion and cannot arrange such matters, and the management of this office of my holy father has passed to me’ (indeed, his brother Jaume was an Observant Friar; his sister, Clara, a Clarisse). He also leaves fifty libras to each of the following institutions: the alms house of the cathedral, the work towards the redemption of Christian captives, the city’s Friars Minor and the repenedides or ‘repenters’. This legacy was, in fact, required to fulfil the obligations set out in the inheritance he received from his paternal grandmother Isabel, married to Ferrando Garcia, although the presbyter was doubtless linked to the majority of these entities himself, in one way or another: in 1441, he was appointed by the council of canons to agree, with Jacomart, the design of a door for the alms house; his maternal grandfather, Pere Jordà, oversaw the work of redeeming captives; and, finally, Garcia was especially devoted to Saint Mary of Egypt, patron of the repentant and a paragon of conversion and solitary life (in addition to describing her as ‘my singular lady’ in his instructions concerning the masses for his soul, he commissioned a panel for the cathedral depicting the story of her death, and dedicated to her the chapel he financed in Valldecrist, where she would be the titular saint along with Andrew and Ursula). To complete his compliance with his deceased ancestors’ wishes, Andreu Garcia orders that forty libras be paid annually to his sister Clara, a Clarisse in the convent of Valencia: thirty sourced from their mother’s dowry, as she had stipulated in her testament, and ten from his own fortune. Clara would be able to demand the payment of this quantity as long as she lived (even if some obstacle should emerge regarding the inheritance from her mother, Garcia ensures that his sister will nevertheless receive the money, whatever the source of the funds might be), with neither the convent nor any abbess having any claim to the ten supplementary libras, Garcia having assigned them to Clara that she might comply with certain charges he had agreed with her ‘in secret’. Before moving on to pious donations and pecuniary bequests to family members, the testator affirms that, in his role as proxy to the prior and the monks of the Grande Chartreuse, he does not wish to retain or accept any sum of money. In the case that any might remain, it should be entrusted to an individual chosen by the prior, as it is not Garcia’s intention to receive any remuneration for this work.

The religious and charitable activities Andreu Garcia selected as recipients of his inheritance comprise a long list: the collection boxes for the shamefaced poor of Valencia’s twelve parishes, the infirm in the leper colony, the poverty-stricken inmates of the communal prison, the chest of clothing for the needy, the Carthusian monastery of Portaceli, the Franciscan monastery of Segorbe, the convent of Santa Clara in Valencia, the monastery of María de Jesús, the convent of La Trinidad, the convent of San Miguel de Liria, the Hospital de Inocentes, Valencia’s monastery of
Franciscans, the monastery of San Agustín, the Dominican convent, the convent of Carmen, the collection box for the redemption of captive Christians in the Virgen de la Merced, the friars of La Murta, the monastery of Sant Esperit, and the Bishop of Valencia, as well as the complete redemption of two Christian captives. The quantities involved vary significantly from case to case (from the ten sueldos received by the bishop, the lepers and the prison inmates to the three hundred earmarked for the Inocentes). The legacy left to Portaceli is nonetheless striking (two hundred sueldos), as is García’s specific consideration of the Observant Friars’ monasteries: the foundations of Santa María de Jesús, Segorbe, Liria and Sant Esperit each receive fifty sueldos.

The priest’s instructions concerning the mourning that should be observed by those close to him give a comprehensive idea of the concept of family cherished in the mid-fifteenth century: not only are his siblings listed, but also his executors, the notary who would oversee the will, and a string of names that are not, at first glance, easy to connect to the deceased (from a certain Johana Blanch, who was at the time convalescing in García’s house, to his brother’s wet nurse, via Llorenç Palau, Peret Mas, and Francesca, the widow of a furrier). Among these stand out Joan Reixac, Pere Bonora and Goñcal Sarrià, who he also holds dear and expects to don a gramalla—a type of toga worn after bereavement—and mourning cap. When he later moves on to specify the quantities of money assigned to each, various relationships of financial dependence and service emerge: Jacmeta, who should also wear a black blouse and cloak, turns out to be García’s servant; Peret Mas, who receives the same inheritance as Jacmeta, and who resides in García’s house, must also have served on his household staff. A different case is that of Llorenç Palau, also resident in the priest’s home, to whom he bequeaths 100 libras for his services, in addition to various essentials. García also considers leaving him, in case he wishes to become a priest, his breviary, his diurnal and a Manipulus Clericorum.

He charges him, furthermore, with assisting his executors in the realisation of his testamentary dispositions. The large amount of money García assigns to Palau, his concern for the youth’s future and his interest in involving him in the execution of his will suggest a relationship based not only on service (or, at least, not only on domestic service): Llorenç Palau perhaps assisted García in the management of his many businesses and transactions, securing a considerable inheritance as compensation for these works. It should be noted, in addition, that after the donations to religious institutions, Palau is the first individual to be named in the distribution of the presbyter’s estate. Next, Jacmeta, Peret Mas and the cutler Andreu Çabater would each receive between one and two hundred sueldos (the first two in thanks for their service in García’s house; the third ‘for the love of God’), followed by an extensive list of names who would each receive fifty sueldos, among them Goñcal Sarrià. Joana Blanch closes this roster of individuals who, while not blood relations, 43. This was a type of clerical manual very popular in the late Middle Ages. They appear frequently in the inventories of fifteenth-century ecclesiastics: cf. Iglesias i Fonseca, Josep Antoni: Llibres i lectors a la Barcelona del segle xv. Les biblioteques de clergues, juristes, metges i altres ciutadans a través de la documentació notarial (anys 1396–1475) (unpublished doctoral thesis), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 1996, p. 83.
the priest considers as family. At the time the will was drawn up, Blanch was unwell in the presbyter’s house; he instructs that the belongings she had brought there with her be returned to her. In addition, he requests that while she lives she not be required to repay a debt of three thousand sueldos owing to him (Garcia’s executors will, however, be able to demand this sum following the debtor’s death). Finally, he stipulates that his sister Clara uses fifty sueldos of the ten libras she will receive annually to assist with Joana’s upkeep. The nun would also receive a vernacular psalter on parchment, a wooden crucifix and a Veil of Veronica. Jaume Garcia, brother to Andreu, is to do whatever he sees fit with the Summa de Collationis [sic] and a number of other books.

Following the mention of the Clarisse and the Franciscan begins the list of relatives to whom Andreu Garcia leaves money. One by one appear the surnames of the families related to the presbyter: Corts, Jordà, Sarsola, Ferriol, Centelles and Sist, among others. Francí Sarsola was Lord of Jérica, a circumstance possibly related to Garcia’s involvement in the contract of the Saint Michael altarpiece, charged to Miquel Alcanyís by Bertomeu Terol, a cleric of that region. There are, in any case, much more obvious clues linking the priest’s familial origins to the commissioning of artworks. Several of his forebears established ecclesiastical positions that, ultimately, generated the commissioning of artistic works by the testator. As has already been noted, Garcia’s great-grandfather, Bernat Çanou, had founded the benefice of San Bernardo in the cathedral, held by Garcia himself. Consequently, among his testamentary commands is the chapel’s provision with a chalice and paten of gilded silver (both of which are to bear Çanou’s and Garcia’s coats of arms; the chalice, in addition, must be decorated with enamels of Piety, the Virgin and Saint Bernard), a missal and various liturgical garments. Also stipulated is the renewal of the liturgical apparatus in the prebend of Espíritu Santo, established in the church of Santa Catalina by Pere Jordà, Garcia’s grandfather (namely chalice and paten, of gilded silver and a specific weight, missal, and altarpiece). Finally, he leaves various altar cloths to the chapel of San Joaquín and Santa Ana in the church of San Martín, whose benefice had most likely been endowed by his father, Ferran Garcia (his will makes reference to a perpetual seat in said parish, founded by his father Ferran, but does not link it directly to the chapel of San Joaquín and Santa Ana).

As well as these diverse commissions, all related to the embellishment of sacred spaces patronised by his family, Andreu Garcia desires the completion of one of the two chapels whose construction had already begun in Valdecrist—a matter he had previously raised with both the prior and the monk Guillem Jordà—and that an altarpiece be created dedicated to Saint Andrew, Saint Ursula and Saint Mary of Egypt, following a sketch he himself has drawn. This triple dedication can be easily explained from what we already know of the presbyter. Not only was his mother—buried in the same cemetery in Valdecrist—named Úrsula, but so too were many

44. It is, most likely, the Summa Collationis de Johannis Gallensis that appears in the inventory: that is, the Communiloquium or Summa collationum by the Franciscan Juan de Gales, a manual for clerics and preachers then popular in the Crown of Aragon. Cf. Hauf i Valls, Albert G.: Eximenis, Joan de Salisbury i Joan de Gal·les. Barcelona, Publicacions de l’Abadia de Montserrat, 1992; see also Iglesias i Fonseca, Josep Antoni: Llibres i lectors..., p. 153, note 507.
other women of the Jordà family, a family of which the monk with whom Garcia arranged the chapel’s completion may have been a member; Saint Mary of Egypt was a figure towards whom he felt particular devotion, as has been demonstrated (it is redundant to reiterate the arguments corroborating this affirmation); while Saint Andrew was included as titular for entirely obvious reasons. Taken together with the painstaking planning of the altarpiece (Garcia himself providing a design), one might imagine that the chapel was designed as a funerary votive offering that the priest planned to present to a monastery to which he felt especially close (the particular link tying Garcia to the Carthusian order will be analysed somewhat later; the possibility of the chapel as a space of interment must be disregarded, as his will explicitly specifies that the presbyter will be buried in the cemetery of the Carthusian monastery).

The concretion of the artistic commissions stipulated in this testament remains an unknown quantity. In principle, the executors, perhaps aided by Llorenç Palau, would be responsible for carrying out these commands, although it is hard to believe, given Garcia’s nature, that he would leave it to others to resolve issues to which he himself was so sensitive, when in other matters he made reference to various texts he planned to write in which he would more carefully describe how particular provisions should be implemented. In any case, the priest’s contacts with the most distinguished artisans of the art world is an indisputable fact, as is his proven reputation as mediator in commissions awarded by prestigious clients. As if this were insufficient, the inventory of his possessions records various invoices concerning considerable numbers of craftsmen to whom he loaned money, probably in the form of the aforementioned censal (among these, silversmiths were of particular prominence). To Joan Reixac and Pere Bonora, Garcia —having reached the end of his last wishes, following the rewarding of his executors and the distribution of certain books— leaves ‘the papers and other samples of painting I possess, and certain images I own in copper and gypsum and wax’, whose division the testator would arrange in a document he intended to write at a later date. Perhaps the missals from the benefices of San Bernardo and Espíritu Santo would go to Bonora, and the two altarpieces —from Espíritu Santo and Valldecrist— to Reixac. The price of the missals (three hundred sueldos for the cathedral’s missal, and two hundred for Santa Catalina’s) and the altarpiece from Espíritu Santo (1,500 sueldos) are in accordance with the status of their creators, without being excessive. The details of the budget assigned to the works at Valldecrist are unknown, although the promoter’s nature suggests it would be a quantity no less than that reserved for the city’s temples. That Garcia played the role of mentor in Joan Reixac’s professional activity has been known for some time. The commissions the painter received

45. The listed individuals are Mondo de Molins, Francesc Riba, Gaspar Teixidor, Bonanat Armengol, Jaume Esteve, Joan Agulló, Domingo Gocalbo, Joan Peres, Vicent Adrover, an operator with the surname of Martí and the widow of Capellades, in addition to other silversmiths whose names are illegible due to the protocol’s poor condition.
46. See, once again, Ferre i Puerto, Josep: ‘Trajectòria vital de Joan Reixac...’; García Marsilla, Juan Vicente: ‘La demanda i el gust artístic a València...’; and Gómez-Ferrer Lozano, Mercedes: ‘Nuevas noticias sobre retablos del pintor Joan Reixach...’.
through the presbyter’s mediation were numerous, and at least one of these was destined for the Carthusian monastery of Portaceli (in 1439, Garcia paid Reixac for an altar cloth and painting for this institution in Serra)\(^47\). Surprisingly, there is no documented commission for Valdecebrist that directly implies both individuals. Of course, the main altarpiece of the Carthusian church —partially preserved in the Museo Catedralico in Segorbe, and considered, at least the central panel, as the work of Reixac, commenced around 1454\(^48\)— would be difficult to explain without Andreu Garcia’s intervention, although it has not been possible to support this possibility with documentary evidence. Although the painter perhaps began his work two years after the eclesiast’s death, it is tempting to see Garcia’s influence in the altarpiece’s promoter, Ursula\(^49\), his first cousin and wife of Francesc Sarsola (and cited as such in his will of 1450, in which he bequeathes her a hundred sueldos). In any case, the documentation linking the priest’s cousin to the work states that its author was ‘Juan Roiz de Moros’, rather than Reixac.

Andreu Garcia’s links to the Carthusian order go far beyond his possible involvement in the commissioning of artistic works for Portaceli and Valdecebrist. As has been indicated, the cleric elected to be buried in the cemetery of this latter monastery, choosing to be interred wearing the habit of the order. He also indicates that Francesc Maresme, the prior of the Grande Chartreuse, whom he describes as ‘my Lord and Father’, had bestowed upon him the honour of monkhood. His executors, moreover, were to send a notice of his death to the order. This, in fact, they did, as in one of the order’s Chartae, corresponding to the General Chapter of 1453, his death appears in the following terms:

Spectabilis et deuotus dominus, Dominus Andreas Garcia, sacerdos Magne Valencie, promotor fidelis & diligens executor negociorum Domus Maioris Cartusie matris nostre et nostri Capituli Generalis, qui per xxiij annos sine adminiculo alicuius stipendi temporali cum magnuo feroere ac zelo contemplatione Ordinis laborauit, tamquam bene meritus habet per totum Ordinem nostrum plenum cum Psalterii monachatum. Cuius obitus dies scribantur in kalendariis conuentualibus domorum Ordinis sub xiija Nouembris\(^50\).


\(^{48}\) The monastery’s chronicler Fray Joaquín Vivas, in his Historia de la Fundación de la Real Cartuja de Vall de Cristo (a work compiled in 1775), informs us that the venerable paintings of the altarpiece were the work of ‘Juan de Exarch’, who had commissioned them for 300 florins in 1454 [Vivas’ work was published by Enrique Díaz Manteca in ‘Para el estudio de la historia de Vall de Crist. El manuscrito de la Fundación de Joaquín Vivas’, Boletín de la Sociedad Castellonense de Cultura, vol. lxvii (1993), pp. 85–116; the paintings are mentioned on p.114]. Recently, the unity of the altarpiece has been called into question by David Montolio, who indicates the possibility that at least one of the panels of the ensemble actually originates from the monastery of San Blas de Segorbe. Josep Ferre, to whom we are grateful for his clarification of this matter [email dated March 1st, 2013], has studied the piece exhaustively, and is inclined not to discard the former hypothesis that considers the paintings a single entity related to the main altar of Valdecebrist.


In his will, Garcia had already explained that he was proxy to the Grande Chartreuse, and that he desired no form of recompense for his works. The previous document serves to add, furthermore, that he held this post for twenty-three years (he began, therefore, in 1429), an extensive period that can perhaps be explained through his personal relationship with Francesc Maresme, Prior General from 1437 and linked to the administration of the order from some time earlier (he was coadjutor to the former General, Guillaume de Lamotte, and his representative in the schismatic Council of Basel). In any case, the executors found in the presbyter’s home a great quantity of money belonging to the Grande Chartreuse (more than 60,000 sueldos), representing payments made in 1445, 1446, 1447, 1448, 1449 and 1451. Also found in the deceased’s home were further documents most likely related to this administration of the Grande Chartreuse’s assets. One document, for example, records that in May of 1452 Garcia received, from the monk Joan de Nea, twenty libras paid by the alamin (the figure responsible for overseeing weights and measures) of Serra. In this context, Nea is deserving of a brief mention, defined by historiography as a ‘volcanic convert’, highly active in the circles of the Aragonese court, a close collaborator of Maresme, and the man behind the Carthusian foundations in Montalegre and the Anunciata, the ephemeral monastery close to the city of Valencia, patronised by Jaume Perfeta and inhabited only between 1442 and 1445. It is impossible to know what involvement Garcia had in this project, although he was surely aware, through Nea and as proxy to the Grande Chartreuse, of its vicissitudes. Finally, before concluding the revision of the connections that bound Andreu Garcia to the Carthusians, all that remains is to briefly return to his relationship with Francesc Maresme. This must have been a particularly strong connection, judging by the attention the former paid the latter in his will. The two may have met in Portaceli, the Carthusian monastery where Maresme professed in 1402, although there are signs that perhaps point to a familial connection: the deceased presbyter’s inventory of 1452 mentions a table to hold candles bearing both Maresme’s and Garcia’s insignias, and two altar cloths with the same emblems. This is difficult to explain without resorting to the possibility of a kinship between the two. On the other hand, it is known that Maresmes founded a chapel in Valldecrist.


52. In Garcia’s room, stored in a walnut chest wrapped in canvas, the executors found five hemp sacks and a pouch of white leather in which he kept the money, along with the corresponding receipts and documentation.


(that of San Antonio or Santísimo Cristo)\textsuperscript{57}, a commission that perhaps represented, if dating prior to 1450, a model Garcia could emulate in terms of artistic promotion.

Andreu Garcia’s affinity with the Carthusian order is clearly apparent: he handles the affairs of the Grande Chartreuse for years on end without recompense, chooses to locate his tomb in Valldécrast, and before his death receives the honour of monkhood from Maresme. The manifestations of this accord are well-known, though its causes are not, perhaps residing both in a close personal relationship to an eminent member of the order as well as in a particular spiritual sympathy. The ecclesiastic’s inventory demonstrates his interest in the figurative arts\textsuperscript{58}, but also a well-defined religiosity, evidenced by his library. Comprising books, treatises and devotional works, the writings found in Garcia’s home by the executors number some seventy examples. Most of these were concentrated in the deceased’s bedroom and, even more so, in a small study annexed to it. The diversity of works is considerable, although they can be loosely categorised into three broad topics: the first would include sacred texts, liturgical manuals and books of worship; the second, theological treatises and preaching guides; the third, works characteristic of an education in the arts. From the first group, in addition to two Bibles distinguished by their opulence, which are ‘in the most secret compartment of that room’, and found alongside other volumes, is listed a Mass of the Virgin bound with other orations and psalms, a rubriquet or rúbrica (a compilation of procedural guidelines for religious ceremonies, copied into a small book), the Psalterium alias laudatorium de Eiximenis, a small volume including the Office for the Dead and the Little Office of Our Lady (the first on paper, the second on parchment), an Hours of the Virgin, the Expositio de Ordine Missae by the Dominican Guillelm Anglès\textsuperscript{59}, a Manipulus Clericorum, a volume entitled Un milagro de un maesto en Teología, another entitled ‘Angela de Fulguio’ (most likely the Memorial by Angela da Foligno, or her Instrucciones), a Vida de San Francisco, a psalter, an Hours of the Virgin ‘of Humility’, a breviary and diurnal by the Bishop of Valencia, a Flos Sanctorum, various note-books of ‘devotions’ and a factitious volume containing the Contemptus Mundi. The theological treatises and preaching manuals are, if possible, even more abundant, although their identification, in certain cases, presents difficulties, due to the poor condition of the protocol: along with a small parchment book whose (fragmentary) title is ‘De divinis docmatibus’ (perhaps a work attributed to Saint Augustine, De

\textsuperscript{57.} Martín Gimeno, Enrique & Santolaya Ochando, María José: ‘Tipología de la cartuja de Valldécrast y de otras cartujas valencianas’, p. 292.

\textsuperscript{58.} The figure of the man of God with an interest in the plastic arts was not uncommon: remember the priests who worked on the preparations for the grand entrance of Martin the Humane, as well as the character of fray Gabriel Carbonell, cited in Gonçal Sarrià’s will as a ‘hermit of the house of the Beghards of València’ (Aliaga Morell, Joan: Els Peris i la pintura valenciana medieval. Valencia Edicions Alfons el Magnànim, 1996, p. 238), who, of course, attended the auction of Garcia’s possessions, buying two touchstones and various medicine bottles on December 2nd, 1452 (APPV, No. 1107, Ambrosi Alegrèt). Carbonell’s inventory (the friar having died in 1477) was unearthed by Juan Vicente García Marsilla, and includes a booklet of designs, various books and assorted pious images (García Marsilla, Juan Vicente: ‘La demanda i el gust artístic a València…’, p. 58).

dogmatibus ecclesiasticis), Garcia owned the ‘recomandatio’ by Saint Alselm, the De Miseria Humanae Conditionis by Innocent III, a treatise on Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite’s ‘Triple Way’, a De Contemplatione (probably a Llullian work), the Repertorium Morale by Petrus Berchorius in three volumes, Roberto Holcot’s Moralitates (an exemplary collection for preachers), various documents by Francesc Eiximenis whose nature is unrecorded, the Apologia Pauperum by Saint Bonaventure, a book of Sunday sermons by Eiximenis, parts of the Cristià, the Cercapou, a Suma de vicis (perhaps the Summa de vitae et virtutibus by the Franciscan Guillermus Peraldus, or the one by Laurent d’Orléans), the Scala Dei (cited as a ‘book by Francesc Eiximenez for the queen’), a parchment booklet entitled Lo primer de creure fermament en un sol Deu, a Libellus de Virginitate (of uncertain authorship, being attributable to both Saint Jerome and Saint Ildephonsus, among others), two Ars Moriendi, a De Natura Angelica, a ‘speculum ugonis’ (perhaps the Speculum Ecclesiae by Hugo de San Caro), various writings on the coming of the Antichrist (in all probability one of these was the De adventu Antichristi by Arnau de Vilanova), the ‘Bartholina’ (the Summa Casus Conscientiae, compiled by the Franciscan Bartolomeo da Pisa), various writings by Saint Bonaventure and Saint Jerome (by the latter, De vitis Apostolorum), the Summa Collationum by Juan de Gales, Jean Gerson’s Mens Contemplationis, a book of ‘super meditationes arbore vite de Bonaventura’ (the Lignum Vitae by Saint Bonaventure), an Imago Vitae (probably the Soliloquium de quatuor mentalibus exercitio quod dictur Imago Vitae by Saint Bonaventure), and various works tackling the art of oration, as well as the articles of faith. Finally, the presbyter had also amassed in his home rhetorical works, grammatical notes, a book on logic, Boethius’ Consolation of Philosophy, a ‘liber de secretis philosophie artis’ (probably another work by Llull) and a Cato in a factitious volume.

Taken as a whole, the books owned by Andreu Garcia make up a comprehensive theological education, and a spirituality as personal as it was common in early fifteenth-century Valencia, clearly allied to Observant Franciscanism (protected and patronised in those years by none other than Maria of Castile)\(^6\), with many commonalities with the doctrines of Llull and Arnaldus and the writings of Eiximenis\(^6\). Judging from his interest in the titles by Saint Alselm, Saint Bonaventure and Gerson, Garcia appears inclined towards affective oration and prayer-meditation (in his inventory, in fact, is a De meditatione), a tendency clearly evident in


the abundance of writings he owned by Francesc Eiximenis: the Psalterium alias
Laudatorium, a book of Sunday sermons, the Scala Dei, parts of the Cristià, and a
Cercapou. The listing of a work by Angela da Foligno reinforces this idea of con-
templation based on emotion, supported by the mystical diary (or Instrucciones) of
this beatified Umbrian. Furthermore, the Ars Moriendi, the writings on the com-
ing of the Antichrist (some perhaps by Arnau de Vilanova), the possible works by
Llull (De Meditatione and De secretis philosophie artis) and two volumes such as the
De Miseria Humanae Conditionis and the Contemptus Mundi confirm that Garcia
felt an affinity with the Joachimite Franciscanism then so active in the Crown of
Aragón. Comparison with other ecclesiast’s libraries from the same period (the
majority catalogued in post-mortem inventories) might help place Garcia’s books
in context. Of these libraries, studied by María Rosario Ferrer Gimeno in her doc-
toral thesis, there is only one that exceeds Garcia’s in numerical terms, the re-
mainder being much smaller than these two cases. This was the collection of 108
books sold in the auction of Francesc Mestre, parish priest of Castelló de Xàtiva.
The auction was held in January 1450, and attended by Andreu Garcia himself,
who bought for sixteen sueldos and six dineros the work by Angela da Foligno that
appeared in his own inventory two years later, as well as a Brevisquium by Saint
Bonaventure (nor, most likely, was this the first time Garcia resorted to this means
to acquire some volume or other: in the jackets of his De divinis docmatibus and his
De Miseria Humanae Conditionis can be read ‘property of Pere Ribera, notary’). In
general, the titles appearing in these inventories of priests and canons are relat-
ed to liturgy, patristics and authors such as Eiximenis and Bonaventure (Antoni
Riera, for example, a priest incumbent in the cathedral, lists in his will of 1434 a
missal, a diurnal, a flos Sanctorum, and ‘my books by Bonaventura and
Angela’). Moreover, works that Garcia possessed are cited with some regularity:
ENCARNA MONTERO TORTAJADA

Before bringing to a conclusion this brief portrait of Andreu Garcia, reconstructed through the documentation relating to his person, it is worth mentioning his more than probable links with the Beghards of Valencia. There are fairly sound arguments to support this connection: in the first place, the priest was able to acquire works by Arnau de Vilanova and Llull (Vilanova has repeatedly been forwarded as the mentor of the city’s Beghard and Beguine movement75, and in the library of the Hospital de Beguinos is registered a *De contemplatione*, with various theories pointing to the existence of an early Valencian Llullist school in that very institution)76; along with other related reading materials, Garcia owned a ‘Suma de vicis’, likely to be the *Summa de vitis et virtutibus* by Laurent d’Orléans, one of the preferred titles of the Beghard community, according to the inquisitor Bernat Guiu77; moreover, the ecclesiastic pays particular attention to the ‘repenters’ or ‘penitent women’ in his will, leaving them fifty *libras* (this institution of reform for female sinners was founded by a Beguine in 1345, and probably continued under the patronage of the Third Order of Saint Francis a century later)78; similarly, in the inventory of 1452 appears ‘an old Beguine penitential vestment’, perhaps belonging to one of the many inheritances Garcia had to manage; and, finally, the painter Gonçal Sarrià, with whom the priest shared a particularly close relationship, died in 1451 in the Hospital de Beguinos, leaving various tools to Gabriel Carbonell, a hermit of said institution, Garcia acting as guardian and executor of his testamentary wishes79.

In conclusion, it seems *mossen* Andreu Garcia was a rather more complex figure than it might initially appear: born to a family belonging to the civic oligarchy, and later welcomed into the elite of the ecclesiastical class, he practiced meditative prayer and the reading of theological works on a daily basis, judging by the titles that appear in his library; furthermore, he interacted frequently with Carthusians, Observant Friars and, seemingly, Beghards. This whirlwind activity was in addition to his practice of drawing, his dealings with artisans and his general interest

74. See, in the thesis of FERRER GIMENO, documents 17 (inventory of Berenguer Vidal, presbyter and rector of Guadalest and incumbent in the cathedral, dated to 1436), 21 (inventory of Joan Lopiç, parish priest of Silla, dated to 1437), 35 (inventory of Francesc d’Aries, canon and superior of the cathedral, dated to 1444), 43 (auction of the belongings of Francesc Mestre, parish priest of Castelló de Xàtiva, dated to 1450) and 52 (inventory of Martín Domínguez, presbyter, dated to 1452). Add to this list the inventory of the canon Pere d’Artés, carried out in November 1440, in which there is no mention, with the exception of liturgical works, of books identifiable with Garcia’s [see. WITTlin, Curt J.: ‘Testament i inventari del canonge valencià Pere d’Artés (†1440)’, in FERRAndO, Antoni (ed.): *Miscel·lània Sanchis Guarner* [Biblioteca ‘Abat Oliva’, 210]. Valencia, Universitat de València-Publicacions de l’Abadia de Montserrat, 1992, vol. I, pp. 459–480].

75. HAUF I VALLS, Albert: ‘La espiritualidad valenciana en los albores de la Edad Moderna’, pp. 491–492: ‘Arnau was, as is known, the spiritual mentor of the Valencian Beghards, and we must not allow ourselves to forget the importance of a centre such as the ‘house and hospital of the Virgin Mary of Beghards of the distinguished city of València’ […]’. See also, and above all, RUBIO VELA, Agustín & RODRIGO LIZONDO, Mateu: ‘Els beguins de València en el segle XIV. La seua casa-hospital i els seus llibres’, *Miscel·lània Sanchis Guarner*, 1 [Quaderns de Filologia] (1984), pp. 329 and 334.


77. Idem, p. 335.


79. ALIAgA MOREll, Joan: *Els Peris…*, pp. 237–239.
in art, activities perhaps undertaken by other clerics who appear repeatedly in the documentation, still awaiting the relief and definition that have been restored to this particular priest, who, at the time of his death, in November 1452, was also a monk. This case, then, is a clear example of the existence of individuals not easily accommodated by the categories habitually employed by historiography, when examining the specifics of a given commission: promoter, client, sponsor and patron are the names typically assigned to the instigators of artistic undertakings. Garcia was promoter on only a handful of occasions. Client, sponsor and patron are classifications that can only with great difficulty be applied to his known activity. Yet this outstanding man of the church was involved in a great many negotiations between commissioners and artists throughout the first half of the fifteenth century, and was repeatedly acknowledged as an efficient agent in such matters, a catalyst for the wishes of the purseholder, and a reliable intermediary to whom one could delegate the dialogue with the artisans. This task of mediation represents the core of what could be termed the 'hidden capitulations' of a contract: beyond prices, dimensions, deadlines and quality of materials, exist equally precise questions requiring a concretion that the documentation rarely apprehends; iconographies, decorative repertoires, compositional schemes and figurative models are matters whose definition occurs far from the notary’s office, through verbal expression or through notes, and, on occasion, through a third party judged sufficiently capable to carry out this task. Andreu Garcia, a member —by birth and by position— of the sector of urban society that generated the bulk of the market's artistic commissions, at the same time compare or friend to various artists, was, without a shadow of a doubt, a more than necessary accomplice in a great many of the works contracted in Valencia between 1417 and 1452.
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Abstract
Juan Martínez Silíceo (c. 1477–1557), as well as Cardinal and Archbishop of Toledo, was a distinguished humanist and mathematician who played a prominent part in the history and culture of sixteenth-century Toledo and Spain. He enjoyed great admiration and recognition even beyond his death, as evidenced by various literary sources and later historiography. However, various aspects of his relationship to the arts have still to be studied in any detail. This article aims to set out a novel investigation into Silíceo’s iconography, through a selection of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century literary and visual sources considered most relevant.
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Resumen
Juan Martínez Silíceo (c.1477–1557), además de cardenal y arzobispo de Toledo, fue un importante humanista y matemático que desempeñó un destacado papel en la historia y cultura del Toledo y la España del siglo XVI y que gozó de gran admiración y reconocimiento más allá de su muerte, tal como evidencian las fuentes literarias y la historiografía posterior. Sin embargo, aún quedan pendientes de estudio pormenorizado algunos aspectos relativos a su relación con las artes. Este artículo pretende plantear un primer acercamiento a la iconografía de Silíceo a través de una selección de las fuentes literarias y visuales de los siglos XVI al XVIII consideradas más relevantes.
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JUAN MARTÍNEZ SILÍCEO (C. 1477–1557) — who was, as well as archbishop and cardinal, tutor to a very young Prince Philip (later Philip II) — has received little attention beyond his facet as a mathematician in the specialised publications of that field, or as the individual responsible for the establishment of the Estatutos de Limpieza de Sangre in the Dives Toletana (Toledo Cathedral) in historical courtly works. The only treatment of this archbishop’s relationship to the arts was that set out by Rosario Díez del Corral Garnica in Arquitectura y mecenazgo. La imagen de Toledo en el Renacimiento, a work that constitutes a small part of the author’s doctoral thesis, unpublished, read in 1985 under the title of Mecenazgo y arquitectura: los orígenes del Renacimiento. However, following a detailed study of several literary sources penned between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, including chronicles and descriptions of the city of Toledo, ecclesiastical histories, poetry and travellers’ journals, we deduce that Silíceo must have played an important role in the history and culture of sixteenth-century Toledo and Spain and must have enjoyed great admiration and recognition not only in life, but also long after his death, as evidenced by his repeated appearance in literary sources.

The following discussion aims to shed light on Silíceo’s iconography, using the most pertinent literary and graphical sources dated between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, among them a number of heretofore unknown works.

1. ALL, TO ME, IS A FIRE STEEL: SILÍCEO’S EMBLEMS

Silíceo, born in Villagarcía de la Torre (Badajoz), came from a humble family from Extremadura. His parents, it seems, were labourers, a fact that seemed to pose no obstacle to the young Silíceo receiving his early education in Llerena. He began his university studies in Valencia, moving to Paris in 1507, whose lecture halls he frequented first as a student and later as a professor of arts.


4. Remember the case of Baltasar Porreño, author of the Historia de los Arzobispos de Toledo, who fifty years after the prelate’s death, around 1608, wrote in defence of the Estatutos de limpieza de sangre, and ultimately of Silíceo himself, in a brief text entitled Documentos referentes al Estatuto de la Santa Iglesia de Toledo (Biblioteca Nacional de España [BNE], MS/13043). It also speaks volumes that Francisco de Prisa, a descendant of Jewish converts, includes in his Descripción de la imperial ciudad de Toledo (Toledo, 1605) a poem in Sicilian octaves composed by Doctor Gregorio Fernández de Velasco dedicated to ‘algunos claros varones de Toledo’, among whom Silíceo appeared —at the beginning of the list, no less— as the subject of four verses, while other characters of the same period such as Juan de Vergara and Alfonso de Cedillo scarcely merit a single verse.
From his arrival in Paris, and until his death, Silíceo’s existence transpired in the circles of the cultural elites (the universities of Paris and Salamanca) and the proximity of the court (first as tutor to Philip II and later as Archbishop of Toledo), worlds —almost in the manner of theatrical scenes, especially the court— governed by specific codes where the heraldic and emblematic were indispensable tools. Both underwent profound development during the Renaissance, increasing in importance and complexity. We need only recall examples such as the marquis’ Palacio de la Conquista in Trujillo, or Valladolid’s Iglesia de la Magdalena, to appreciate the importance of heraldry in Spanish Renaissance society.

However, against the background described above, Silíceo came from a humble family, lacking any type of heraldic emblem with which to represent his lineage, as a result of which, when his moment arrived to assume a role in the courtly ‘theatre’, he found himself obliged to create his own image, to codify his person and personality in plastic terms, through an insignia that would personally identify him. The first attempt materialised on the frontispiece of his work Ars Arithmetica, a mathematical treatise published in Paris in 1514 (Figure 1). On this appears Silíceo’s motif, framed against a silver background, the first line with the upper case initials J. M. in gothic characters, and a second line with the letter S. The timbre consists of a helm from whose upper part emerge the mantling and a cockerel. The emblem is completed by Latin mottoes situated above and below the shield, the lower adorned with a hand and compass in its central area: A menta abstine and Teneo mensura, which translate as: Abstain from mint and I remain in measurement.

As we can see, Silíceo chose to include just three initials (the S indicates that the Latinisation of his second surname, del Guijo or Guijarro, had already taken

---

5. A bilingual edition of this work was published in 1996 by the Universidad de Extremadura, created by Eustaquio Sánchez Salor.
6. Cirilo Florez Miguel relates the phrase ‘Teneo mensura’ with Pythagoreanism, to which Silíceo’s work Ars Arithmetica is specifically aligned (Flores Miguel, Cirilo: ‘El ambiente cultural de la Salamanca del Renacimiento en torno a la figura de Juan Martínez Silíceo’, in VVAA: Arzobispos de Toledo, mecenas universitarios. Cuenca, 2004, pp. 111-142). As for the mysterious, imperative phrase ‘abstain from mint’, its significance remains unknown. Perhaps this plant had some sort of property then deemed negative. According to Greek mythology Mente or Menta was a nymph who inhabited the underworld and was a lover of Hades, for which she was struck by Persephone until she became a plant (Grimal, Pierre: Diccionario de mitología griega y romana. Barcelona, 2004, p. 352).
place), and a cockerel as an element above the helm, an animal generally associated, in heraldry, with bravery and tenacity in battle.

We are unaware whether this first emblem was employed elsewhere by Silíceo during his Parisian years or even those he spent in Salamanca, as the Biblioteca Nacional de España’s example of his logical-mathematical work *Siliceus In eius primam Alfonseam sectione in qua primaria dyalectices elemêta comperiuntur argutissime disputata*, published in 1517 in Salamanca, has either lost the frontispiece where the emblem would have appeared, or this only ever consisted of the title page alone. It is also absent from the frontispiece of the work printed in the town of Tormes in 1530, *Logica brevis*, which includes the scenes of the Desposorios and the Coronación de la Virgen.

This all appears to corroborate something that Silíceo himself indicates in one of his texts, as we shall see: that his definitive emblem would only have been created due to his naming as archbishop, rather than any of his former appointments such as tutor to Prince Philip or Bishop of Cartagena. Indeed, we have documented this, for the first time, in two texts dating to 1546, the same year in which he was named as archbishop. On one hand, in the *Oración en alabança: llamada en griego Panegyris* by Blasco de Garay; on the other, in the *Itinerarium Adriani sexti ab Hispania* by Blas de Ortiz, both works dedicated to the archbishop and boasting his coat of arms on their frontispiece.

It is Silíceo himself who describes the emblem in his 1550 work *De divino nomine Iesu*:

In view of the fact that we received from our past no coat of arms of the worldly nobility, we determined, when we attained the grandeur of the rank of Prelate, to take as our emblems those that our Eternal Father gave to his son, Jesus Christ, of whom all men are sons, which is the name of IESUS, carved into a flint that gives off tongues of flame, with a border of eight fire steels with the motto *Eximunt tangentia ignem*.

---

7. Silíceo Latinised his second surname during his stay in Paris, changing it to Siliceus. On his return to Spain, rather than readopting his original surname, he proceeded to Hispanicise the Latin word, resulting in ‘Silíceo’.
9. In 1526, Silíceo published another mathematical text in Paris, the *Arithmetica Ioannis Martini Silicei*, which built upon the *Ars Arithmetica* and whose frontispiece bears not his first coat of arms but rather, arranged into columns, a series of characters linked to the four liberal arts corresponding to the quadrivium (astronomy, music, geometry and arithmetic).
10. Ventura Leblic García expresses a degree of doubt about whether his coat of arms might not have already been adopted during his period as Bishop of Cartagena. LEBLIC GARCIA, Ventura: ‘Evolución de las armas del cardenal Silício en el Colegio de Doncellas Nobles de Toledo’, Boletín de la Sociedad Toledana de Estudios Heráldicos y Genealógicos, 9 (1988), p. 3.
11. DE GARAY, Blasco: *Oración en alabança: llamada en griego Panegyris*: juntamente con el parabien dado al illus­trissimo y reverendissimo señor don Juan Martínez Siliceo por el arçobispado de Toledo de que ha sido proveyo. Toledo, Juan de Ayala, 1546.
12. *Itinerarium Adriani sexti ab Hispania; vnde sumus aceris tus fuit postfæx, Toledo, Juan de Ayala, 1546.*
13. Ioannis Martini Silicei Archiepiscopi Toletani de divino nomine Iesu, per nomē tetragrammaton significato liber unus: cui accessere in orationem dominica salutationem[m]ue Angelicum, Exposiciones duae ab eodem autore nunc primum typis excussae. Toledo, Juan de Ayala, 1550, f. 42. The Spanish translation used to create the English is that produced by GONZÁLEZ DÁVILA, Gil: *Teatro eclesiástico de las iglesias metropolitanas y catedrales de los Reynos de*
which he himself translates as ‘all, to me, is a fire steel’.

Just as Silíceo describes, the shield (FIGURE 2) is composed of the trigram IHS above a flint spitting tongues of flame, this ensemble surrounded by eight fire strikers. This appears superimposed upon a curled hide, with the timbre consisting of the galero with eighteen tassels¹⁴ as well as a bishop’s processional cross. His coat of arms, then, would be canting arms, as Leblic defined them, as the rock alluded to his second surname¹⁵.

Many are the authors who, when describing the insignia, have offered their own interpretation of it, the majority agreeing that the flaming flint symbolises Silíceo’s

las dos Castillas. Vidas de sus arzobispos, y obispos, y cosas memorables de sus sedes. Madrid, Imprenta de Francisco Martínez, 1645, p.332.

¹⁴. The galero should, in reality, boast twenty rather than eighteen tassels.
¹⁵. LEBLIC GARCÍA, Ventura: op. cit., p. 2.
ceaseless, boundless charity\textsuperscript{16}. Thus, the aforementioned Blasco de Garay, praising
the archbishop’s choice of heraldry, comments:

Rejecting from your coats of arms the bears, lions, serpents, dogs, wolves, eagles, doves,
cranes, trees, seas, stars and other flirtations of this type of little or no significance.
Having sculpted and painted only a flint surrounded by its flames: representing the
charity that you contemplate by day and night, as declared by the motto with which
you have united them, which says. All, to me, is a fire steel. This is a fine thing to know:
that whatever matter, whatever occasion or whatever motive, however small it may
be, moves one to charity\textsuperscript{17}.

With the archbishop’s abstract and conceptual plastic representation now es-
tablished, as opposed to a portrait-based representation, it could — and did —
appear in the many architectural, pictorial, sculptural and literary works linked
to his person. His coat of arms can be found on the screens of Toledo Cathedral,
outside the Colegio de Infantes and Colegio de Doncellas Nobles, on the altarpiece in
the synagogue of Santa María la Blanca, and on the jackets of books that he pat-
ronised or which were dedicated to him, such as the Missale secundum ordinem pri-
matis ecclesiae toletanae (Toledo, 1550) or the Commentaria in Genesim by Antonio
Honcala (Alcalá, 1555).

It is striking, or at the very least curious, that Silíceo would select as the key ele-
ment of his emblem the Latin trigram of the name of Christ, which, at a very similar
time —indeed, almost the very same— was also employed as a personal emblem
by, firstly, Ignatius of Loyola, and later by his Company of Jesus\textsuperscript{18}, an order towards
which the Toledan archbishop exhibited particular aversion\textsuperscript{19}.

As for the individual significance of the three letters, IHS, the reader will know
that numerous interpretations exist\textsuperscript{20}: from its identification with the motto of Con-
stantine’s labarum (\textit{in hoc signo} [vinces]) to the reading of the phrase \textit{Jesus hominum

\textsuperscript{16} PISA, Francisco de: Descripción de la imperial ciudad de Toledo, y historia de sus antigüedades, y grandezas y cos-
sas memorables que en ella han acontecido. Toledo, Pedro Rodríguez, 1605, in folio 261 r and v, explains its significance
using the words of Silíceo himself. Remember also the poem by Sebastián de Horozco, included in his Cancionero
(Seville, 1874, p. 82 and ff.): ‘The striker with which / our shepherd summons the flames, / calls forth the fire / that
inflames with love / the hearts of his flock, / and with that same striker, / should the herd be thirsty, / from the
rock, like Aaron, / summons cascades of water’. For a modern interpretation, see FlóREZ MUÍGEL, Cirilo: \textit{op. cit.},
pp. 139–142.

\textsuperscript{17} GARAY, Blasco de: \textit{op. cit.} (the book is devoid of numbering). He also added that ‘I affirm that these are truly
your divine, living and immortal images, which must be maintained in your name, fresh and incorrupt throughout
the centuries, with celestial and earthly glory’.

\textsuperscript{18} The Jesuit order was formalised as such in 1540 by Pope Paul III.

\textsuperscript{19} As Archbishop of Toledo, Silíceo came to pronounce various persecutory edicts against the Jesuits, which
were revoked in 1552. We must not forget that the order of Saint Ignatius of Loyola accepted converts among its
ranks. For the archbishop’s problems with the Jesuits, see IAnUZZI, Isabella: ‘Mentalidad inquisitorial y jesuitas: el

\textsuperscript{20} The Latin trigram of the name of Christ certainly did not appear in the sixteenth century, as it was already
present in primitive Christianity and ended up replacing the Greek monogram of the Chi Rho. It was with Bernardi-
no de Siena, in the fourteenth century, that it achieved great popularity: the saint preached before the masses while
bearing a panel with the trigram IHS enveloped in flames. Remember also the story of Saint Ignatius of Antioch,
who, according to tradition, was martyred in the days of Trajan by being thrown \textit{ad bestias}, and on whose heart —his
chest being opened after his death— appeared the letters of Jesus’ name (IHS) written in gold. For more detail, see
Salvator. The Jesuits, for their part, read the trigram as an acronym of Jesum habemus Socium (‘Jesus is our ally’). Silíceo, as we might well have predicted, also offered his own interpretation in his work De divino nomine Iesu. In his eyes, the trigram IHS contained the H as an equivalent to the E in Greek (in IESUS-IHS(u)S) and because, furthermore, the letter H served to remind the Christian of the tetragrammaton of the name of God, IHVH. In summary, then, and leaving further arguments aside, for Silíceo IHS was an abbreviation of IESUS, IHVH and CHRISTI21.

2. PORTRAITS OF SILÍCEO

In contrast to the numerous literary sources that, with varying degrees of reliability, echo his life and attempt to present a spiritual portrait of his person, plastic testimonies to Silíceo’s appearance are few22. The earliest reference we have found to a portrait of the archbishop originates in Italy, in a text by the Italian humanist Paolo Giovio (1483–1552). The text in question is Le iscrittioni poste sotto le vere imagini de gli huomini famosi, its original Latin version published in Venice in 1546, with an Italian translation published in Florence in 155123. These iscrittioni were none other than the placards created to accompany the portraits in the gallery of learned men that Giovio hoped to create in his house in Como, a task in which he had displayed an interest since 1521.

Among these erudite fellows was Silíceo, of whom Giovio commented:

Ho poi inteso che va molto appresso lui [Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda] Martino Siliceo Vescouo di Carthagine; il quale insegnando santamente, e con molta diligenza a Philippo figliuolo dell’Imperadore, co suoi lodeuolissimi costumi, con le bueno lettere, con l’alto ingegno, e con la pura sua faccondia lo rende un’ottimo Principe, e l’enuia a conseguire l’ornamento dell’inuitto padre con la felicità del Regno24.

As a result, Silíceo’s fame, as tutor to the young Philip, reached Italy while he was still Bishop of Cartagena (recall that the text, in its earliest version, dates to 1546, the same year in which Silíceo was named archbishop). The Italian goes on to


21. Despite all this, it appears that the trigram IHS represents the first letters of Jesus’ name, as it was written for many years (Ihesus). In addition to the aforementioned articles, we recommend the reading, in relation to this trigram, of the following paper: QUERO, Fabrice: ‘Les emprunts du De Divino nomine Iesu per nomen tetragramaton significato (1550)’, in GONZÁLEZ FERNÁNDEZ, Luis: Hommage à André Gallego. La transmission de savoirs licites ou illicites dans le monde hispanique péninsulaire (xii au xvi siècles). Toulouse, 2011, pp. 399–414.


23. To study this project in more detail, see the article by SUÁREZ QUEVEDO, Diego: ‘Los Huomini Famosi de Paolo Giovio. Alberti en el primer Museo’, Anales de Historia del Arte, 20 (2010), pp. 87–123. Included at the end of the article is an appendix featuring the transcription of various fragments from Le iscrittioni...

relate how he awaited a portrait of the prelate, which was to be delivered to him in Rome by Cardinal Francisco de Mendoza, Marquis of Cañete. We do not know whether Giovio eventually came to obtain a portrait of Silíceo for his gallery of illustrious men. In any case, the fact that this distinguished humanist included him among his *uomini famosi* should be considered a consequence not only of Giovio’s position as a diplomat, which led him to frequent diverse European courts, but also of the transcendence of Silíceo’s mathematical work, which, without a doubt, enjoyed wide dissemination.

On his return to Spain, the first portrait of which we have documentary evidence, in terms of author and date, comes from as late as 1547: the likeness created for the gallery of portraits in Toledo Cathedral’s *Sala Capitular*. It was Isabel Mateo Gómez who recorded the fact that, in January of that year, Comontes was paid 6,375 *maravedís* to create a portrait of the archbishop and to restore the portrait by Fonseca. We are unaware to which portrait this refers, and have no record of its current existence; in any case, this is not the portrait now found in the *Sala Capitular*, dated to 1557, which we will discuss here.

The portrait of Silíceo that can be seen in the *Sala* today was painted by Francisco de Comontes, son and nephew to painters who worked with Juan de Borgoña, who must have been born in the early years of the sixteenth century. He died in 1565 and boasted the title of *Pintor de la Catedral* from 1547. The artist, who in 1545 had already produced the portrait of Tavera, charged 2,250 *maravedís* on December 31, 1557, for that of the Cardinal-Archbishop of Toledo, Silíceo.

---


27. Idem, p. 150. Mateo Gómez does not specify the documentary source from where he acquires this information. We have consulted the *Libros de Obra y Fábrica (Books of Work and Manufacture)* of 1556 and 1557 and find no
This portrait from 1557 (Figure 3) shows the prelate in half-length and three-quarter profile, his figure outlined against a neutral background. At the bottom of the painting can be found a placard with the name of its subject, Joān eS MartineZ SilícEo. CarDinaLis, while the upper right corner houses his personal coat of arms. In the upper area can be read OBiIT 31 Mai 1557. As the inscription indicates, he appears with the cardinal’s galero, supported by some indeterminate surface, in addition to the bishop’s staff and mitre. He is portrayed wearing the red cardinal’s cassock and a cope featuring floral decorations, fastened with a brooch bearing the trigram of Christ enveloped in a circle of flames.

As we have indicated, SilícEo is both represented and identified as cardinal, a rank not ceded to him until 1556, ruling out the possibility that the Sala Capitular’s portrait is the unknown one of 1547 whose payment is recorded in the Libros de Fábrica. Furthermore, if this iconographic argument were insufficient, the accounts of 1557 specify a payment to Comontes for a portrait of the cardinal-archbishop, while those of 1547 refer to SilícEo as archbishop only. It is true, however, that the work of 1547 would initially have been located in the Sala Capitular, as indicated in the Libro de Obra y Fábrica, to later be replaced, on SilícEo’s appointment as cardinal, with the piece that can be observed today.

A copy of this very portrait has been preserved (Figure 4) in the chapel of the Colegio de Doncellas Nobles in Toledo, a charitable educational institution established by SilícEo in 1551, which, as well as a school for youngsters, was the site the prelate chose to be buried. The portrait, oil on canvas, can today be found in the church’s gospel side, above the doorway to the chapel. The Archbishop appears as cardinal, in a composition identical to Comontes’ version from 1557, with the exception that SilícEo wears a ring on his index finger and his coat of arms is absent from the upper right corner. Furthermore, the cope he wears is decorated.

28. A reproduction of the image can be viewed at [http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File%C3%A9Cardenal_Sil%C3%ADceo.JPG](http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File%C3%A9Cardenal_Sil%C3%ADceo.JPG) [consulted 19/12/2014].
29. Nevertheless, Isabel MATEO GóMEZ (op. cit., p. 154) identifies the portrait in the Sala Capitular with that of 1547, without delving into such chronological and iconographic detail.
31. This portrait was photographed by the Toledan Casiano Alguacil (1832–1914) and included in a series of photographs named the Colección Borbón-Lorenzana, currently held in Toledo’s Archivo Municipal, which has been digitised and can be seen at [http://www.ayto-toledo.org/archivo/imagenes/fotos/casiano/vsic2.asp?imageno=27amien-lacesPintura/Retrato%20de%20la%20colecci%F3n%20Borb%F3n-Lorenzana](http://www.ayto-toledo.org/archivo/imagenes/fotos/casiano/vsic2.asp?imageno=27amien-lacesPintura/Retrato%20de%20la%20colecci%F3n%20Borb%F3n-Lorenzana) [consulted 19/12/2014]. We consider the designation of these photographs as the Colección Borbón-Lorenzana to be erroneous, as not all of them correspond to the canvases that make up said collection, currently exhibited in the Alcázar of Toledo.
with scenes, rather than the simple vegetation seen in the painting of the Sala Capitular (one of the scenes being the *Desposorios de la Virgen*), and his brooch, here, does not display the trigram.

Cardinal Lorenzana, towards the end of the eighteenth century, created the Biblioteca Pública Arzobispal, whose collection, later combined with another originating from the personal library of Cardinal Luis María de Borbón y Vallabriga’s father, makes up today’s Borbón-Lorenzana collection. This prelate, to decorate his library, selected the portraits of eighty-six Toledan archbishops and scholars, among them Sílceo. It would seem, from what can be deduced from the payments, that the archbishops’ representations were entrusted to Dionisio Santiago Palomares, son of the noted palaeographer and diplomat, Francisco de Santiago Palomares. A number of these portraits can now be found exhibited throughout the eighth floor of the west gallery of Toledo’s Alcázar (today converted, as well as a museum, into a library).

The portrait of Sílceo (Figure 5), an oil on canvas, is undoubtedly based—once again—on Comontes’ portrait in the Sala Capitular, introducing as its main variant a change of clothing. Here Sílceo is represented as cardinal, having divested himself of the bishop’s mitre and staff, as well as the cope: he wears only the clothing and mortarboard of a cardinal and, on his breast, a crucifix, similar in composition and attire to the portrait that Alonso Sánchez Coello (c. 1531–1588) painted of Diego de Covarrubias y Leiva in 1574, now kept in Toledo’s Museo del Greco, and which would later be copied by the Cretan artist. On the paraphet appears the following inscription: *IOANNES MRZ(S) R(OMANÆ) S(ANCTÆ) CARDINALIS ARCHIEP(ISCOPUS) TOLETANUS*. Like the vast majority of portraits in the series, it is lacking in quality, most likely compounded by it having been repainted over the years.

Another subsequent portrait of the prelate should be dated to the early seventeenth century (Figure 6), yet another oil on canvas, currently kept in the Colegio...
de Doncellas Nobles. On this occasion, Silíceo is painted standing, full-length, dressed in cardinal’s attire in a sombre room, resting his right hand on a book atop a table holding a pen and inkwell, perhaps an allusion to his literary activity. His left hand, whose index finger bears a ring, holds a glove. The composition is completed in the upper left-hand corner by a gathered red curtain, probably in reference to his proximity to the court and his ties to power, while in the upper right-hand corner is his coat of arms, with the timbre consisting of the galero and the processional cross. The painter has clearly taken certain liberties in the representation of the coat of arms, failing to respect the typical iconography and therefore its implicit symbolism: the flint has become an oval, and the flames a fire burning below the trigram IHS rather than around it. The number of fire strikers, furthermore, has been reduced from eight to six.

While it is exceedingly rare to find popes represented on foot, as opposed to seated, as came to be habitual from the beginning of the sixteenth century (remember Rafael’s Retrato de Julio II, which can almost be considered a paradigm of the iconography of members of the ecclesiastical class), cardinals and archbishops enjoyed greater freedom in the style of their portraits, with numerous examples of prelates immortalised on foot in a similar manner to Silíceo. We might recall, for example, some of the portraits of students of Saint Bart- holomew, belonging to the collection of the Universidad de Salamanca, or those owing to Antonio de Mora y Barahona, from the close of the seventeenth century.

This type of composition is related to the courtly portraits of nobles and kings of the House of Austria, whose characteristics were established by Antonio Moro in the middle of the century and subsequently adopted by, among others, Velázquez, Alonso Sánchez Coello and Pantoja de la Cruz and his followers (notably Rodrigo de Villandrando). Noteworthy examples include Velázquez’s depictions

---

35. For a more detailed commentary on these variations of Silíceo’s heraldry over time, see the 1988 article by Leblic García, previously cited in note 9.

36. These portraits are assembled in NUETO GOÑAZ, José Ramón & AZOFRA AGUSTÍN, Eduardo: Inventario artístico de bienes muebles de la Universidad de Salamanca. Salamanca, 2002, pp. 84–85.

of Philip IV, in which the monarch rests one hand upon a bureau, holding a sheet of paper in the other.

Stylistically, this once again represents a work of lesser quality, in which the painter’s evident technical shortcomings (the poorly resolved perspective of the table and its surroundings, issues with anatomical proportions) are exacerbated by its imitation of an existing model, as the subject of the painting was no longer living, obliging the artist to copy Comontes’ portrait in the Sala Capitular, or perhaps even one of its facsimiles.

An entirely different iconography is presented by the portrait that introduces the biography of Silicéo (Figure 7) found in the second edition (1766) of the Vida del Illustreísimo don Diego de Anaya Maldonado, written by Francisco Ruiz de Vergara y Álava, with additions by José de Rojas y Contreras, Marquis of Alventos, and published in this new version under the title of Historia del Colegio Viejo de San Bartolomé. The prelate appears in the garb of a cardinal, in bust form and left-hand profile, bearded and with a pronounced aquiline nose. Around the tondo appears the inscription EL EMINENTISSIMO SERENISSIMO DON JUAN MARTÍNEZ SILICÉO CARDenal DE LA SANTAYglesia (De) rOMA Arzovi(SP) O DE TOLEDO. It is clear that neither the draughtsman nor the engraver were familiar with Comontes’ portrait in the cathedral, nor any of its copies, hence the entirely fantastical features of this engraving. However, in a letter addressed to the rector and the students of the Colegio Viejo de San Bartolomé, included at the beginning of the first volume of the Segunda Parte, José de Rojas indicates that both the portrait of Silicéo and the other likenesses of students ‘have been produced by the finest Maestros of this court, and made to resemble as closely as possible the portraits that Your Grace keeps in his library and chapel, as I was instructed that they should’. 

38. The portrait is reproduced in Rupérez Almajo, María Nieves: El Colegio Mayor de San Bartolomé o de Anaya. Salamanca, 2003, p. 21. We are grateful to this professor from the Universidad de Salamanca for indicating the engraving’s origins.

39. The text was published in Madrid, by the printing house of Andrés Ortega, and dedicated to Charles III. Silicéo’s biography occupies pages 281 to 292 of the Primera Parte. Silicéo, as a former student of San Bartolomé, is more than justified in appearing in this work.

40. De Rojas y Contreras, José: Historia del Colegio Viejo de San Bartolomé. Madrid, 1768, unnumbered pages. We do not know to which collection of portraits this might refer. Another testament to the esteem in which Silicéo was held in Salamanca, even in the eighteenth century, is a silla de cadera, a type of Spanish x-chair with arms, which formed part of the old seating in the rectory of the Colegio Mayor de San Bartolomé, created in Manila and donated by a former pupil in the second half of the eighteenth century. On the chair appears Saint John of Sahagún, surrounded by a series of characters, all former students, among whom can be found Silicéo. See Nieto González, José Ramón & Azofra Agustín, Eduardo, Inventario artístico de Bienes Muebles de la Universidad de Salamanca. Salamanca, 2002, pp. 258–259; Rupérez Almajo, María Nieves: ‘La Universidad y los colegios seculares’ in Loci et imagines. Imágenes y lugares. 800 años de patrimonio de la Universidad de Salamanca (exhibition catalogue) [Patio
The final portrait we have unearthed forms part of the series of biographies *Retratos de los españoles ilustres con un epítome de sus vidas* (Figure 8), published in Madrid in 1791. Here, Silíceo’s image is, once again, an engraving, sketched by J. Mata and transferred to plate by Manuel Alegre (1768–1815)41, who presented the prelate in half-length and three-quarter profile, seated before a table in readiness to write, with paper, quill and ink well and dressed in cardinal’s attire. The artist shows us a Silíceo with less severe features and expression than in Comontes’ version. The image is completed with the following inscription: ‘D. Juan Martínez Silíceo. Extremeño. Obispo de Cartagena. Arzobispo de Toledo y Cardenal. Fue Maestro de Felipe II. Murió en 1557’.

3. THE MIRACLE OF THE WELL

Just as Silíceo lacked a coat of arms and had to create one, the absence of impressive family ‘deeds’ probably inspired him to produce them, and his panegyrists to transmit and even embellish them. Through our study of literary sources, we have observed the fairly uniform repetition of a series of events linked to Silíceo’s personal evolution, ranging from apparitions of the Virgin to the providential assistance of various characters who foretold, to the young Silíceo, the prosperous future and lofty positions that awaited him42.

Of these multiple anecdotes from Silíceo’s life, which we have uncovered through our reading of literary sources, only one would acquire artistic transcendence. This was the miracle of the well, according to which a young Silíceo (his age varies depending on the source, from two and a half to seven years old) fell into a well from which he was rescued, unconscious, later awakening in a church and relating how
the virgin had appeared to him while he was trapped in the depths of the well. Silíceo himself related the event in the following manner:

In the time of my childhood, I fell into a well full of water, on the day of Saint Catherine, martyr, in which well that lady had me in her lap for more than six hours, and once rescued from there I was taken for dead for a good many hours, until, placed on her altar, where her figure is painted on the altarpiece, which says Santa María de Araceli, I was resuscitated.

Juan Correa de Vivar (c. 1510–1566) was responsible for the first pictorial recording of this motif, in an altarpiece created in 1552 (Figure 9) for Toledo Cathedral’s Capilla del Sagrario, currently preserved in its Capilla de San Pedro, an altarpiece of which at least two more versions are known: one in the parish of San Julián, originating from Toledo’s Colegio de Infantes, and another in the Colegio de Doncellas, a piece we will discuss in more detail below. Each of these, with very little variation, portrays the interior of a well with the Virgin together with a young boy directing his gaze towards her. The scene takes place amidst a landscape dominated by vegetation and classical architectural features that fade into the distance.

Had we been unaware of the connections between these works and Silíceo’s person, the theme expressed in them might have been linked (were it not for the figure of the infant) to one of the dedications to the Virgin derived from the Song of


44. This account, narrated by the archbishop, taken from a ‘Memorial de agravios del cabildo catedralicio contra su arzobispo Silíceo’ and dated to November 1556, compiles a collection of questions, which in many cases bear a hint of reproof, about diverse matters that the members of the council addressed to Silíceo. Baltasar Porreño, in his text Defensa del Estatuto de Limpieza que estableció en la Iglesia de Toledo el Cardenal Arzobispo don Juan Martínez Silíceo (f. 45 and ff.) collected the council’s interventions (and complaints), but not Silíceo’s responses. It was Hilario Rodríguez de Gracia: ‘Documentos para la biografía del cardenal Silíceo’, Anales Toledanos, xviii (1984), pp. 85–179, who first reproduced the complete memoir with Silíceo’s answers. According to Rodríguez de Gracia, the original document is found in the Archivo Diocesano de Toledo, where we have unfortunately been unable to locate it. The quote by Silíceo comes from this article (p. 168). The work is reproduced in the catalogue of the exhibition Juan Correa de Vivar c. 1510–1566. Maestro del Renacimiento español (exhibition catalogue) (Museo de la Santa Cruz, Toledo, December 18th, 2010 to February 10th, 2011), Toledo, 2010.


46. Zarco del Valle, Manuel: op. cit., pp. 53–54. The work was valued by Francisco de Comontes and Manuel Álvarez (painting and carving, respectively). For the complete work of Correa de Vivar see Mateo Gómez, Isabel: Juan Correa de Vivar. Madrid, 1983 and Juan Correa de Vivar...
Songs or to certain litanies, in particular that of the ‘well of living waters’\(^{47}\). Yet the fact that Correa de Vivar’s work was created for the chapel during Silíceo’s lifetime suggests that the theme depicted is the archbishop’s miracle of the well, as opposed to some other tale unrelated to his person\(^{48}\). Moreover, the existence of two other versions, both linked to foundations established by Silíceo, lends credence to this identification of the theme.

While the first version of this iconographic subject matter was completed in 1552 by Juan Correa de Vivar, the second corresponds to Luis de Velasco (1530–1606)\(^{49}\) (Figure 10), dated to 1557, with Nicolás de Vergara (who died in 1574) responsible for the altarpiece in which the work was inserted\(^{50}\). On this occasion, the panel was destined for the chapel in the Colegio de Infantes, only recently having been relocated to the Toledo parish of San Julián.

The variations with respect to Correa’s original version are truly minimal; the composition, characters and perspective are all exactly the same. The only changes are the location of the ruins—located on the left-hand side in Velasco’s panel and the right in Correa’s case—and the posture of the young Silíceo, here facing the Virgin rather than resting his arm contemplatively on her knees. The only significant difference between both works is in their dimensions and format, as Correa’s panel is nearly twice as tall as that of Velasco, which is practically square in shape\(^{51}\). The two works are mentioned by Francisco de Pisa in his Apuntamientos para la II parte de la Descripción de la Imperial Ciudad de Toledo\(^{52}\).

A copy of Velasco’s version—the third representation of this theme—is kept in the Colegio de Doncellas, identical in composition although slightly smaller.

---

47. Song of Songs, 4, 15: ‘A fountain of gardens / a well of living waters / and streams from Lebanon.’
48. MATEO GÓMEZ, Isabel: op. cit., p. 181, in what we consider a less than convincing manner, rejects the child’s identification as Silíceo, considering, instead, that the piece depicts a legend concerning a child cast into a well by a Jew. Fernando MARIÁS, for his part, qualifies the iconography as ‘doubtful’, suggesting that the child might be Jesus Christ (‘Los artistas del Colegio de Infantes en Toledo’, Archivo Español de Arte, 193 (1976), p.95).
50. The work was valued by Correa de Vivar and Alonso de Comontes; see MARIÁS, Fernando: op. cit., p.95, who once again provides the documentary source (Archivo de la Catedral de Toledo, OF 851, f. 114). It is reproduced in GONZÁLVEZ RUIZ, Ramón (dir.): La Catedral Primada de Toledo. Dieciocho siglos de Historia. Toledo, 2010, p. 352.
51. Correa’s work measures 220 x 164cm, Velasco’s 168 x 140cm. (Juan Correa de Vivar..., pp. 142–144).
52. ‘Within the Colegio de Infantes] is a chapel in honour and reverence of Our Lady the Virgin Mary; he being but a boy, she rescued him from a well into which he had fallen, in which Our Lady had seized his hand that he not sink and drown in the water, being the Virgin herself, and it is drawn as such in the altar of the same chapel, and a similar piece is in the shrine of the holy Church of Toledo’ (de Pisa, Francisco: Apuntamientos..., p. 82). Porreño (Documentos referentes..., f. 49) also alludes to this work: ‘having been miraculously rescued in his childhood from a well into which he had fallen, which can be seen painted on the retablo of the altar and chapel of the Colegio de los Infantes that he founded in Toledo’.
In addition, the child wears different clothing to the simple tunic of Correa’s and Velasco’s paintings.

4. THE WOODCUTS OF THE ‘MIXED MISSAL’ OF 1550

The Hispanic or Mozarabic Rite can be considered as one of the identifying characteristics of Spanish religiosity, as contrasted to Roman liturgy, with Toledo as its foremost stronghold. In 1495, Cardinal Cisneros founded the Capilla Mozárabe in Toledo’s cathedral, to ensure the continuation of this virtually forgotten rite, and in 1499 ordered the publishing of the Missale mixtum almae ecclesiae toletanae, which combined both the Toledan and the Mozarabic rite, from whence came its name of mixtum or ‘mixed’.

Silíceo was also responsible for the creation of a mixed missal, dating to 1550, bearing the title of Missale secundum ordinem primatis ecclesiae toletanae. Various examples of this missal still exist, corresponding to different editions: we consulted the version found in the Biblioteca Nacional de España, printed in Toledo. The first interesting characteristic of this book is its frontispiece (Figure 11), which features Silíceo’s coat of arms framed by the text IOANN eS MA rTINuS SILIC euS ARCHIEPISCOPuS TOLeTANuS and, around this and its title, a series of figures among whom can be found the Evangelists and Saint Jerome. The upper and lower areas of the frontispiece are each completed by a distinct scene. Above is depicted a vision of Heaven, with God the Father seated and Christ kneeling at his right hand, accompanied by a group of male saints, and the Virgin as intercessor to his left, followed by female saints. The lower scene takes place inside a church and exhibits the same composition as the celestial vision: in the centre sits an archbishop, presumably Silíceo himself, accompanied by an altar boy kneeling before the altar and consecrating the Body and Blood of Christ; to the left is Pope Julius III, with his coat of arms and retinue; to the right, Emperor Charles V, with his emblem of the imperial two-headed eagle, the orb, and a sword at his feet, accompanied by his corresponding retinue. Below the image appears the verse originating from Psalms 85:4, ‘Converte nos Deus Salutaris noster: et averte iram tuam a nobis’.

Later, on folio 180, appears another interesting woodcut (Figure 12): a kneeling individual dressed in a simple habit receives a laurel wreath from the hands of a youth. These are surrounded by eight feminine figures, the scene taking place in a landscape dominated by a rocky mountain from which a river flows. The majority of these figures (some dressed in tunics, others nude) are also crowned with wreaths and bear musical instruments or other objects. When we also consider their

---

53. Catalogue number R/6052.
54. ‘Turn us, O God of our salvation, and cause thine anger toward us to cease.’
55. This xylograph is located at the bottom of the first page dedicated to the Corpus Christi service. It is completed by images and Latin texts from the Vulgata alluding to this festivity and to the Eucharist, such as David’s relocation of the Ark of the Covenant (1 Cor. 15:25–29), Saint John the Evangelist on Patmos (John 6:35) or the texts of Matthew (Matt. 26:26), Mark (Mark 14:12) and Paul (1 Cor. 11:23–26). It also includes, in the upper left corner, an image presumably intended to depict Toledo’s own Corpus Christi procession.
Figure 11. Title page of the 1550 Missale Biblioteca Nacional de España.
FIGURE 12. PAGE180 OF THE 1550 MISSALE
Biblioteca Nacional de España.
number —nine in total— it seems only logical to identify these women as the nine Muses. One of them, for example, carries an armillary sphere, through which she can be linked with the muse of astronomy, Urania; several carry musical instruments such as violas, sitars, lutes and flutes, attributes generally associated with the Muses Erato, Euterpe, Thalia and Terpsichore, among others. Finally, one of them bears a sceptre, an object occasionally carried by Melpomene, although she is more commonly associated with the mask and the sword.

There are several factors leading us to believe that this depicts Silíceo, despite the absence of any indicators of his position as archbishop. Firstly, as the individual responsible for the publication of the missal, his presence in the book is more than justified. Secondly, he is surrounded by the figures we have identified as the nine Muses, symbols of the arts and sciences and emblems of the cultivation and protection of culture, letters and sciences on Silíceo’s part. In addition, this would not be the only time the archbishop would be connected to the Muses, as during the festivities to celebrate the awarding of the galero, held in 1556 in Toledo, they would appear once more (along with Mount Parnassus) in the decorations of the triumphal arch. We must not forget how multiple literary sources extolled Silíceo’s erudition in the arts and sciences; nor should we ignore the fact that Silíceo was Professor of Natural Philosophy at the Universidad de Salamanca.

Finally, the water flowing from the rock can be linked to Castalia’s spring on Mount Parnassus, but also, without discounting this first association, to the Old Testament episode of the rock at Horeb or the waters of Meribah, linking the stone, inevitably, to Silíceo’s emblem and surname. Remember that, for example, Sebastián de Horozco, in one of his poems, described Silíceo as a pastor who: ‘should the herd be thirsty, / from the rock, like Aaron, / summons cascades of water / though the opposite element’. Diego de Castejón y Fonseca would express himself, decades later, in identical terms.

56. For a more detailed commentary on the iconography of the Muses, see AGHIÓN, Irene, BARBIllÓN, Claire & LISSARRAGUE, François: Guía iconográfica de los héroes y dioses de la Antigüedad. Madrid, 2001, pp. 241–243; and, in particular, ELVIRA BARBA, Miguel Ángel: Arte y mito. Manual de iconografía clásica. Madrid, 2008, pp. 174–177. As Professor Elvira Barba rightly indicates, while Early Modern art tends to respect the correct correspondence of Muse and attribute, this is not always the case, and it is often the artist (or the client) who selects the objects at their discretion, based on specific models of their choosing or other circumstances, so that we cannot speak of a unique, unified iconography (ELVIRA BARBA, Miguel Ángel: op. cit., p. 177). It is, even, common to find the Muses devoid of any type of identifying object. Cesare RIPA, in his Iconología (Rome, 1593), describes three different ensembles of Muses, with variations in attributes between them, proof of this absence of an established, unified iconography during the Early Modern period.

57. In the words of Blasco de Garay ‘Not only do you know the liberal arts inside out, as others report, but have deeply penetrated the hideaways and refinements of other philosophies’ (DE GARAY, Blasco: op. cit., unnumbered pages).


59. Cancionero de Sebastián de Horozco..., p. 95. The author indicates at the start of the poem that he submits the following Latin verses as a type of commentary: ‘Ignea vis silici est, urit pia pectora flamis / si sitias veras luit quoque prebet aquas’.

60. ‘And as the mysterious stone of Moses, at his request, gave forth torrents of refreshing water to the people of God, so our Silíceo’s benevolent hand poured out his treasures of wisdom and fortune for the needy who came under his protection’ (DE Castejón Y Fonseca, Diego: op. cit., p. 1046).

59. For a more detailed commentary on the iconography of the Muses, see AGHIÓN, Irene, BARBIllÓN, Claire & LISSARRAGUE, François: Guía iconográfica de los héroes y dioses de la Antigüedad. Madrid, 2001, pp. 241–243; and, in particular, ELVIRA BARBA, Miguel Ángel: Arte y mito. Manual de iconografía clásica. Madrid, 2008, pp. 174–177. As Professor Elvira Barba rightly indicates, while Early Modern art tends to respect the correct correspondence of Muse and attribute, this is not always the case, and it is often the artist (or the client) who selects the objects at their discretion, based on specific models of their choosing or other circumstances, so that we cannot speak of a unique, unified iconography (ELVIRA BARBA, Miguel Ángel: op. cit., p. 177). It is, even, common to find the Muses devoid of any type of identifying object. Cesare RIPA, in his Iconología (Rome, 1593), describes three different ensembles of Muses, with variations in attributes between them, proof of this absence of an established, unified iconography during the Early Modern period.

57. In the words of Blasco de Garay ‘Not only do you know the liberal arts inside out, as others report, but have deeply penetrated the hideaways and refinements of other philosophies’ (DE GARAY, Blasco: op. cit., unnumbered pages).


59. Cancionero de Sebastián de Horozco..., p. 95. The author indicates at the start of the poem that he submits the following Latin verses as a type of commentary: ‘Ignea vis silici est, urit pia pectora flamis / si sitias veras luit quoque prebet aquas’.

60. ‘And as the mysterious stone of Moses, at his request, gave forth torrents of refreshing water to the people of God, so our Silíceo’s benevolent hand poured out his treasures of wisdom and fortune for the needy who came under his protection’ (DE Castejón Y Fonseca, Diego: op. cit., p. 1046).
5. CONCLUSIONS

Throughout the preceding pages we have studied a number of the artistic works related to the figure of Archbishop Silíceo. Others that remain unexamined in this analysis include the relief on the doorway of the Colegio de Doncellas Nobles, the work of Juan Bautista Vázquez, the series of woodcuts that illustrate the book Publica laetitia and Silíceo’s tomb, built in the late nineteenth century by Ricardo Bellver (1845–1924) in the chapel of the same Colegio. The abundance of works already researched, along with the many that may still await investigation, highlight the necessity of an in-depth study into Silíceo’s relationship with the arts, a work we trust will be tackled in future publications.

61. PALOMERO PÁRAMO, Jesús María: ‘Juan Bautista Vázquez y la portada del Colegio de Doncellas Nobles de Toledo’, Boletín del Seminario de Estudios de Arte y Arqueología, 49 (1983), pp. 467–473. The author of the article brings to light a series of documents concerning the design and creation of this doorway, which he transcribes and comments upon.
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Abstract

If it is true that works of art belong to a context, it is also important to bear in mind that they also help to define it. This dialogic relation, this complicity, as it were, between art and reality, between the object of art and their agents—patrons, potential public and censors—does not always receive the attention it deserves. The present article proposes a model of analysis for one of the most representative aspects of material and figurative culture in early modern Spain: the sacred image. The article problematizes the definition of religious imagery as devotional, and investigates the narrative elements with which images define the religious experience. Placing the medium and not the message in the center of attention—as it is argued in this text—offers an alternative to those explanation models in which the work of art is presented as the reflection (be it spontaneous or censured) of its context.
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Resumen

Las obras de arte pertenecen a un contexto, pero también son productoras del mismo. Esta relación dialógica, o si se prefiere cómplice, entre el arte y la realidad, entre los artefactos y sus agentes—ya sean sus patronos, su potencial público o sus censores—no siempre recibe la atención que merece. El presente artículo propone un modelo de análisis para uno de los aspectos más representativos de la cultura material y figurativa de la España altomoderna: la imagen sacra. El artículo problematiza la definición de la imaginaria religiosa como arte devocional,
investigando en su lugar los recursos narrativos con los que las imágenes definen dicha experiencia religiosa. Poner el medio (y no el mensaje) en el centro de análisis —se argumenta en este trabajo— ofrece una alternativa a aquellos modelos de explicación en los que la obra de arte aparece como el reflejo (ya sea espontáneo o censurado) de su contexto.

**Palabras clave**
Contexto de la obra de arte; relación entre arte y realidad; imagen sacra en la España altomoderna
CREER — Latine credere, asentir con lo que no entendemos o sentimos, propio acto de la fe. 2. En las cosas humanas los que se fián poco de los demás tienen este refrán: «Ver y creer», que en rigor es no creer.

Sebastián de Covarrubias (1611)

A VISITOR WALKING DOWN the northern nave of Segovia Cathedral encounters the life-sized polychrome sculpture of a Roman soldier who directs his attention to the interior of the chapel. The soldier holds a spear in his right hand, while his outstretched left arm guides our eyes to the central scene of the altarpiece of which he is a part and a disquieting smile, almost a grimace, stretches across his face. Even more disturbing, his eyes are half-open, his falling eyelids impeding his complete vision. If we are to follow his advice and look through the grill and into the chapel, we will find a massive relief of Christ’s entombment and realize that this soldier jailed between two massive Corinthian columns is none other than Longinus. But what is he smiling at? Is he laughing at Christ? Is this a parody, a self-inflicted moral condemnation? Although neglected by art historians, Longinus’ gesture would have been perfectly understood by a sixteenth-century Castilian audience. According to an old medieval legend still popular in the Renaissance, Longinus was blind when he attended the Crucifixion, but when he pierced Christ’s chest with a spear to be sure that he was dead, blood and water miraculously poured out of Christ’s body and Longinus was healed of his blindness. His aggression produced unexpected evidence: not of Christ’s death but of his triumph over it. There is therefore nothing parodic in the soldier’s gesture. On the contrary, his half-open eyes and laughter illustrate his graceful recovery of sight and thankful recognition of the blessing that he has received. Longinus’ gesture can now be perfectly read as an invitation to follow his own experience: ‘Look and see; see and be converted!’ he seems to state. Conversion is here dramatized as the performative act of seeing, but seeing is also imagined as evidence of the viewer’s conversion. Before moving forward: it is not that the viewer confronts in Longinus a visual example of virtuous conversion, it is that when moving into the chapel, the viewer finds himself in front of a polychrome life-sized representation of Christ’s body, a characteristic of Spanish early modern art in front of which he can (at least hypothetically) experience his own conversion.

Since at least the nineteenth century, historians of early modern Spanish art and visual culture have repeatedly emphasized its deep religiosity. These analyses, employing what I would call a ‘representational explanatory model,’ reduce early modern Spanish painting, sculpture, and especially the hybrid language of polychrome sculpture into simple expressions of belief. According to these studies, images either represent what people believed in the sixteenth century or — in a more

sophisticated but still limited paradigm—images were used to educate or discipline religious behavior. Either way, however—whether belief preexists the image, or if it is ‘infused’ with its help in the mind of the viewer—art remains external to the act of belief, becoming either a visual expression of interior (and collective) states of mind, or the vehicle through which other ideological forces control the individual. Paradoxical as it may seem, images are in this model only media for external forces, fluid channels through which religion and power circulate. The possibility that images (and artists) could articulate and therefore intervene in this process, or that the whole process could be jeopardized is ignored. That the process could be manipulated either by the artist or the patron or fail to infuse belief as it was supposed, becoming an empty sign, or as it was put at the time, a sign of hypocrisy, is therefore never considered.

What lies behind this approach is an unproblematic understanding of belief, or, to put it in other terms, a simple and anachronistic identification of faith with belief that precludes images from being anything but reflections of inner feelings. Images in this historiographical model are redundant when not historically unnecessary. This is on at least two different levels. First, it ignores any tension between the act of personal belief and the collective/institutional dimension of Faith as a doctrinal corpus deposited in the church, thus discounting its political implications. Second, it blurs the distinction between the cognitive aspect of belief as the acquisition of—or conformity with—a proposition of faith (that Jesus was the son of God, for example), and the individual’s attitude of trust or fidelity towards an object of faith (trust in Christ himself). Here this approach simplifies the act of believing. Finally it ignores that, since at least the Middle Ages, Faith had been defined as a virtue. Consequently, Faith had to be formed through practice and because of this, at least as an object of historical research, cannot be analysed in separation of it. While these elements had been central to the theological discussion of Faith since the Scholastic period, they were subjected to new and evolving tensions during the Reformation. Because I would not like to keep the discussion on this theoretical level, I will offer one example.

In 1582, just a few years after the Burgundian sculptor Juan de Juni finished the retablo in the Cathedral of Segovia that we have just seen, the Inquisition interrogated another artisan with the same northern provenance for expressing unorthodox opinions regarding the nature of faith. The scene took place in a tavern in Madrid, where a certain Anton Duay—the culprit—was with one Andrés de Marquina.
(we’ll call him ‘Andrés’). Andrés recommended that a group of unoccupied women pray with their rosary; for every prayer, he claimed, one soul would be freed from purgatory, as the pope had conceded in a recent bull. Hearing this, Anton Duay expressed his skepticism, invoking on his side none other than doubting Thomas. This is the way the Inquisitor recorded his testimony:

 [...] e un onbre que alli estaba que le paresçio en el hablar ser françes dijo que el no creia tal que avia menester vello para creello. y este declarante le replico que en el ospital de la corte avia cuentas de perdones e se publicava y este lo crehia como la santa madre yglesia lo manda y el dicho honbre dijo que si no lo viese que no lo crehia, que dios no avria echo pontifices mas de san pedro e san pablo y este le reprehendio lo susodicho diziendole que estavamos obligados a creher e cumplir lo que el sumo pontifice mandava conforme a la fe catolica y el dicho honbre dijo que este no savia lo que dezia y que tambien le dijo este que quando alçavan la hostia consagrada este la adorava como a dios y hombre verdadero que hera fe catolica que se avia de tener e creher ansi y el dicho honbre franzes dijo heso es otra cosa, mas lo que yo no veo no lo creo que santo tomas es preste juan de las yndias y este le dijo luego querreys dezir ver y creher como santo thomas e dijo el dicho honbre que si que lo que el no ve no lo cree.7

[...] and a man who was there, and seemed to be French for the way he was speaking, said that he needed to see it to believe it. And this witness responded saying that in the court’s hospital there were accounts of the sins forgiven, and these were published, and that he believed in it as the Holy Mother the Church prescribes. And the above-mentioned man said that if he did not see it he would not believe it, that God had made no other popes than Saint Peter and Saint Paul. And he [the witness] responded that we were obliged to believe and comply with what the Pope ordered according to the [Roman] Catholic Faith. And I also told him that he did not know what he was saying, and that in the elevation of the consecrated host we adore [Him] as God and real man, and this was [part of] the Catholic Faith and had to be accepted and believed this way. And then the French man said [to me]: ‘That’s another thing’ [!] But what I don’t see I don’t believe. That Saint Thomas is Prester John of the Indies’. And then I [Andrés] said to him: ‘I imagine that what you want to say is see and believe like Saint Thomas’. And then that man [Anton] responded: ‘Exactly, that whoever does not see, does not believe’.

This dialogue reveals some of the tensions and paradoxes inherent in the concept of ‘belief’ in sixteenth-century Spain, some of which are more apparent than others. It might be worth beginning by noticing the unquestionable fact that here belief and faith were discontinuous religious experiences, and thus elements we should consider separately. At least one of the interlocutors (Anton) thought that he could have faith in the Church and still have reasonable doubts in its teachings. In fact, both Anton and Andrés expressed no reservations regarding the Eucharist (for which they used the term ‘faith’), but still had very different understandings of how they should believe in it, or, to put it in more general terms, of the relationship

between personal belief as an act of will and the faith of the Church to which they belonged as baptised Catholics.

Of course this was nothing new. Doubt in itself was probably as much a human experience in the Middle Ages as it was in post-Reformation Europe. It was the consideration of faith that was changing, as religious belief was subject to new intellectual, political and social challenges. While philosophical distinctions between faith and religious belief might be condemned to failure, it is out of the question that in post-Reformation Europe belief was progressively redefined in terms of doctrinal confession. As religious conflicts dismembered Christianity's unity, the 'formal, official, public, and binding statement of what is believed and professed by the Church' acquired a new relevance. This brought an increasing strain between religious belief as a subjective state of conviction (what in scholastic jargon received the name of fides explicita) and the expression of religious belief in the adherence to a communal Faith (fides implicita). As the example we are now considering proves, the gap between the two was not only institutionally intervened, but, at least in the territory of the so-called Catholic Monarchy, also closely policed.

A good example of these tensions comes from the same dialogue we have been considering. For as much as Andrés and Anton might have coincided in their unquestionable submission to the Catholic Faith, they completely disagreed in their understanding of how faith was related to personal belief. Interestingly enough, the two protagonists of our story expressed their views through the same narrative available: the story of Doubting Thomas from the Gospel of John. At the same time, they interpreted this episode in two very different and incompatible ways. Moreover, as we will see, Andrés and Anton's understandings of the story represent only two of three possible interpretations ventured in this age of 'uncertainty,' defined, as one recent author puts it, by an anxious quest for 'certainty' that took place across confessional borders.


10. This is oftentimes defined as a 'propositional' dimension of belief, fides quae, belief 'in' something, as opposed to the more intrapersonal aspect of Christian faith as trust (fides qua). For the quotation, Jaroslav Pelikan offered an impressive account of this in his latest Credo. Historical and Theological Guide to Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition. Yale UP, 2003. See especially, pp. 53–92.

11. The distinction between fides explicita and fides implicita to which we are now referring is in urgent need of a non-confessional study for the Early Modern period. For the Middle Ages I have found especially helpful, Van Engen, John: 'Faith as a concept in Medieval Christendom', in Belief in History, Th. Kselman (ed.), London, University of Notre Dame Press, 1991 (39–62), pp. 36–51. And Justice, Steven: 'Did the Middle Ages Believe in Their Miracles?', Representations 103, 1 (2008), pp. 1–19. This is a major division between Catholic and Reformed understanding of Faith, as illustrated in Wüstenberg, Ralph K.: 'Fides implicita revisited – Versuch eines evangelischen Zugangs', Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie 49 (2007), pp. 71–85.

DOUBTING THOMASES

With this shifting historical scenario as our context, the two positions expressed by Anton and Andrés can be related to conflicting positions in the understanding of the relationship of belief to faith. In order to make sense of the dialogue, first of all, one must acknowledge Andrés and Anton’s complete misunderstanding of each other: while they both evoked the famous Doubting Thomas episode, the story meant two quite different (at some points even opposite) things to them. One of the two might sound more familiar to the reader. For the ‘rabelaisque’ Anton Duay, Thomas’ act of introducing his fingers into Christ’s wound signified that only if he/they had a sensible piece of evidence, he/they would be willing to accept a statement as true. For this reason, he asked to see the bull to which Andrés was referring. Anton amplified his observation with some drops of irony, remembering the popular association of Thomas with the legendary Prester John of the Indies. According to a well-known medieval legend the relic of Thomas’ hand was kept in his mythical kingdom, where it periodically ‘flourished’ but, what is more important, every time a successor of Prester John had to be elected, the relic would designate the new candidate by stretching his finger and pointing to him. Not any more a credulous man, only facts would make this artisan believe in such a fabulous story. We could say that Anton Duay thought of himself as being as ‘skeptical’ as the apostle. Like Rabelais—whose Pantagruel ironically marries the mythical Prêtre Jean’s daughter—Anton thought that if something was not self-evident, a proof should be provided if he was to believe it.

While Anton’s understanding of the story of Doubting Thomas seems to be in harmony with an emerging scepticism, an erosion of belief that we usually identify as part of a secularizing process, Andrés, did not read Thomas’ doubt as existing in contradiction to his faith. This does not mean that he misread the passage, but because he wouldn’t take ‘doubt’ as an independent form of inquiry, he only emphasized the outcome of the apostle’s gesture—his acquisition of faith through evidence—, considering doubt as an element intrinsically dependent of faith. Andrés’ interpretation of the Gospel of John is crystal clear: ‘see and believe as Saint Thomas’ (‘ver y creer como Santo Tomás’), were his words.

Andrés’ understanding of doubting Thomas’ gesture will most probably be doubly alien to the modern reader, whether religious or not. If the reader is not

13. This is of course an ironic remark: Saint Thomas’ body was supposed to be buried in the Kingdom of Prester John. According to a Medieval legend, each new ‘Prester John’ was appointed after a ceremony in which a procession of candidates was made around the relic of his body until Thomas’ hand (the same one that had been introduced into Christ’s wound), opened to point to the elected. See Sánchez Lasmarías, Elena: ‘Edición del Libro del Infante don Pedro de Portugal de Gómez de Santisteban’, Memorabilia 11 (2008), pp. 1–30. The book was very popular in 16th-century Spain, and was published in 1515, 1547, 1563 and 1596.
16. Not certainly leading to a secular world, as the context of our story proves.
religious, he would likely agree with Anton; if religious, he might be puzzled by Andrés’ assumption that Thomas’ gesture of doubt did not compromise his faith, but supported or confirmed his belief. He might also be confused by the accompanying implication that faith is not the object of an interior act of belief—one whose reasons do not go beyond those of the heart, as Pascal most famously put it—but, instead, that the dynamics of faith imply finding evidence for belief, as in this specific case through sensorial experience.

If we are to accept that Andrés’ position was not completely irrational or inconsistent, it is necessary to read it first through the eyes of the understanding of faith that had been inherited from the Middle Ages. First of all, it is important to consider that, since the 13th century, theologians had brought faith as close as possible to reason, defining it in cognitive terms as an act of the intellect. Faith preserved its status between opinion and science; it could not achieve certitude of particulars (one’s own salvation, for example, was beyond reach), but it was also the intellectual act by which the individual had access to Truth through revelation. This gave faith, as well as the act of Christian belief, an objective quality. There could not be such things as different faiths: if it was Faith, it was true.

In fact, this is often the way that scholastic theologians interpreted the Doubting Thomas story. For Thomas Aquinas, for example, the apostle’s gesture illustrated the discontinuity of ‘vision’ and faith, and, consequently, of faith and science (whether he did or did not touch Him is another story; what is out of the question is that he saw Christ resurrected). In agreement with what St. Augustine had said before him, the important thing in this story, at least for Aquinas, was that Thomas ‘saw’ one thing, but ‘believed’ another. This is the formula against which inquisitors would have most probably tested Antón’s error: considering doubt as something that would not have questioned the quality of Thomas’ faith but had it fortified instead. Diego de Simancas’ popular Inquisitorial guide (first published in 1552) might have helped resolve this specific case:

and in this way Our Redeemer said to Thomas, as he was not willing to believe (credere):

because you have seen me, you have believed, blessed be those who did not see and believed. As if he had said: So you believe. [But] because you have seen and have touched

---


20. Summa Theologiae 2.ª 2.ª, q. 1, art. 3.

21. The Gospel’s words, it should be remembered here, refer to sight but not to touch: Jn 20, 29, ‘Quia vidisti me Thomae, credidisti.’

22. Summa Theologiae, 2.ª 2.ª, q. 2, art. 4.
palpasti], you’re doing nothing extraordinary. Blessed be those, and be their faith re-
munerated and prized, who have not yet seen me but still believe in me23.

However: are we to identify Andrés’ wording with Aquinas’ thought? I think not. What Andrés said was not that Thomas faced the paradox of having his faith contradict his senses; what he said is that the sense of sight provided him with ex-
ternal evidence of the object of his belief. This of course did not make him a het-
erodox. On the contrary, Andrés just limited himself to acknowledging that while the testimony of the senses could not offer him certitude, it did offer credibility. This space of credibility was not only consistent with the cognitive dimension of faith mentioned above, it was also destined to be one of permanent negotiation with reason as we will soon see. Just as the stories in the Gospels were made by eye-
witness accounts, Thomas’ personal experience of seeing and maybe even touch-
ing Christ’s resurrected body reinforced the authority of Scripture. Of course, this understanding of the story was not just the most popular way of telling the story in 16th century Spain;24 it was the message implicit in a large part of the visual il-
lustrations of this passage25. Again, in the words of the same Diego de Simancas:
Catholic Faith is infallible; it is rooted in divine revelation and cannot fail, but it is also confirmed [confirmata] by innumerable miracles, by Scripture, as well as by the testimonies of Scripture and sacred witnesses26.

Once placed in this perspective, it becomes clear that ‘doubt’ played an impor-
tant role in the reasoning of both the sceptical Antón de Duay and the Catholic An-
drés. But doubt appears at different moments in their arguments: for one of them, before belief, for the other, as a way to support or complement a faith that, even if rooted in perfect revelation, had been given to human’s imperfect understand-
ning. Both their attitudes express complementary poles in the complex and gradual undermining of the medieval concept of fides, in which Faith came to be defined in terms of revelatory certitude and, paradoxical as it may seem, belief entered the realm of uncertainty and ‘doubt’27. Anton de Duay’s use of the Doubting Thomas episode illustrates this point perfectly; Sebastián de Covarrubias’ (1611) definition of creer introducing this article is also self-explanatory: ‘seeing is believing, which, strictly speaking, means to disbelieve’ [‘Ver y creer’, que en rigor es no creer’]. Finally,

24. Alonso de Villegas’ very popular Flos Sanctorum (1588) for example explicitly interprets the passage in relation to John’s first Epistle: ‘Lo que vimos y lo que tocaron nuestras manos, de esto damos testimonio y anunciamos’ (1 John 1). I cite from the edition of Barcelona, 1794, p. 72.
25. The pre-caravaggiesque material put together by Glenn W. Most (Doubting Thomas, pp. 155–214) seems to offer though a double way of visualizing the passage. If some Late Medieval and Early Renaissance artists made Thomas look to the wound where he inserts his finger —therefore insisting on the phenomenal experience— others put his eyes in His radiant spiritual face as his finger sticks into his carnal body (Dürer, for example, in the kleine Passion, 1511). This I would argue, dissociates sight from touch identifying the former with faith, and the latter with sensorial experience.
26. Institutiones Catholicae, f. 96 v.
27. Wilfred C. Smith: op. cit., p. 60.
it is important to remember, that these different positions did not only clash in the intellectual minds of educated readers, they did so in the midst of the taverns.

**FAITH AS EVIDENCE**

There were therefore at least three possible interpretations of the same story, two articulated by the participants in the discussion, and a third one that we have identified in more scholarly (in this case inquisitorial) sources. With this in mind let us now return to our altarpiece. To which of these models does the story of Longinus belong? To both Antón and Andrés, I would argue. The story of Longinus is one of faith, the drama of the conversion of an unbeliever. According to sixteenth-century Spanish devotional literature, Jews forced Longinus to pierce Christ’s breast with his lance so that they could be assured of his death. Longinus’ act had an unexpected outcome, however. It did not prove Christ’s death, but his miraculous triumph over it: as the lance entered into his body, blood and water flowed out of the wound. The legend existed in a continuous tradition since at least the 13th century in both texts and images. Both visual and textual accounts agreed that Longinus was blind, sometimes only partially blind, and that he was cured at the foot of the Cross. Literary tradition attributes Longinus’ healing to drops of blood that sprinkled into his eyes or flowed down the staff of his lance to reach his hands and later his eyes. Visual tradition instead presented his experience of seeing the blood and water pouring out of Christ’s dead body as the cause of his healing. Each follows the conditions of its own medium: the texts respect the order of events, with Longinus’ healing resulting from his physical contact with Christ’s blood (he could not have seen the miracle if he was blind); images, for their part, simultaneously present the miracle and the healing, turning instead to the viewer to connect the two through his own experience of the image itself. Unlike texts, they invite the viewer —at least potentially— to reenact in the picture Longinus’ experience of his conversion.

The ‘visual’ nature of the miracle was made eloquent in many different ways. In one 15th-century Flemish manuscript, for example, Longinus’ recovery of sight is equated to that of the brazen serpent that Moses erected in the dessert so that anyone bitten by a serpent, just by looking at the sculpture, would be healed (Nm 21). The comparison equates conversion with a process of spiritual healing and frequently appeared in Spanish literary and visual sources at the time our retablo was carved. But in order to fully understand the structure of these specific set of images we need to look into the history of how they originated.

---


Despite the inflation of Christian imagery in Western Europe since the Late Middle Ages, Faith was still consistently defined in the 16th century as belief in something for which there was no (visual) evidence. The major source for this was Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 11, 3): 'Now faith is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not' (Est autem fides sperandarum substantia rerum, argumentum non apparentium). According to Martin Buber in this double formula, ‘the Jewish and Greek concepts of faith are joined together’, but without finding any possible synthesis: Paul brought the latter dimension of ‘proof’ or ‘demonstration’ (ἔλεγχος ‘argument,’ in the Vulgate translation) to complement the trust in God for salvation which Buber identified as the major component of the Jewish faith. It was, however, this latter cognitive — and therefore confessional — element of recognition or obedient acceptance of truth that would shape a distinctive understanding of the Christian faith from the time of Paul until the present. Faith had not only its object in Christ as revealed in Scripture, but also in Scripture itself as the primary historical testimony that made this same faith ‘credible’.

It is interesting how little art history has explored the connections between Christian iconography and this dimension of the Gospels as testimony for faith, remaining in this way completely blinded to the significance of such images as the one we are now trying to understand. Testimony designates the act of testifying, but it is not limited to reporting what is seen or heard. In Paul Ricoeur’s words:

> The eyewitness character of testimony ... never suffices to constitute its meaning as testimony. It is necessary that there be not only a statement but an account of a fact serving to prove an opinion or a truth. Even in the case of the so called ‘testimony of the senses’ this counts as ‘testimony’ only if it is used to support a judgment which goes beyond the mere recording of facts. In this regard testimony gives rise to what Eric Weil calls the ‘judiciary’ [David Stewart and Charles E. Reagan trans.]

I do not have the time here to explore this ‘judiciary’ element in all its complexity. For the moment, let me just emphasize that it was this testimonial dimension of the Gospels — the most important source for Christian iconography — that is at the root of such images as the one that we are now considering. As Ricoeur makes clear, one of the peculiar dimensions of the act of witnessing in the Gospels is its close relationship to the public act of confession. If the language of the Gospels

---

30. Most famously in Augustine: ‘Quid enim est fides, nisi credere quod non vides?’
depends on witnessing as it had been used in both the medical and historiographical realms of the Greek tradition—insisting on the reliability of something that is being testified with the experience of the sense of sight—Scripture reformulated this same trope by providing it with a new prophetic and eschatological meaning.

In order to understand its artistic consequences, it is important to emphasize that this did not mean giving up on the forensic and ‘autoptic’ roots that testimony had in that tradition but to amplify its semantic content.

In the Gospel of Luke, witnessing takes on a narrational emphasis, famously introduced as the narration of those who had seen with their own eyes. In the Gospel of John, however, this same trope is pushed in a confessional direction. Here, testimony is understood simultaneously as an act of witnessing and confessing.

It is therefore not a coincidence that it is in the Gospel of John that we find the source for the iconography of Longinus, and also for the very same words that Andrés captured in the inquisitorial trial that we have been examining. Eye-witnessing in John uses the Greek term μάρτυς/μαρτύρια. This term appears in the fourth gospel far more frequently than in the Synoptic Gospels (47/77 and 30/37 times, respectively), an indication of the importance the author gave to instilling belief in his readers. In some cases, testimony comes from those who witness Christ’s Passion, while in other cases it comes from the Beloved disciple himself. This use of testimony in John’s gospel uses the logic that ‘seeing’ is frequently continuous or synonymous with ‘believing’. In one case, the author goes so far as to use the miraculous narrative of the blind man who recovers his sight as a paradigmatic metaphor for conversion (John 9:39). The importance of these narrative strategies has not been the object of any consistent research, but, as I am about to explore, they became extremely important in the construction of the visual discourse of belief in early modern Spain.

It is in the Passion narrative that we find the passages most relevant for visual iconography. The first example of the intersection between visual testimony and belief in John happens at the foot of the cross, when they break Christ’s legs and then assure themselves that he is dead by having a soldier insert a lance into his body:

...but one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear, and at once blood and water came out. And the one who saw has testified, and his testimony is true, and that one knows that he tells the truth, so that you may believe (John 19:35).


Without explicitly identifying the witness with the Beloved Disciple, the text establishes a solid link between the testimony that comes from the experience of eye-witnessing (‘et qui vidit testimonium perhibuit’) and the resulting act of believing (‘… ut et vos credatis’). A famous 8th-century icon from Mount Sinai —the earliest known representation of Christ dead on the cross— is the first visual example I know of that highlights this element of the narrative. From the side of Christ’s dead body, two clear lines—one red for the blood, another white for the water—flow down in the direction of the Virgin Mary who is standing at the foot of the Cross. John stands at the other side of the Cross, looking in the same direction. Mary’s wide-open eyes look to the miraculous stream in dramatic contrast to those of her son, which are completely closed. With her left hand, she unequivocally points to her own eyes, redundantly presenting herself as a witness to the miracle.

It is not clear when the act of witnessing transferred to Longinus, whose name is a translation of the Greek word for ‘lance,’ but he was not first imagined as blind and only in the Late Middle Ages was he dramatically turned into a narrative subject of conversion. At least since the 13th century, images present a blind Longinus pointing to his own half-closed eyes as a thin line of blood sprinkles into them. The image invites the viewer to connect the act of seeing with his experience of faith and then reflect on their relation. There is however an important shift in the invention of the blind Longinus: by identifying the Gospel’s anonymous witness with a converted soldier images made their own pictorial exegesis. It is in this tradition that we have to understand Juan de Juni’s development of the trope in the dramatic medium of polychrome sculpture.

John’s narrative of the Crucifixion is followed by two more episodes in which seeing and believing are again problematically connected, both of them with dramatic consequences in the visual tradition to be investigated in this study. In John 20:8, John and Peter, having heard from Mary Magdalene that Jesus was resurrected, rushed into the tomb to see it with their own eyes, only to discover that it was empty, the body having disappeared. Only his burial shroud provided proof that the tomb had once been occupied by the Savior. Just a few lines later (20:29), after inviting Thomas to look at his pierced hands and touch his wounded body, Jesus admonished the apostle with the formula that, as we have seen before, would stir so many different interpretations: ‘Because you have seen me, you have believed, blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed’.

Returning now for the last time to the strange dialogue that took place between the French Anton and the Spaniard Andrés in a tavern in Madrid in 1582, it is interesting to note that Andrés used not Thomas’ words, but those proclaimed by John at the tomb —‘vidit et credidit’, ‘ver y creer’, he ‘saw and believed’— to explain the doubting apostle’s reaction. It is reasonable to suggest that for Andrés, Thomas’ visual witnessing of Christ’s resurrected body and John’s encounter with the abandoned shroud at the empty tomb had not undermined either apostle’s faith, but,

on the contrary, strengthened it with the power of those visual signs with which Christians were invited to make their faith ‘credible’.

CREDIBILITY, DOUBT AND THE ROLE OF IMAGES

In early modern Catholic Europe, and certainly in Spain, images were important sites of credibility in the different categories credibilitas was understood by theologians: beyond their most obvious capacity to visually translate — or we might better say, interpret — Scripture, images were sites for miraculous occurrences — when they did not become themselves ‘miraculous’; also they could represent, even re-enact ‘relics’ — like for example the famous ‘Verónica’; and finally they could become relics themselves if their cult could be traced back to the time of the primitive church — the brushes of one privileged witness, like the apostle Luke, or the gouge of one inspired sculptor like Nicodemus. All of these themes were important ones in the artistic production of Golden Age Spain and frequent tropes of its art theory. Tradition was certainly one of the important sources for the reformation of the Tridentine church and the interest of 17th-century artists and patrons in these models went far beyond the acquisition of iconographic decorum that has limited current scholarly discussions. Artists intentionally reenacted many of these traditions, either by exploring ideas of authorship inherited from the past or — and this has received almost no attention — by considering medieval cultic images as models for their own production of artistic wonders. In the most interesting cases, however, images involved both issues of cult and authorship simultaneously. The importance of these images can be measured by the increasing expansion of their cult as well as by resistance to them, both in Spain — as for example Inquisitorial evidence tells — or when their cult transcended Spain’s political borders. Against a historiographic tendency that separates the history of images and the history of art as two opposed poles in a segmented teleology, I would argue that an urgency to reconsider art’s primordial goal as one of creating (saintly) images is a defining characteristic of seventeenth-century Spanish art39. Moreover, it was in the effort to define art as ‘image-making’ that some of the most interesting self-reflective experiments in art theory were elaborated40.

At the same time, however, this is just half of the story. As the example of Andrés and Anton demonstrates, ‘credibility’ in post-Reformation Europe increasingly depended on the quality of evidence provided. As much recent scholarship has demonstrated, in such realms as the defense of relics and canonization processes41,  

41. See for example for the case of relics the studies collected in BOUTRY, Philippe, FABRE, Pierre Antoine & JULIA, Dominique (eds), Reliques modernes. Cultes et usages chrétiens des corps saints des Réformes aux révolutions, 2 Vols., Paris, EHES, 2009. For the use of autopsies in canonizations, VIDAL, Fernando: ‘Miracles, Science, and
the Catholic Church did not only look for arguments in the authority provided by Tradition but also stepped forward. To meet the challenges presented by critics, whether those of Reformed or dissenting minorities, they looked to historical textual criticism, from archaeology to biblical exegesis, and turned to the support offered by experimental procedures in the natural sciences, such as medical autopsies. It is interesting to remember, for example, that Counter-Reformation exegesis on the Doubting Thomas episode responded to Calvinist condemnations of Thomas’ ‘epistemic faith’ by paradoxically insisting in the certainty that the apostle acquired through his senses. One of the consequences of this was, for example, a new attention given to modern relics like the Holy Shroud in Turin that could better respond to new epistemic criteria. Whether by looking to the tradition and history of the Church, or by supporting and testing their reliability with new forms of evidence, the truth of relics, of miracles and of images in between them remained always limited to ‘moral certainty’. The object of faith and the act of belief were still beyond the certitude that could be provided by the senses. For this reason, I would argue, images’ Baroque potential for credibility and its artistic persuasiveness is as much a testimony of faith as it is, at least obliquely, one of doubt. The works of art that we have considered here can be seen as responses to doubt, not only as affirmations of faith. By being dramatized as a reply to a lack of belief, they recognize its own existence; implicitly, but also explicitly. Returning for the last time to the Deposition at the Cathedral of Segovia, it is only by looking at the whole range of reactions to the scene that we arrive at a complete understanding of the artist’s intention. Opposite the laughing Longinus, also struggling to escape from between two Corinthian columns, is another soldier. Modeled on the Classical Laocoön, this last soldier twists in anguish, his mouth deformed in a grotesque expression of pain, his eyes open. This second soldier, like Longinus, witnessed the miracle at the foot of the cross. Unlike Longinus, however, he failed to believe.
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Abstract
Artists colonies proliferated during the 19th century; but some especially ambitious were founded in the early 20th century: in a broader sense they could be called ‘art colonies’. Apart from a high density of painters, sculptors, architects or other creative inhabitants, these places were noticeable for their elegant art ornaments and in some cases museums or exhibition spaces were planned as their epicentre. Two of the most outstanding cases were founded on the outskirts of the German cities of Darmstadt and Hagen. Their respective promoters coveted the integration of arts and crafts, a typical art nouveau idea. On the other hand, they were also re-enacting the classic mouseion ideal, even with their high location, towering over their respective city. In both cases such ‘city crown’ would become with time a museum complex in the modern sense of the word.
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Resumen
A lo largo del siglo XIX proliferaron las colonias de artistas; pero a comienzos del XX se fundaron algunas especialmente ambiciosas, que cabe calificar como «artísticas»

1. Coordinator of the consolidated research group Aragonese Observatory of Art in the Public Sphere, funded by the Government of Aragón with ESF funds, and leader of the research project ‘Museums and art districts: Public art, artists, institutions’, funded by the State Secretary for Research at the Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (code HAR2012-38809-C02-01). This article is based on field work and literature survey made possible by a research stage during the summer of 2012 at Ruhr Universität Bochum, thanks to a grant for training travels of the Programme for International Mobility granted by the Office for International Relations of the University of Zaragoza within the Erasmus Programme (jpl@unizar.es).
en un sentido más amplio, pues no sólo se concentraba en ellas una importante población de pintores, escultores, arquitectos u otros creadores, sino que además se distinguieron por sus elegantes ornamentos artísticos, e incluso se planeó como su respectivo epicentro algún museo o espacio expositivo. Dos de los ejemplos más señalados fueron fundados en las afueras de las ciudades alemanas de Darmstadt y Hagen por sendos mecenas que aspiraban a la integración de artes y artesanía, una utopía propia del *art nouveau*. Por otra parte, revivían también el sueño clásico del *mouseion*, hasta por su ubicación elevada por encima de la urbe respectiva. En uno y otro caso, esa «corona urbana» se convertiría con el tiempo en un complejo museístico, en el moderno significado del término.
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SINCE THE ROMANTIC MOVEMENT many communities and artists’ colonies have been established on the margins of big cities or even in rural communities deep in nature: for the general public perhaps the best known are the French localities of Barbizon or Pont-Aven; but whoever goes there is not going to find much to visit while in Wopswede, its German equivalent, there are abundant public art attractions and even some museums. Even more so in the case of the two places studied here, thanks to the generosity of their respective patrons, who shared a vision widespread amongst the German elites of that time, which placed artists and poets at the height of ideal society. This utopian exaltation of men of arts and letters goes back to ancient culture. It persisted throughout Renaissance iconography depicting great artists or writers in laurel wreaths, located on top of Mount Parnassus. But such cultural ideal reached its peak particularly in nineteenth-century German treatises from Schiller and Goethe to Richard Wagner, Rainer Maria Rilke, Thomas Mann and other leading figures not only from the arts world but also from politics and finance, all enthused by this myth, called in German Künstlerstaat or Ästhetische Staat. This is probably why no other nation came to built not only a monumental pantheon to great men of all times, the Walhalla, built by commission from Ludwig I from Bayern on a hill in the surroundings of Regensburg, but even an ‘acropolis’ dedicated to art and contemporary artists.

That was the high aspiration driving Karl Ernst Osthaus, a potentate from Hagen, who spent a fortune in his urban projects of Hohenhagen, and also Grand Duke Ernst Ludwig in Darmstadt’s Mathildenhöhe. Significantly, these two art patrons who promoted what was then called an ‘artists colony’ —in German Künstlerkolonie— insisted on using this denomination regardless of the fact that very few houses were built for artists, while most dwellings were designed for high-ranking magnates: as if they were all part of a kinship of hoi olligoi, almost a polis above and beyond common urban society. In any event, the name Stadtkrone —crown of the city— used in German bibliography to refer to both instances has certain geopolitical innuendos. On the other hand, the fondness in the Central European culture by forested mountains certainly justified the prominent role of trees and nature

2. It would exceed the limits of this article to undertake here a review of the international literature on artists’ colonies throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; but such panoramic review can be found in the book JACOBS, Michael: The Good and Simple Life. Artists Colonies in Europe and America. Oxford, Phaidon, 1985. On the German examples and the literature in this language see WIETEK, Gerhard: Deutsche Künstlerkolonien und Künstlerorte. Munich, Verlag Thieming, 1976.

3. In ancient Greece, Mount Parnassus was considered the headquarters of the Muses, thus it had statues in their honour and a school of poetry. In the classical tradition, mount Parnassus would represent the ideal homeland of poets and, by extension, of artists and scholars. Rafael’s famous fresco in the Vatican represents a rocky hill with fountains and trees; but roofless living on top of a hill would be too rough, thus other painters imagined a palatial residence on the peak of Parnassus, as can be seen in a picture by Alessandro Allori kept at the Uffizi (reproduced in FABIANSKI, Marcin: ‘Iconography of the architecture of ideal musaea in the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries’, Journal of the History of Collections, 2.2 (1990), pp. 95–134 (figure 19 in p. 113). This dream was also very present in treaties of utopian cities, often imagining a museum standing prominently in the middle, both an education centre and sacred temple, dedicated to the highest civic endeavours; cf. POHL, Nicole: ‘Passionless reformers: the museum and the city in utopia’, in GIEBELHAUSEN, Michaela (ed.): The Architecture of the Museum: Symbolic Structures, Urban Contexts. Manchester-New York, Manchester University Press, 2003, p. 127–143.

complementing the artistic charme of these Siedlungen. German culture has always felt a fascination for forests, particularly after the Romantic doctrines of Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, of considerable influence over many community settlements, both artistic and non artistic: even the naturist colony of Monte Verità, for a period the home of writers such as Thomas Mann and Mircea Eliade, the authors respectively of The Magic Mountain and fascinating essays on the myth of the ‘Holy Mountain’.

And it is hardly a coincidence that the hill overlooking the capital of the German state of Hesse would become the site given to the Viennese architect Olbrich to create a new mount Parnassus. His effective urban symbiosis between art and nature —incorporating winding paths and existing rose gardens instead of designing wide radial avenues— was not a start from scratch, as the site already had elements of landscape and architectural heritage he was able to adapt and reuse, as well as an enduring political symbolism obvious for anyone looking at the broad panorama dominated from its summit.

1. THE MATHILDENHÖHE IN DARMSTADT: A GESAMTKUNSTWERK FOR PUBLIC AND RESIDENTIAL USE

Darmstadt is a city on the Rhine dominated by a hill where once stood a ducal palace and its gardens. This estate was the symbol of power opened to the citizens by the Grand Duke Louis III of Hesse and his wife Mathilde, in whose honour it was named Mathildenhöhe. In the Romantic period, trees and a few cottages surrounded this spot; in the last third of the nineteenth century water cisterns to supply the city were built on top of the hill as well as a quaint Russian orthodox chapel, donated by tsar Nicolas II, who had married princess Alexandra, the sister of the Grand Duke Ernst Ludwig.

This lord was supposed, as head of a constitutional State, to remain above and beyond politics or government work, thus he focused his interest on theatre, music and the arts, a passion he inherited from his mother, the Grand Duchess Alice, the daughter of Queen Victoria of England. She had also instilled in him an interest in William Morris’s proposals on matters of architecture and art. Consequently, in 1897 he engaged British Mackay Hugh Baillie Scott and Charles Robert Ashbee, members of the Arts & Crafts Movement, as interior designers. He did so prompted

by publisher Alexander Koch, a great advocate of this movement in Germany whose company was located in Darmstadt and who had published, amongst other things, the journals *Innendekoration* and *Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration*. Koch put the Grand Duke in touch with German artists of this trend and in 1898 produced a memorandum written by Georg Fuchs proposing the creation in Darmstadt of a school or centre for designer artists. This request was later expanded adding that the city also needed an exhibition hall for the public to view the latest in architecture, interior design, etc.

Ernst Ludwig seemed to be willing to do this and much more. At a time when the German elite were fascinated by the influential book *The civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, published by Jacob Buckhardt in 1860, many considered art a State issue and believed that a good ruler ought to excel as a patron of the arts. In that context it was hardly surprising that after having commissioned a plan to build a group of elegant villas and gardens known as *Villenkolonie* on the Mathildenhöhe, the Grand Duke started calling it *Künstlerkolonie*. That ‘colony of artists’ deserved to be led by an up-and-coming figure. During a trip to Paris in 1898 Ernst Ludwig contacted Alsatian sculptor François Rupert Carabin and offered him a house and a generous salary if he would move to Darmstadt. The successful French artist declined the invitation on patriotic grounds. That same year, however, another promising figure of Parisian *art nouveau*, German painter Hans Christiansen did take up the offer. Both Rupert Carabin and Christiansen had a good relationship with the Secession artists in Vienna, a city Ernst Ludwig knew well. Architect Joseph Maria Olbrich arrived from there in 1899 and was soon joined by the five other founding members: Peter Behrens, sculptors Ludwig Habich and Rudolf Bosselt, as well as Paul Bürck, a painter and textile designer and Patriz Huber, an architect, painter and sculptor. At just 21 years of age Bürck and Huber were the youngest while the eldest, Christiansen and Olbrich, were 33 and 32 respectively. They were all promised accommodation and an annual salary for at least three years. They initially stayed at the Prinz-Georg-Palais in Darmstadt until the new buildings were ready on the Mathildenhöhe, where Ernst Ludwig wished to have a house built with workshops for his artists, which might occasionally be used for temporary exhibitions open to the public.

Olbrich had already designed other exhibition buildings and had become famous thanks to the *Secession-Haus* of Vienna. It was therefore a matter of course that the Grand Duke should ask him to build the central building, as he had so

---

6. After the Franco-Prussian War and the consequent loss of Alsace and Lorraine many French people resented Germans. Rupert Carabin did not only take into consideration his own patriotic feelings but also those of the social establishment he worked for. He eventually became the director of the School of Decorative Arts in Strasbourg. Perhaps one of his merits in reaching this position was the fact he had rejected the offer put forward by the Grand Duke of Hesse.

7. None of them ever received the 12,000 annual marks the Grand Duke had allegedly offered Rupert Carabin (or at least this was the figure the French artist claimed to have rejected). Olbrich was the best paid of all, earning 4,000 marks per year, followed by Behrens and Christiansen with 3,000 marks each; Habich earned 1,800 marks and Bossel, 1,200 marks per year; while Bürck and Huber only received 900 marks each (according to KRIMMEL, B., *‘Der Fall Olbrich’*, in Joseph Maria Olbrich Architektur. Volständiger Nachdruck der drei Originalbände von 1901–1914. Tubingen, Ernst Wasmuth Verlag, 1988, p. 11–16; the data on annual incomes are on pages 13 and 14).
enthusiastically adhered to the Künstlerkolonie. Christiansen, however, who was originally expected to act as leading mentor of the new ‘art colony’ in Darmstadt, never fully broke all ties with Paris and used to spend his winters there until he finally moved back to the French capital in 1902. Yet, the house built for him was the largest and coupled with Olbrich’s, both prominently located on each side of Ernst Ludwig’s. (FIGURE 1). As for the others, only Habich and Behrens decided they could afford to have their own houses built despite the Grand Duke offering all of them comfortable terms with regard to purchase of the site and financing the construction, provided all eight houses were finished by the inaugural exhibition in 1901. They were therefore replaced by some magnates from Darmstadt who had four beautiful villas built. This seeming return to the original idea of a Villenkolonie did not appear to question the concept of ‘art colony’ so zealously supported by Olbrich, who took on the role of leader of the group.

The visual unity in the style of the Mathildenhöhe is the direct result of his massive undertaking, as he was the architect of choice for artists and other owners to have their houses designed... Save for Peter Behrens, who did not submit to the domineering Viennese architect and chose to design his house himself: a bold decision, as he was simply a painter and decorator. He thus started a new career as a self-taught architect. His was the cheapest house, its austerity and lack of ornaments —striking amidst the other houses in the neighbourhood— foreshadowed his most famous building, the AEG turbine factory in Berlin. Nonetheless, Behrens may not yet be considered a ‘functionalist’ because of his strong inclination towards symbolism, noticeable in the metaphoric diamond shapes and lamps in his house and in the famous poster he designed for the inaugural exhibition.
On 15 May 1901 Behrens actually directed the esoteric ceremony of public opening, devised by Georg Fuchs, one of the intellectual promoters of the colony. The latter chose a literary text and a theatre performance as a Zarathustrian parable: a ‘Greek chorus’ of performers dressed in white tunics conversed with a man and a woman in black, the allegories of humankind, clamouring for art’s healing redemption. In response to their invocations a bearded prophet in a scarlet cloak appeared and proclaimed that the place would become the temple of a priesthood of art. He then solemnly marched towards the Grand Duke and gave him something he had concealed in his hand, a crystal, the symbol of the artists’ alchemical work (Figure 2).

The open air stage of this performance was appropriately placed on the flight of steps amongst the terraced gardens inherited from the former rose garden of the Romantic park: a central axis amongst the new houses, presided over at the top by the Ernst-Ludwig Haus, where the workshops of the seven artists were to be located, open to the public on the occasion as an exhibition centre. Its entrance had been decorated by Olbrich with the motto Seine Welt zeige der Künstler die niemals war noch jemals sein wird engraved in golden letters, as enigmatic as the inscription decorating his Secession-Haus in Vienna. Much has been speculated on the meaning
of all of this, though all historians dealing with the colony usually focus on architectural matters without revealing much about the sociology of this community, hardly paying any attention to the rich decorative agenda gradually implemented on the Mathildenhöhe with other forms of ‘public art’.

8. The notion of the artist as a being above the community is linked to Nietzsche’s Übermensch and to the concept Richard Wagner had of himself. The composer is usually referred to as having had an influence on Olbrich because their common longing to amalgamate all arts, or Gesamtkunstwerk; but it seems that Olbrich read the parable of the artist as a priest, as a performer of Beauty for mankind, in a text written in 1898 by Hermann Bahr, which provided him with the abstruse motto for the entrance, which could be translated as ‘Let the artist show his world, which never was, nor ever will be.’ Batschmann, O., The Artist in the Modern World. A Conflict Between Market and Self-Expression. Cologne, DuMont/Yale University Press, 1997, p. 150.

9. References to rumours spreading around Darmstadt on Ernst Ludwig’s sex adventures with both men and women on the Mathildenhöhe may be found on the Internet but none of this is mentioned in written bibliography. It is not explained either why Paul Bürck, Hans Christiansen and Patriz Huber abandoned the art colony by 1902, followed by Peter Behrens and Rudolf Bosselt in 1903.
And yet, the art nouveau’s struggle to integrate all arts is key to understanding this colony as conceived by Olbrich. Like his master Otto Wagner, he also gave statues and other ornaments a prominent role in his architectural designs. This can still be noted in the monumental façade of the Ernst-Ludwig Haus, flanked by the goddesses of Victory, created by sculptor Rudolf Bosselt. Two colossal statues of a naked man and woman were placed on each side of the archivolt—they already appeared in the first preparatory sketches of the project—representing Strength and Beauty, the attributes of new mankind. (Figure 3).

In his own house, Olbrich-Haus, he placed the statue of a young man kneeling to drink in the outer corner of his garden to be admired by passers-by along Mathildenhöhweg. The statue was the work of sculptor Habich, who also made another monumental statue placed in the central street of the colony. There are also decorations carved in wood in a corner of the façade of the little house designed for sculptor Rudolf Bosselt, bought while still under construction by affluent furniture manufacturer Julius Glückert, thus becoming Kleine Haus Glückert, his small house, as the same furniture tycoon had another ostentatious house built right next to it, the Große Haus Glückert, used by his company as a display room for furniture and interior decoration. There are other simpler houses, though not without certain quaint touches, such as the house of sculptor Ludwig Habich, redolent of a Mediterranean villa, or the house of the colony’s administrator Wilhelm Deiters, in the style of an English cottage. But these were severely damaged in World War II and later rebuilt not exactly as the original but to the more modern taste of ornamental sobriety.

Some other houses bombed during World War II were never rebuilt, such as Villa Beaujou, owned by the wealthy Georg Keller, with intricate art nouveau wrought-iron railings. Or the house of painter Christiansen, the first to arrive in the colony of artists, boasting a porch with a painted floral decoration around a figure wearing a tunic and a saint’s crown, evocative of a Russian icon. Was this perhaps supposed to harmonize with the nearby orthodox church, which could be seen in the background, as a colourful backdrop? The entire ensemble lacks that effect now that this picturesque house, one of the most prominent, has disappeared: a void which has not been fully replaced. On the other hand, we only have old drawings and photos to envision what other temporary installations created by Olbrich and his colleagues must have looked like (Figure 4). For instance the access gate to the inaugural exhibition of 1901, decorated by Paul Bürck with allegoric mural paintings; or the Spielhaus theatre where the Grand Duke engaged poet Wilhelm Holzamer to stage literary recitals during that summer; or the bandstand where

10. Habich was highly successful amongst German audiences with his open air statues, some of which still adorn the parks and streets of Darmstadt, his home town, including the Mathildenhöhe hill. In its main street, Mathildenhöhweg, in 1905 he erected the monument to Gottfried Schwab, a poet and playwright born in Darmstadt, who had died in 1903. It is not usually reproduced or reported in the bibliography existing on the art colony but it is one of tourists’ favourite spots for taking photos.

11. To alleviate it a fountain was erected in 1959 created by Berlin artist Karl Hartung, presented at the German pavilion of the Universal Exhibition of Brussels the previous year. Since 1965 it has been called Fountain Ernst-Ludwig in honour of the patron.
the New Philharmonic Orchestra of Vienna used to play for visitors who could also access a restaurant pavilion decorated with stained glass windows designed by Christiansen, and of course, the Haus der Flächenkunst, an exhibition hall erected opposite Ernst-Ludwig Haus, for the temporary display of paintings, sculptures and decorative arts. All these ephemeral buildings designed by Olbrich were removed after the closure in October of the first show entitled *Ein Dokument deutscher Kunst*.

Despite the large amount of visitors the venture resulted in enormous economic loss and three years passed before the Mathildenhöhe once more opened to the public to display an exhibition from July 15th to October 16th, 1904. This time, they
tried to economize by cutting back both on temporary constructions —simply using kiosks as restaurants— and on the three terraced houses built for the occasion, none of them intended for new artists in the colony\textsuperscript{12}. Once more, Olbrich was in charge of the design remaining true to his ornamental taste and the colony continued to receive new constructions and other art creations. The so-called Blue House featured a maiolica figure by Daniel Greiner in a niche by the garden gate; wood-engraved decoration adorned the roof of the Corner House, also known as the House of the Wooden Gable; finally the Grey House boasted seraphs made by Greiner, who also made a statue, \textit{Mother and child}, placed on a pedestal in a garden area between the wrought-iron gate and the entrance door. This house, the most ornate, was precisely the only one not rebuilt after World War II. A totally different building now occupies its place, while the other two continue to evoke their original shape though with numerous alterations. Hence, the only consistent testimony left of this second exhibition is a monument in a public area between Sabaisplatz and the yard in front of the boulevard of plane trees, an architectural ornamental fountain designed by Olbrich, decorated with small figures of animals by Daniel Greiner and a bronze mask-fountain by Ludwig Habich.

Four years later, the exhibition entitled \textit{Hessische Landesausstellung für freie und angewandte Kunst}, showcased artists and artisans from Hesse in general, not just specifically from the Mathildenöhhe art colony. The only remaining founding member was Olbrich\textsuperscript{13}, after some had left and others arrived. At the time he was enjoying the peak of his contribution \textit{in situ} but it was also the beginning of his separation from the project. He could no longer be in charge of everything, as architects Conrad Sutter and Johan Christoph Gewin designed respectively new mansions and five other architects from Darmstadt shared with him the commission funded by several local industries to build a series of workers dwellings —later to be located in another part of the city. In the meantime, Olbrich was busy with important commissions in other cities and had settled in Dusseldorf. He did not even return to the colony on May 23\textsuperscript{rd}, 1908 to attend the inauguration of the next exhibition and the new buildings, two of which were his own projects. On the one hand, the Oberhessisches Ausstellungshaus, commissioned by an association created in 1907 to display industrial and decorative arts from the north of Hesse. This house, however, located on the west side of the hill, was bought after the exhibition of the following year by oven manufacturer, Roeder, and then turned into a house for two families. Further modifications were later made to adapt it
to different institutional uses. On the other hand, the Corporation of Darmstadt ordered the construction of a panoramic tower on top of the hill and an adjacent building for exhibitions, which became Olbrich’s last masterpiece after experiencing numerous complications14.

The idea of erecting a panoramic tower there had been under consideration by the City Hall since 1898 and had haunted Olbrich ever since he had arrived in Darmstadt. The occasion of the second marriage of the Grand Duke Ernst Ludwig was a fine pretext to put it into effect. The Grand Duke had divorced his first wife in 1901 and his only daughter had died in 1903. It was Olbrich’s suggestion that the city of Darmstadt build the tower as a present and a tribute to the ruler and his new wife, Eleonore Solms zu Hohensolms-Lich. Not only did the tower contain one private chamber for each of them but part of the building was open to the public to enjoy the panoramic view over Darmstadt and its surroundings. It soon became the landmark of the city, a 48.5 m tall tower topped by five staggered crests, known as Fünffingerturm – five finger tower. Its sculpture-like quality transcends its distinctive silhouette which has been compared to Late-Medieval architecture in Prague and Malchin. It also perfectly fits within its surroundings: the tower of a nearby nineteenth-century Russian chapel also has a staggered capital topped with five points15. And like Olbrich’s other buildings in Mathildenhöhe, his tower is also profusely ornate both inside and outside. The entrance, in particular, is decorated with allegoric reliefs by Heinrich Jobst representing Strength, Wisdom, Justice and Gentleness, to which a sundial and a clock were added in 1914, plus mosaics in the atrium and on the sundial by F.W. Kleuken. Many of these decorations were paid for by companies from Darmstadt to keep municipal expenses within reason (FIGURE 5).

The Corporation also paid for the attached exhibition hall. To save costs, a functional cement building was chosen, though its Sabaisplatz entrance was later decorated with four expressionist allegoric figures — Wrath, Hatred, Revenge, Greed — made by sculptor Bernhard Hoetger. The other request made by the municipality was that the exhibition area should only receive light from above; yet Olbrich did not wish to deprive the building of the beautiful views and insisted on installing windows. In many ways, Olbrich considered the tower and exhibition hall, originally called Gebäude für freie Kunst, the culmination of his work at Mathildenhöhe. Unfortunately, he died of leukaemia a few months after the inauguration and could not participate later when the ensemble was used as a museum. A local art association, the Deutsches Kunstlerbundes Darmstadt took on the management of the museum and organized exhibitions each summer. The windows were covered with

14. Some technical difficulties occurred as the water tanks were located there and they needed to be covered using skilful engineering. There were also legal impediments as the municipality could not give the commission to construct buildings to any architect other than the municipality’s official architect, August Buxbaum, who was not willing to relinquish his rights and produced the plans of another panoramic tower. After a heated discussion and subsequent voting the council chose Olbrich’s project provided he was not paid as the author but was involved in the project as the Grand Duke’s advisor.

large curtains during the exhibitions and were finally bricked up in 1975 —the internal space distribution was also totally remodelled after World War II.

The person in charge of finishing the urban planning process on the hill was one of the eldest members of the art community there\footnote{Albin Müller, Jakob Julius Scharvogel, Heinrich Jobst and Friedrich Heinrich Kleukens were the most senior. They had been joined in 1911 by sculptor Bernhart Hoetger, architect Edmund Körner, and painter and illustrator Hanns Pellar, as well as interior decorator Emanuel Josef Margold. Painter Fritz Osswaldm, jeweller Theodor Wende and printer Christian Heinrich Kleukens arrived in 1913.}, the painter and self-taught ar-
chitect Albin Müller. On the northern side of the hill he built a group of 37 dwellings for lease distributed in eight three-storey blocks and one five-storey building for workshops —which is the only building still standing as the houses were destroyed during World War II. He also erected a pergola and a decorative kiosk —called Swan Temple— along Alexandraweg. He placed a bench under a mosaic-adorned canopy in an adjacent alleyway and an ornamental water basin in front of the Russian chapel —known as the Iris Pond— with multi-coloured ceramic at the bottom, though its main ornamentation consists of the sitting statues of Saint Joseph and the Virgin with Child placed by sculptor Bernhard Hoetger on each side, as if resting by the water while fleeing to Egypt. Müller also built a monumental gateway, no longer in existence, on the Mathildenhöhe, the Löwentor or ‘Lions Gate’, so-called because of the six statues of stone lions on its top, also the work of Hoetger. This sculptor of masonic beliefs also strove from 1911 to 1914 to decorate the Romantic boulevard of plane trees placing two bronze statues at the entrance. The statue to the west represents a panther bringing the Spirit of the Night and to the east a silver lioness carrying the Spirit of the Day. A fountain was placed amongst the trees with three allegoric female figures representing the cycle of water plus a group of four monuments on the cycle of light and shadow in life with multi-coloured reliefs evoking Spring, Summer, Dreams and Resurrection. The iconographic programme was rounded up with two curious statues, one of a sitting Buddha and the other of a dying mother holding her child in her arms —he would later produce similar sculptures for two monuments in Worpswede. (Figure 6). All these architectural and sculptural additions were inaugurated on 16 May 1914 when the last exhibition of the colony opened to the public. It was due to last until 11 October but had to be closed at the beginning of August after the outbreak of the Great War.

The war did not bring about the definitive end of the colony on the Mathildenhöhe. Not all the artists and residents left, a number of them stayed on for many more years. Even more turned up during the war contributing a fresh intellectual input to the community. The Grey House had been built for the Court Chaplain but Ernst Ludwig sold it in 1918 to pacifist philosopher Hermann Graf Keyserling, a German immigrant from the Baltic who had almost everything he owned expropriated by the Bolshevik revolution and who reached Darmstadt with but a meagre part of his wealth. In November 1920 he opened the Schule der Weisheit, a ‘school of wisdom’ whose main activity were private classes for relaxation, concentration and meditation. It also had considerable public impact through organizing annual...
meetings of contemporary leaders of science, politics and finance or intensive seminars with individual personalities—for instance, one week with Indian poet Rabindranath Tagore. He turned the Mathildenhöhe into one of the most prestigious cultural spots in the Weimar Republic; alas, Keyserling was critical of the Nazis and this institution and its activities soon withered under the new political scenario19.

19. After Hitler’s rise to power he only met with obstacles to holding his meetings and publishing his works. His house was destroyed during World War II and he decided to make a fresh start in Innsbruck, though he died before his new ‘School of Wisdom’ was inaugurated there.
In contrast, the art on offer to the public on top of the hill did not cease, though it was obviously influenced by developments within German society. Art exhibitions continued to be held every summer from 1917 onwards: the most renowned show took place in 1920, dedicated to German Expressionism. Exhibitions in the 1930’s were much more committed to historical art, not ignoring contemporary art, as long as it did not clash with Nazi ideals and taste.

From a political point of view, radical changes had already come about with the revolution of November 1918. Grand Duke Ernst-Ludwig refused to abdicate and he was deposed by the Darmstadt Workers and Soldiers Council. Sorting out his private property from what was owned by the public treasury was no easy task. An agreement was reached the following year whereby he was acknowledged the rightful owner of the mansions and lands outside of Hesse while his estate within the territory was reclaimed as the property of the new State. This did not affect the houses on the Mathildenhöhe bought by private citizens, though there was some confusion regarding public infrastructures as some had been paid for by the City Hall. In any event, one part of the old Ducal park, the Rosenhöhe, with the cottage and grave of Ernst Ludwig’s only daughter from his first marriage, was set aside for the private use of his family. The Löwentor was placed at the entrance in 1926, and the Duke and his second wife and children were buried there. In the meantime, in the absence of a promoter of this artistic estate, infrastructures deteriorated and some buildings and other elements were never rebuilt after bombing raids during World War II. Exhibitions did continue to be held after the summer of 1948. The shows of 1951 and 1976 commemorating the fiftieth and seventy-fifth anniversary of the opening of the Mathildenhöhe were particularly noteworthy. The municipality did attempt in various ways to resume the idea of a colony of resident artists and intellectuals but as the art nouveau style—despised by the most radical enthusiasts of the Modern Movement—regained popularity, the preservation of the ensemble became a priority over its residential function. At the same time, there was a growing desire to promote public use and access. While none of the various plans to erect a new museum there came to fruition the Ernst-Ludwig Haus was rebuilt from 1984 to 1990 to house the ‘Museum Künstlerkolonie’. Thus, any artist

20. While still interested in the colony on the Mathildenhöhe and in art in general, the deposed Grand Duke spent his last years busy with litigations. When his estate was confiscated he had been promised a compensation of ten million marks though he was only advanced one part of this amount. Rampant inflation caused terms and agreements to be revised in 1930 and 1934. Ernst Ludwig died in October 1937. One month later, his second wife and children died in a plane crash.

21. In 1951 Darmstadt City Hall offered the lower floor of the Ernst-Ludwig Haus to architect Otto Bartning. He made significant remodelling work on the left wing of the house at his own expense. From 1965 to 1967 the Corporation erected seven workshops and dwellings in adjoining Rosenhöhe. The purpose was to create a new art colony which incorporated writer Heinrich Schirmbeck, poet Karl Krolow, art historian Hans Maria Wringler and sculptor Wilhelm Loth, amongst others.

22. In 1963 a project was commissioned to build a museum to the east of the exhibition buildings, on top of the hill. But ideas about its collection and management were unclear and the project came to nothing. Cf. Geelhaar: op. cit., (note 15), p. 165 y 283. After 2006 the Corporation planned to erect an art museum on the site formerly occupied by the Christiansen house. Its contents were to be the donated from the Sander collection of paintings and art objects from the eighteenth to twentieth century (including some works by Christiansen and also by Eugen Bracht, who had lived in the Christiansen house for three years). In 2010, given the lack of social and political consensus, the project was halted: see the account (very much in favour) offered by Ruth Wagner, in the website of the liberal party,
and visitor can access one of Olbrich’s most celebrated constructions housing art, plans, photographs and information on the history of the artists’ colony on the Mathildenhöhe. The Ausstellunshallen are also open to the public for temporary exhibitions as well as the Hochzeitsturm, used since 1993 to celebrate civil weddings. It can also be visited by the public to enjoy the panoramic views (FIGURE 7).

FIGURE 7: PANORAMIC VIEW OF THE MATHILDENHÖHE FROM THE MARRIAGE TOWER, OVERLOOKING THE CITY OF DARMSTADT

Originally an exclusive art district, an elitist acropolis born out of the patronage of the Grand Duke, with buildings only occasionally open to visitors, it is now a museumized ‘crown of the city’. The museion, in the etymological sense of the word, has become a museum: this conversion was not originally expected in this case, though it was the intended strategy for another analogous Stadtkrone originating in a similar cultural context.

2. AN ART QUARTER AS ‘CITY CROWN’, ON THE OUTSKIRTS OF HAGEN

The term Stadtkrone is usually attributed to Bruno Taut. It is therefore appropriate to use this epigraph here as it was Taut himself who planned yet another ambitious artists’ settlement on top of a hill on the outskirts of Hagen giving it that name. Other architects had been involved earlier, Peter Behrens, amongst them, just after leaving the Mathildenhöhe in Darmstadt. In this case, the main sponsor of the project was also a generous patron of the arts, Karl Ernst Osthaus, the heir of a local family of bankers and industrialists. He no doubt knew Grand Duke Ernst Ludwig, shared his convictions that local socio-economic growth could be promoted through art and admired the artistic blend so beautifully planned there by Olbrich and later expanded. Many parallels could be found, as Osthaus also aspired to a Gesamtkunstwerk mixing all the arts and combining private residential use with public open areas. But, as we shall see, there were significant differences, namely that in this case the culmination was supposed to be a museum and educational building designed by Taut. In fact, the story of young Karl Ernst as art patron had started precisely with a museum in the city centre.

By 1902 Osthaus had already founded a new museum in his hometown offering to the public a peculiar combination of many things which revealed his personal development: he had evolved from historicist traditional architecture used on the façade to unrestrained art nouveau in the interior design, from an initial specialization in natural science to an anthropological collection complemented with a growing interest for contemporary art, all of which was given the enigmatic name of Museum Folkwang, a label evocative of German mythology which he simply made up. In many ways, visiting his museum was like visiting him, as his family lived in the same building. The rooms he shared with his wife Gertrud and their five children

23. At the age of 22 Osthaus had already commissioned the family architect, Berliner Carl Gérard, a neo-Renaissance building to open his own collection on natural science to the public as a museum. But when this conventional construction was nearly finished, he met Belgium architect Henry van de Velde whom he asked to design the interior. The outcome was an art nouveau masterpiece, where every element, from the ceilings to the cabinets and showcases was decorated with organic shapes in bright colours. Impressed by the originality of this space and after having made new acquaintances through van de Velde, Osthaus decided to devote his museum to modern art and for this purpose he gathered one of the most famous collections in Europe, combining postimpressionist pictures with pieces of contemporary design and oriental pieces of craftsmanship, as well as primitive objects to complement the museum mounting, which was aesthetically distributed, in the manner of private collections, and not chronologically or by materials. Cf. Lorente, J.P., Cathedrals of Urban Modernity: The First Museums of Contemporary Art, 1800–1930, Aldershot-Brookfield, Ashgate, 1998, p. 162.
were opened to the public on the occasion of concerts or other social events. Besides, Osthaus loved to give lectures on aesthetic matters illustrating them with items from his collection. Due to this, in 1904 he asked Peter Behrens to design a hall next to the museum; but the Folkwang building continued to be insufficient so Henry van de Velde, the same architect who had designed the art nouveau interior was commissioned to build another house: a mansion surrounded by a garden on the outskirts of the city. (FIGURE 8).

Probably emulating the Mathildenhöhe, Osthaus started in 1906 to gradually build a Villenkolonie or colony of villas on the wooded hill of the Emst district
next to the old town of Eppenhausen—which had become a quarter of Hagen in 1901. The view from this area was not particularly dramatic, as trees and vegetation covered the hill but at least it was isolated from the toxic fumes spewed out by the factories in Hagen. This colony or *Siedlung* combined the symbolism of colonies and the woodlands and soon became a fashionable spot frequented by many visitors. Amongst them was a young Swiss man called Charles-Edouard Jeanneret—later known as Le Corbusier—attracted by Osthaus’s villa and garden, conceived as a raised ‘court’ or *Hohenhof*, the new epicenter of his household and ‘courtiers’. Besides his own residence, designed by van de Velde and decorated by an array of

*Figure 9: Villa Cuno, Designed by Peter Behrens in the Surroundings of the Hohenhof*
modern artists, Henri Matisse amongst them, the tycoon plotted the vast land he had purchased in order to be surrounded by his friends’ dwellings. On the one hand he built other mansions to rent or to sell them to renowned dignitaries, as Ernst Ludwigs had done on the Mathildenhöhe so it is hardly surprising that the person asked to design those houses was someone who had lived there: his protégé Peter Behrens. (Figure 9) Yet, on the other hand, he asked Josef Hofmann, August Endell, Walter Gropius and Bruno Taut to design sixteen villas for his artist friends, none of which came to fruition.

Renouncing such sumptuousness, in 1910 Osthaus announced in the local press the offer of more modest affordable houses in a green suburban area to be linked by a tram line. These were not luxury mansions but a terrace of detached or semi-detached houses along Stirnband, a winding road in the vicinity of his villa Hohenhof. The architect in charge was to be Dutchman J.-L. Mathieu Lauweriks, brought to Hagen by Osthaus through Behrens’s mediation and who had become Osthaus’s new protégé. His spiritual inclinations were in agreement with those of painter Jan Thorn Prikker, another of the patron’s favourite artists. They were the leading residents of this new middle-class neighbourhood which attracted mainly artists and intellectuals. But only nine houses were built. Lauweriks based his design on the theosophical symbolism of mazes, which he evoked using recurring square geometrical patterns on the decoration of the buildings and gardens of each of these houses, all of them of the same height and made of identical materials and colours: brick, stone and wood. Some of the artists who lived in them, such as sculptor Milly Steger and painter Thorn Prikker, added decoration to their façades or gardens, partially visible from the street; but the general look is almost anodyne and not at all typical of a Kunstlerkolonie. (Figure 10) Furthermore, the construction of this estate turned out to be too lengthy and expensive because Lauweriks introduced changes without cost control, to the point that from 1911 Osthaus hired architect Georg Metzendorf as an advisor because of his proven capacity to build cheap houses on the outskirts of Essen in the first German garden city, Margarethenhöhe, promoted by businesswoman and benefactor Margarethe Krupp.

Osthaus had been one of the founders of the Deutsche Gartenstadt-Gesellschaft (DGG) or ‘Society for the Garden City’ and already by 1905 he had organized in Hagen a conference on social housing. He even was one of the key-note speakers, along with other specialists on the subject such as Hermann Muthesius, Karl Henrici, or

---

24. In the westernmost side of the plot purchased by Osthaus, marking the entrances leading to the Hohenhof, Peter Behrens adapted to the paths and irregular ground to design, with uneven results, villas with gardens for some members of the local elites. The first, in 1908–1909 was so-called Haus Schröder — the surname of the dentist who was to inhabit it —, followed in 1909–1912 by Villa Cuno — its first dweller was the mayor of Hagen at the time, Willi Cuno— and finally, in 1911–12 a grand mansion for engineer C.H. Goedecke.

Richard Riemerschmid\textsuperscript{26}. The latter had even received the commission, through Osthau, to plan on the other side of the hill in Ermst, known as Walddorf, a workers colony for the employees of the Elbers textile factory\textsuperscript{27}. Only six terraced houses were built in 1910–12 out of the 87 houses designed by Riemerschmid. But the


Bavarian architect devised several plans for the Walddorf Siedlung which he was able to put into effect elsewhere, in the garden city of Hellerau, founded near Dresden by furniture industrialist and philanthropist Karl Schmidt-Hellerau around his design company for interior decoration, called Deutschen Werkstätten.

From this emerged Osthaus’s most ambitious project in emulation of Hellerau and Margaretenhöhe. He set out to establish the Ems ‘garden city’ around his Villa Hohenhof, giving it the name Hohenhagen. The initial core would be the terrace of middle-class houses designed by Lauweriks, who was promised full responsibility for the design though in collaboration with another friend, architect Walter Gropius, also recommended by Behrens. Osthaus led them to believe that they would build around 2,500 houses distributed along wide streets; though what thrilled him most were ‘representative’ buildings. While the Festspielhaus —a multi-purpose building offering theatre and music performances and including a school of music and rhythm founded in 1910 by Swiss Émile Jacques-Dalcroze— occupied a place of honour in Hellerau’s urban planning, Osthaus’s garden city was also to erect a monumental building for the Deutsche Museum für Kunst in Handel und Gewerbe—a museum with no premises he had created in 1909 to promote exhibitions of industrial arts. Other public buildings were to be constructed on the higher spots of the urban complex with further premises situated on the periphery: sports arenas, an equestrian school, a site for rhythmic gymnastics.

Indeed, cultivation of the body were amongst German ideals of a return to nature. These could be described as ‘naturism’ in the modern sense of the term as they included nude sunbathing and collective nudist games in the open air—an activity practised by the Osthaus family in the gardens of Villa Hohenhof, as attested to by a photograph of around 1915. But the hedonism and vital optimism which originally lay behind these practices gave way to a rising disenchantment with modern urban life in the return to nature stirred by the Great War. Gropius and Osthaus were mobilized as a result of the outbreak of the war and Lauweriks was repatriated back to Holland. This put an end to the dream of a garden-city in Hohenhagen, and was replaced by another form of utopia. It was no Rousseauian withdrawal into nature, based on the counter-model represented by Mount Veritá’s Siedlung, which had always fascinated artists and intellectuals—including Henry van de Velde himself—as well as masons and other supporters of alternative trends of thought close to Osthaus. He had grown disenchanted with his great civic project in Hohenhagen and undertook to defend a small community in his doctoral thesis of 1918, entitled Grundzüge der Stilentwicklung (Main features of style development). He sent a copy of his dissertation to architect and urban planner Bruno Hesse-Frielin, Herta: Karl Ernst Osthaus: Leben und Werk. Recklinghausen, Bongers Verlag, 1971, p. 376.


29. Visitors temporarily staying in ‘Monte Veritá’—including many artists—were gladly welcomed as guests to join in sunbathing and working the land. After the founders left at the end of World War I, the management of Mount Veritá was taken over in 1923 by artists Werner Ackermann, Max Bethke and Hugo Wilkens who ran it as a successful relaxing holiday resort. A modern hotel was built in 1926 when the land was bought by banker Eduard von der Heydt. After his death in 1964, the estate remained the property of Canton Ticino and has been used ever since for tourist and cultural events: conferences, exhibitions and a museum inaugurated in 1981.
Taut, who had been directly involved with the German movement of garden-cities but was at the time also evolving towards other chimeras as expressed in his 1918 book *Alpine Architektur*. They then exchanged correspondence and dreamt of putting into effect a common utopian project, no longer focused on dwellings but on the *Folkwang-Schule*.

Osthaus had always championed social education, especially in matters of taste, and he and some of his artist friends supported the revolution of November 1918, when Villa Hohenhof became the headquarters of the Hagen Workers and Soldiers Council. At the end of the war, seriously ill and abandoned by his wife, who had left him for a younger man, he wanted to condense all his previous projects into one. He converted part of his mansion into a school-workshop of arts and crafts for war orphans and for children of middle-class families, an undertaking even more ambitious than the Bauhaus led by his friend Walter Gropius on the outskirts of Weimar. He envisioned that the *Folkwang-Schule* of Villa Hohenhof should be complemented by surrounding workshops, farms, houses, an astronomy observatory, a chapel, a meeting room, plus the exhibition halls and a museum with a permanent exhibition open to the public. In 1920 Bruno Taut became intensely involved in this project and they both sought the assistance and collaboration of their acquaintances and of various public offices.

They unanimously referred to this project as *Stadtkrone*, since they planned to erect buildings for collective use at the top, as an urban crown around a central square, very like the circular plaza of the garden city drawn up by Ebenezer Howard. But in this case, in agreement with Taut’s theosophical inclinations, the highest building was to be the *Haus der festlichen Andacht*, a tower for festive worship/meditation to be followed in height by a museum with the most spectacular façade (Figures 11 & 12). The walls of both constructions were to have abundant openings partly decorated with stained glass windows in the case of the large worship building while the museum was to provide views over the countryside from a low angle to avoid the effects of lateral illumination. The intended contents of this museum are unclear: given the particular attention paid to the school of industrial arts, it would have been logical for Osthaus to locate his *Deutsche Museum für Kunst*...
FIGURE 11: DESIGN BY BRUNO TAUT TO TRANSFORM THE HOHENHOF COMPLEX INTO A STADTKRONE

FIGURE 12: DESIGN BY BRUNO TAUT FOR THE MUSEUM FAÇADE AND THE TOWER OF STADTKRONE
in *Handel und Gewerbe* there, which would then have finally found a home but the young students might have been interested, to complement their education, in the items from the collection of the Folkwang Museum which in his youth Osthaus had originally devised as a museum of natural history. It was even contemplated that, in due course, the entire collection of the Folkwang Museum could be transferred from the city centre in Hagen to this new museum building.

In 1921 Osthaus’s untimely death put an end to these schemes. The following year his paintings and sculptures were sold by his heirs to the city of Essen as well as the designated Folkwang Museum. His collection of industrial art was later purchased by the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Museum of Krefeld. All that remained of the ambitious *Stadtkrone* that Taut had planned next to Villa Hogenhof simply resulted in the central yard, pompously named the *Goldene Pforte* or golden gate. Right next to it, paper manufacturer Emil Hoesch commissioned Henry van de Velde to build a house, though it was finally completed, with some changes, by architect Theodor Merrill in 1925. A few metres to the south, Villa Kerckhoff was built in 1922, the masterpiece of the architects Heinrich and Leopold Ludwig. These two brothers built their own residence next to the Goldene Pforte in 1937/38. Hence, instead of completing the neighbourhood with buildings for collective use, the original project of private dwellings was resumed: a *Villenkolonie*. In the meantime, Osthaus’ mansion, Villa Hohenhof, was given over to different uses, from a sanatorium to education institutions, until it was restored in the 1980’s and became a branch of the Hagen Osthaus Museum open to the public at established times.

34. When Osthaus’s heirs sold his art collection, the building he had created as a museum in the centre of Hagen, where his archives and natural history collection remained, became a municipal facility. But the memory of the patron was so strong that in 1939 the local art museum was re-named Karl-Ernst-Osthaus-Museum, and after World War II Osthaus’s building was restored and remodelled as a museum of art with a museographic approach in the postmodern period: cf. Lahme-Schlenzer, Monika, ‘Karl Ernst Osthaus und die Folkwang-Idee’ in H. Junge (ed.), *Avantgarde und Publikum*. Cologne-Weimar-Vienna, Böhlau Verlag, 1992, p. 225–234. It has been known as *Osthaus Museum Hagen* since 2009, when it was reopened after restoration work and is part of the so-called Kunstquartier.
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Abstract

Analysis of the agents that took part in the invention, promotion and dissemination of photography in the nineteenth century—photographers, politicians, scientists, intellectuals and artists—allows us to reconstruct the space of the photographic. These agents, and their practices, spaces, institutions and relationships, constitute a mediatory system that actively participated in the construction of photography’s value as a cultural product of modernity. Most importantly, however, photography represents a privileged scientific research subject for understanding the capacity of artistic practices to adapt to the requirements of modern society. The constant tension and dialogue between its aesthetic, scientific, technical and commercial appreciation places photography in an unprecedented space between formal evaluation—linked to the institutions and norms of the world of high culture—and utilitarian logic—tied to the patterns of progress and democratic access to culture. It is, therefore, possible to suggest a theory of mediation for cultural products of modernity: intermediaries influence the construction of value while revealing the state of the cultural object and the needs of the society that consumes it.
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Resumen
El análisis de los agentes que participaron en la invención, promoción y difusión de la fotografía en el siglo XIX —fotógrafos, políticos, científicos, intelectuales y artistas— permite reconstruir el espacio de lo fotográfico. Estos agentes, sus prácticas, espacios, instituciones y relaciones constituyen un sistema mediador que participó de manera activa en la construcción del valor de la fotografía como producto cultural de la modernidad. No obstante, lo más relevante es que se presenta a la investigación científica como un objeto de estudio privilegiado para comprender la capacidad que tuvo la práctica artística para adaptarse a las necesidades de la sociedad moderna. La constante tensión y diálogo entre la apreciación estética, científica, técnica y comercial, sitúa a la fotografía en un espacio inédito entre la valoración formal —cercano a las instituciones y a las normas del mundo de la alta cultura— y la lógica utilitaria —cercana a los patrones de progreso y acceso democrático a la cultura. De esta manera, es posible plantear una teoría de la mediación para los productos culturales de la modernidad: los intermediaries influence the construction of value while revealing the state of the cultural object y las necesidades de la sociedad que lo consume.
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PHOTOGRAPHY IS A NINETEENTH-CENTURY invention that occupies a predominant position in western culture. The diverse social uses of images today make photography an exceptional field for analysing the logics of distinct spaces, or niches, of the production, mediation and consumption of culture. The aim of this study is to observe the beginnings of photography, the configuration of its space and its relationship to the field of art, based on an analysis of the agents, interrelations and logics that gave rise to its system of mediation.

We begin with the hypothesis that mediation is a structural, determinant and constitutive part of the development of the products of western modernity, among them photography. We will not force a separation between cultural objects and mediation to establish their relationship, but rather will attempt to analyse the photographic language embedded within two important nineteenth-century social spaces: modern society itself—which organises and permits the propulsion of the logics of aesthetics and, simultaneously, of the techno-rational sphere—and the relatively autonomous society of high culture: that is, of the world of art.

Using empirical data, we will put to the test the theory that painting is a part of high culture thanks to the autonomic processes of the aesthetic, while photography was born as a practical, technological tool, situating it in an intermediary space, novel and specific, between formal evaluation and technical-utilitarian capacity. Far from being exclusive to the world of photography, this reality is applicable to the various cultural products resulting from the technological development of the Industrial Revolution, such as cinema and design (graphical, industrial, of spaces and of clothing). Photography, however, approximates the formal and social logics of the art world to a considerable extent, and the specifics of this process will be analysed throughout the work.

In summary, we will observe the institutions and agents that intervene in the shaping and interrelation of both fields to understand the systemic reality of which they form a part. The analysis of this reality will help us better interpret artistic expression itself, as part of a system in which the formal and the aesthetic occupy a structural position in a global process.

1. THE SHAPING OF THE FIELD OF ART

In the nineteenth century, the field of art’s processes of autonomous organisation matured. The literature on the forging of the logics of this autonomy is extensive, and devoted primarily to studying the emergence of the history of art; of aesthetics as a discipline independent of philosophy; of art criticism; of the modern market and of related elements and entities. It is important, however, that we also consider the academic system as a part of the mechanisms that moulded the sphere of

---


4. We take the concept of field from Pierre Bourdieu: ‘playing spaces historically set up with their own specific institutions and operational norms’. BOURDIEU, Pierre: Cosas Dichas. Barcelona, Gedisa, 2000, p. 108.
high culture. This involves the analysis of processes, not from a linear-evolutionary perspective, but rather a complex, inclusive and historical one: the possibility of art as a community relatively independent of the heteronomous demands of the social world exists thanks to the aforementioned agents and their relationships, but also to an earlier academic system that gave rise to the unification of the European theory of art, debated matters specific to the artistic (line/colour, ancient/modern...), generated its own publications and exhibitions and, for the first time, trained the artist as a professional.

It is equally important to consider the type of society that permitted this autonomy of art, so thoroughly referenced and analysed. In the central European countries, the processes of modernisation surrounding the rationalisation of political, economic, scientific, commercial, technological and urbanisation systems—greatly increased following the two great revolutions at the end of the eighteenth century—led to a then unprecedented acceleration in the conditions of modern life. In this context, a paradox arose: aesthetic sensibility and plastic experimentation, often seen in the antitheses of progress and development, emerged as the other face of modernity. This apparent contradiction between demonstrated reason and romantic sensitivity was fundamental to the creation of the new modern subject that was photography: pragmatic yet sensitive, scientific yet artistic, but always at the centre of political, public and urban life and the debates of the burgeoning contemporary era.

There are numerous examples of the gradual, relatively autonomous organisation of the space that produced and mediated the plastic, which can be grouped into three basic typologies: the start of specialised discourses and specific disciplinary fields, the diversification of exhibitory spaces and the start of a modern market that supported the innovative. In the first case, we find the countless discourses on art that began to emerge in the sphere of erudite and intellectual production. The incipient organisation of a history of art (undertaken out by scholars such as Winckelmann or philosophers like Hegel) and the definition of the specificity of the plastic (outlined in terms of beauty by Lessing, in those of formal attraction and aesthetic perception by Kant) are some of the best-known examples of this process. Art criticism and the gradual inclusion of the teaching of art in European academic circles were the other two foundations in the creation and specialisation of the discourse surrounding the artistic.

In addition to these discourses, and closely related to them, is the diversification of exhibitory spaces (national museums, salons, and artists’ independent exhibitions) and the emergence of the art market in the modern sense (merchants’ and collectors’ support for innovative, original, subjective and experimental works of art) completed the maturation of the system of high culture in the field of plastic
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5. One of the spaces in which this dual phenomenon can be most clearly observed is in the World’s Fairs, events exhibiting the technological and artistic advances of the industrial bourgeoisie. See Peist, Nuria: ‘Las exposiciones universales y la definición del objeto artístico español’, in Nuevas contribuciones en torno al mundo del coleccionismo de arte hispánico en los siglos XIX y XX. Gijón, Trea, 2013, pp. 329–354.
experiments. Against this background, photography emerged. Tied to the values of the scientific, technical and utilitarian, being one of the great inventions of its era, its constant contacts with the mediatory world of high culture reveal its exceptional nature.

2. THE DAWN OF THE PHOTOGRAPHIC

At the end of the eighteenth century, the technical knowledge necessary for the development of photography was already available. Nevertheless, it was not until the 1820s that the first impressions of visible reality were created using the processes of physical chemistry. The image *La cour du domaine du Gras*, taken by Nicéphore Niépce in 1826, is the oldest photograph still in existence.

Along with the birth of photography itself, and the various scientific theories surrounding light, colour and optics in general, a number of visual gadgets were developed, such as the thaumatrope (1824) and the zoetrope (1834), where advances in optical knowledge were married to entertainment. Modern cities offered an ever-increasing selection of spaces and objects of amusement, thanks to the development of the public space and the increasing leisure time in the lives of individuals from every social stratum. Thus, alongside the theatre, visual spectacles (the Panorama or the magic lantern) and musical performances in their many guises (cabaret, café chantant and café-concert), the Diorama emerged as a visual spectacular on a grand scale, driven by a man considered to be one of the inventors of photography, Louis Jacques Mandé Daguerre.

Trained in an architect’s studio as a draughtsman and painter, Daguerre specialised in scenographic painting, making prolific use of the *camera obscura* system for the representation of reality. In the summer of 1822, in association with the painter Charles Bouton, he built the aforementioned Diorama, based on a complex mechanical and optical system that displayed paintings of great dimensions (22 m × 14 m), creating a play of transparencies that gave rise to dynamic effects in atmosphere and lighting. We can see how technical advances, aesthetic value and an interest in optical effects, three factors indicative of the cultural modernity of the time, were united in a single object. As a result of these interests, Daguerre concentrated on methods of recording images other than the technique of the
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7. In Europe, the physical properties of light were now understood and the first photosensitive substances had been discovered. BRUNET, François: *La naissance de l’idée photographie*. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 2000, pp. 36–37.
9. Located in the Place de la République in Paris, the Diorama consisted of a small theatre exhibiting paintings of romantic themes such as mountainous landscapes, Italian scenes or Gothic ruins, given a magical appearance thanks to effects of trompe l’œil. The spectacle lasted fifteen minutes. BAJAC, Quentin: *L’image révélée. L’invention de la photographie*. Paris, Gallimard, 2001, p. 14.
camera obscura. His meeting with Nicéphore Niépce, a landowner and amateur scientist who had been working since 1816 on chemical experiments into the capture of images, would be decisive. In 1829 they signed a contract to improve and commercialise the technique of photography.

Niépce died in 1833, and Daguerre began to seek allies to promote and disseminate his invention, the daguerreotype. In 1838, he contacted the liberal delegate François Arago, who took charge of promoting the photographic procedure. The importance of Arago’s work reveals the various spaces in which photography began its process of legitimisation. Each of the spaces allows us to observe the point at which photography was activated and, from there, to understand the values it acquired, little by little, as a technological and sometimes aesthetic product of modernity. Photography, then, did not irrupt all at once into the world of art — which, as we saw in the previous section, already had its spaces of autonomy (academia, theoretical debates, history, and, of course, the antiquity of the pictorial and sculptural mechanism) — but rather, in its early days, the agents in charge of its diffusion also had to seek its legitimisation in scientific, political and legislative terms. In this way, they hoped to reinforce its practical value in the service of the variously specialised necessities of the social world.

This is an opportune moment to recall the methodology we are employing in this work, which leads us to our primary hypothesis. Rather than asking ourselves from an essentialist perspective whether photography is in itself a scientific, utilitarian or artistic invention, we choose to observe the mediatory system through which it becomes activated and acquires value and meaning. This system is still not entirely specific to photography, but will gradually and continually adapt, without the force of the autonomous space of art but with interesting idiosyncrasies that we will examine throughout this work. We do not believe that spaces and mediatory agents influence the resulting objects, but that they are themselves the result of certain necessities shaped by the logic of historical processes: in this case, the need for scientific, political and legal acknowledgement of a language that we still cannot call artistic. From this perspective, mediation reveals, more than it influences, the necessities and specifics of the language of photography.

One of the first values associated with photography was the scientific. This can be seen in Arago’s decision to present the invention at the meeting, held on January 7th, 1839, of Paris’ Académie des Sciences. Scientist, internationally renowned educator, liberal politician in the circle of the July Monarchy, delegate of the Chambre des Députés and secretary of the Académie des Sciences, Arago promoted the invention by employing Saint-Simonianist ideas of scientific-technological development and industrialisation, instigated by the state and serving the needs of all social classes. His own position, and the ideas promulgated by the chamber (belief in the political


support, legislative protection and democratic diffusion of inventions) explain the fervour with which he endorsed and spread the invention. But despite the political importance of certain individuals in photography’s diffusion, it is more interesting still to observe how photography’s own characteristics allowed its utilisation as an ideological and functional tool for the new ideas of the liberal bourgeoisie of Europe’s industrialised societies. In other words, the politico-social necessities existed — and the daguerreotype, with the precision of its formal mimesis of reality, satisfied them in a way that previous techniques, such as the photogenic drawings of the Englishman, William Henry Fox Talbot, or the direct positive printing of Frenchman Hippolyte Bayard, had not.

On June 17th, 1839, Daguerre — now renowned thanks to the Diorama’s commercial success — was decorated with the Legion of Honour, an act instigated by Arago. The following day, the chamber formed a commission, headed by the delegate himself, to evaluate the advisability of acquiring the secret of the photographic procedure. On July 3rd, Arago read the final report on the daguerreotype in the Chambre des Députés. A few days later, photographic images were exhibited in the chamber, with the final vote held on July 9th, resulting in 237 votes in favour and just three against. On August 2nd, this time in the Chambre des Pair, it was agreed that the secret would be purchased for an annual payment of 6,000 francs to Daguerre and 4,000 to the Niépce family. On August 18th, the presentation was repeated before the Académie des Sciences and the Académie des Beaux-Arts, assembled in a single space.

In his presentation speech to the Chambre des Députés, Rapport sur le Daguerreotype (…) — and considering that, in the sphere of liberal political ideas, the weight and value ascribed to scientific development were immense — Arago highlighted photography’s relevance to science, as a means of precisely recording reality in fields as diverse as astronomy, photometry, topography, meteorology and archaeology. Nor, citing the arguments of Paul Delaroche, a painter of the Académie des Beaux-Arts, did he neglect photography’s importance for the practice of art:

Le peintre trouvera dans ce procédé un moyen prompt de faire des collections d’études qu’il ne pourrait obtenir autrement qu’avec beaucoup de temps de peine et d’une manière bien moins parfaite, quel que fût d’ailleurs son talent.

He thus completed Daguerre’s own poorly argued defence, in his leaflet of 1838 promoting the invention’s scientific use and, therefore, its social utility. The words

15. Idem, p. 33.
16. It was expressed as follows by the inventor himself, some months before Arago’s official presentations: ‘Cette importante découverte, susceptible de toutes les applications, sera non seulement d’un grand intérêt pour la
of Daguerre and Arago reveal the importance that mediatory agents’ discourses can acquire alongside those of the artists and inventors themselves, as well as the fact that the object defines its own value and use in connection with the logics that activate it.

Along with photography’s inclusion in the official spheres of French science and politics, the legal domain witnessed the creation of various laws designed to formally protect the invention. The Daguerre law of 1839, the first piece of legislation concerning the photographic process, was framed within the ideas of photography’s beginnings, namely dissemination of the invention by the state and the daguerreotype’s suitability for requirements that were, originally, scientific and artistic. This law, however, which dictated the purchase of the invention by the French government, also sought to democratise its use in the service of modern society.

Having described the mediatory fields in which photography was initially activated and evaluated, we should outline the factors that explain the specifics of the photographic system, the images it produces and its social functions, through the logic of said fields. In this sense, Arago’s enlightened, Saint-Simonianist ideas, which enabled the invention’s diffusion by highlighting its public utility, allow us to analyse the basic characteristics that would always form part of photography’s definition: in the social sphere, democratisation, technological development and utility in the quotidian, scientific and artistic —Arago’s ideas— and in the formal world, speed, precision and ease of use —Daguerre’s ideas. What, then, does this mean? That the mediatory discourse imprinted definite, immutable characteristics? Or, rather, that said discourse reveals the form in which the object is used and valued based on specific requirements external to the object itself? We are inclined towards the second option.

Nevertheless, all these characteristics of photographic practice can also be found in the judicial, political, technological and scientific spheres, but with significant differences in their interactions with the spaces of high culture, on one hand, and commercialisation on the other. In the latter case, it is interesting to observe how photography rapidly became a lucrative practice thanks to the proliferation of studios dedicated to the photographic portrait. In contrast, when it sought its cultural dignification, it acquired a very different character, tending towards the idealistic, the minority, the aesthetic: in a word, the artistic.

3. THE FIRST SPECIFIC PHOTOGRAPHIC SOCIETIES

The world of photography gradually took shape as a specific space that in this article we call ‘the photographic’, not in the sense of theoretical analysis proposed by Rosalind Krauss, but rather as described by André Gunthert, that is, considering...
the specific properties of the space and the agents that moulded it. Initially, as we have seen by observing the manner in which its first mediation came about, the photographic was closely linked to technological and utilitarian considerations. This link, however, would not remain an exclusive one, as photography soon became tied to the world of the aesthetic. The novel space that photography occupied from its very beginnings can be seen in the spheres in which it circulated: not only the physical process and the resulting images, but also the development of the discourse that supported its value.

Despite the photographic language’s contacts with agents and institutions of the scientific and political worlds, and unlike other technical inventions of the era, photography would generate its own specific spaces that, although they did not define an autonomous field, are indicative of its singular nature. We can deduce that its proximity to the art world led to a certain degree of distancing from the imperatives of scientific and political institutions, and from the necessities of the ordinary world, through a spirit of ‘contagion’ of aestheticism or formal evaluation of representation. With art becoming ever more legitimised as a logic of high culture, it was only natural that photography would approach its space of production and mediation. This approach did not generate photography’s ‘aesthetic’ idiosyncrasies relative to other inventions, but was the reflection of the cultural potential that photography possessed and could bring to the world of high culture.

The first association specific to the world of photography, the Société Héliographique, was formed in Paris in 1851, a decade after Arago’s presentation in the Chambre des Députés. Its members were, primarily, members of high society, from diverse backgrounds —scientists, writers, painters, intellectuals, aristocrats and the high bourgeoisie— with one characteristic in common: the amateur practice of this new language. After the passing of the Daguerre law in 1839, the process spread rapidly and the first professionals appeared dedicated, first and foremost, to the bourgeois portrait. Such studios began to proliferate in the early 1850s, and a certain reticence arose around the commercial aspect photography was acquiring. This reticence, as might be expected, was particularly pronounced in the world of high culture, whose publications accused photography of aspiring to occupy a place in the dominant culture of representation of the world, then ruled by painting.

The photographic, however, desiring a greater legitimacy than that...
bestowed by commercialisation and political and scientific institutionalisation, would seek the definition of a unique space to preserve it from the danger of the mundane and the material.

In this context, the creation of the Société reveals this need for a dedicated space. The social profile of its first agents is vital to our understanding of the limits that evolved around photography’s specificity, limits that provide us with the very definition of the object and its values. In its first years, the Société was made up of illustrious artists and intellectuals such as Eugène Delacroix, Théophile Gautier, Alexandre Dumas, Prosper Mérimée and Victor Hugo, and the first true photography professionals, who retrained in the profession that began to be known as photographer-artist, such as Gustave Le Gray. This latter led a small group of followers of Paul Delaroche, painters who created a class of photographic images that, while they could not yet be defined as pictorialist, are an excellent example of how, from its inception, photography began to dignify itself in association with the plastic.

Furthermore, it is highly significant that these amateurs utilised and promoted photography on paper, less precise and closer to the techniques of drawing and painting, rather than techniques on metal such as the daguerreotype, sharper and more exact but with an element of coldness more suited to the scientific and the technical, and which, through not being amenable to copying, limited photographic reproduction itself.

The high degree of autonomy and legitimisation possessed by the field of literature also influenced the dignification of photographic practice. The historian André Gunthert has demonstrated the Société’s goal of ‘transforming the marginalised into the avant-garde’, following structures characteristic of the literary world. The importance of the literary sphere in the gestation of modernity’s cultural logics was studied by various authors such as Pierre Bourdieu and Nathalie Heinich, who analysed how the literary field organised itself, in an autonomous manner, before the artistic. This allowed it to contribute a discourse in photography’s defence, above all through romantic and realist novels and the criticism of art. In the case of photography, this spirit of contagion of legitimacy, related not only to the artistic-plastic but also to the literary, can be observed in the number of writers present in this first society. In addition, the Société had its own organ of diffusion, La Lumière, the first European journal dedicated entirely to photography. When the Société Héliographique dissolved in 1853, two years after its formation,


22. We can see similar processes in cities like Barcelona, whose emerging photographic space emulated the dynamic of the great European cities and, in particular, of Paris. See F. Rius, Núria: Pau Audouard. Fotografia en temps de Modernisme, Barcelona, Edicions ub et al., 2013.


the journal continued to be published, thanks in part to its importance as a space for the development of a discourse specific to the photographic.

From the outset, *La Lumière* united the logics of art and science in the novel field of photography26. The critics Ernest Lacan and Francis Wey were the most active agents in the creation of this language. Of a collection of photographs by Édouard Baldus, Lacan said:

Il y a dans cette épreuve un effet de lumière que nous n’avions pas encore vu rendre en photographie. Le soleil étant presque de face, les maisons se dessinent sur le ciel en silhouettes plus ou moins sombres, selon leur plan. Il en résulte un effet de perspective aérienne des plus frappants.27

While photography had already played a part in exhibitory spaces such as the World’s Fairs of 1851 (in London) and 1855 (in Paris), its critical discourse had always been in scientific-technical terms or else in very general terms evaluating it as a new medium28. *La Lumière*, on the other hand, introduced aesthetic analyses, concentrating—as we have seen — on the formal evaluation of each of the works and their authors.

The life of the *Société Héliographique* was brief indeed. After just one year of existence, disagreements emerged, a number of its members leaving the group and, in some cases, starting new journals such as *Cosmos*, created by Benito Montfort29. Another matter pertinent to our understanding of the *Société*’s decline was the creation, in England, of the procedure of damp collodion on copper plate, a technique that united the formal perfection of the daguerreotype and the multiplicity of the calotype, which enjoyed great success at the World’s Fair of 185130. The capital of the photographic world thus moved temporarily to England, where the Photographic Society was formed with the objective of protecting and disseminating the various processes being nurtured there. Its organisation emulated the model of the Geographical Society. The beginnings of the Photographic Society influenced the creation of the *Société Française de Photographie* (SFP) in 1854, a new society, specifically French, founded upon an equally scientific-technical basis. Thus, although many


27. LACAN, Ernest: ‘Les innondations de 1856. Épreuves de M. Baldus’, *La Lumière*, August 9th, 1856. In a homologous manner, we should bear in mind a similar discursive practice in England: namely the reflections of the painter Sir William J. Newton, in the article ‘Upon Photography in an Artistic View and its Relation to the Arts’ (1853), and those of Elisabeth Eastlake in ‘Photography’ (1857). Both discussions are related to the British institutionalisation of photography, bearing in mind that the first text was written due to the founding of the Photographic Society of London, while the author of the second was the wife of Charles Eastlake, director of the National Gallery of Art and first president of the Royal Photographic Society. BRUNET, François: op. cit., p. 152. See also GARCÍA FELGUERA, María de los Santos: ‘Arte y fotografía (I). El siglo XIX’, in SOUZEZ, Marie-Loupe (coord.): *Historia general de la fotografía*. Madrid, Cátedra, 2007.


29. GUNTHER, André: ‘L’institution du photographique…’, op. cit.

members of the Société Héliographique joined the SFP, the latter’s spirit was quite distinct: the model was that of a contemporary society, scholarly but not elitist. The initial project was designed as a ‘Société photographique européenne’, which would champion an impartial promotion of the photographic art and acquire works from the studios of active artists, with a faction within the SFP advocating a benevolent association aimed at lending support to amateur work. A former functionary of the Ministry of the Interior and founding member of the Société Héliographique, Eugène Durieu, an expert in administrative and judicial organisations, was responsible for the creation of the new association, with members numbering in the hundreds and far from the elitist, avant-garde nature of the first Société.

The strength and authority of the newly formed SFP — thanks to the importance of its members and its effective operational structure — provoked feelings of indignation and opposition in certain sectors, above all in the former Société. This was publicly attested to in the pages of La Lumière, with accusations levelled against the arrogance with which the new space had commenced its activity and against the incipient authority that it represented. Ernest Lacan strove to protect the journal’s five years of existence against an entity that had scarcely seen the light of day. In response, the SFP sought its own identity by tending towards the scientific, a characteristic that distinguished it from the Société Héliographique and, even, from England’s Photographic Society, which continued to select its honorary presidents from key figures of the art world. It is highly significant that the first honorary president of the SFP was Victor Regnault, one of France’s most brilliant scholars, a specialist in the fields of optics and physics and a professor at the Collège de France. Another individual, Aimé Girard, a young chemist, was employed as editorial secretary of the Boletín, a publication of the society that rapidly brought it international prestige.

We can see, then, how photography’s first associations oscillated between the artistic and the scientific, seeking an identity and giving rise to the definition of a very specific space for a product that combined —under constant pressure— these two aspects of modern industrial Europe.

4. RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE ART WORLD

Despite tending more towards the ideals of the scientific and the technical, the SFP endeavoured, with eventual success, to take part in the Salon of the Académie des Beaux-Arts in 1859. This intention reveals how, far from evolving into an autonomous space of operation, or defining itself as either science or art, photography would always be connected to one logic or another, ‘borrowing’ its legitimacy from external fields. We can thereby verify our hypothesis, that observing the spaces and

agents through which photography moved reveals its true value and its place in the hierarchy of the era’s cultural products. In other words, we cannot deduce whether a given photograph is science, art or simply photography itself without observing the system in which it participates.

Some of the discussions in the SFP’s meetings, published in its bulletins, focused on this exact matter: as a science, and through the technological values of the photographic process, photography benefited *ipso jure* from the distinction lent by scientific advance, but lost legitimacy in terms of the value of the era’s dominant culture, represented by art. On the other hand—as the society’s members discussed—, when the invention entered into the realms of the artistic, its legitimacy was diminished, as it was compared to the lesser arts such as lithography and engraving.

The manner in which the agents of the photographic world related to that of art is clearly evident in their determination to take part in the Salons of the Académie des Beaux-Arts. In 1850, Gustave Le Gray presented the Salon with a number of prototypes on paper, but these were not accepted. In his texts, such as the famous *Photographie. Traité nouveau* of 1852, the photographer argued that the academy’s administration must take a hand in the progress of photography by admitting it into its expository spaces.

In 1855, photography was exhibited in the ‘Products of Industry’ section of the World’s Fair in Paris, kindling a degree of discontent among some of the members of the SFP. As has been analysed by Paul Louis Roubert, the heart of the institution was dominated by the idea that photography must be exhibited as art, to broadcast its importance and thus bolster its status. The discussions in its bulletins also show a desire to educate the public through the exhibition of works of high quality. This was an attempt to separate genuine photographers from the ‘faux frères’—false brothers, or commercial photographers— whose work, on display in the great boulevards, corrupted the tastes of the public.

From 1855, the institution began a programme of exhibitions (1855, 1856–57, 1859), which achieved great success and marked the beginning of an ongoing application of pressure to obtain an *ipso jure* space in the Salon. The photographer Nadar played a key role in this process. In 1856, he contacted the SFP to highlight the absence of photography in the 1857 Salon des Beaux-Arts:

Messieurs, La Photographie est, jusqu’ici, oubliée dans le programme de l’Exposition des beaux-arts en 1857. Cet oubli me paraît préjudiciable en même temps à l’art et aux intérêts que vous représentez. Vous l’avez sans doute déjà pensé comme moi et j’arrive vraisemblablement un peu tard pour appeler votre attention sur l’influence que ne

---


Nadar’s paradigmatic figure represented the commercial pole, which, although
distanced from the main institutional logic, nevertheless used it as a platform in
its efforts to dignify its profession. Nadar, then, did not hesitate in establishing al-
liances with the SFP, despite having no sympathy with the ties between one of its
factions and the circle of Napoleon III. In this case, we see how the logics of high
culture were applied to the objectives of low culture, in an attempt to dignify the
widespread practice of the commercial portrait. The poles remain well-defined:
science —represented by the association’s scientific faction—, art — present in the
desire to take part in the Salons— and commerce —represented by Nadar, undoub-
edly the most important of the photo-portraitists of his day. The photographic will
fluctuate constantly between these three areas, with operational logics and specific
values that do not impede the necessary and constant alliances the fields establish
with one another.

In 1857, an investigative committee was formed to evaluate the advisability of
including photography in the Salons. Its members were Léon de Laborde, Eugène
Delacroix, Philippe Rousseau, Paul Périer, Olympe Aguado, Cousin and Théophile
Gautier. The matter was not so clear-cut to the members of the SFP, but it eventually
began a process of dialogue with Émilien de Nieuwerkerke, the Director General of
the Académie des Beaux-Arts, who denied the request36. Paul Louis Roubert warns
that the absence of documentation prevents us from reconstructing the route by
which photography was finally accepted into the Salon of 1859. Nevertheless, he
speculates that once the administrative route had been exhausted, the heads of the
association decided, successfully, to apply pressure through political channels and
personal connections. It is probable that Le Gray’s position, as one of the official
photographers to Napoleon III, was influential —along with other alliances— in
the final resolution.

The physical location of the first photographic exhibition to be included in a
Salon is symbolic of photography’s position in the period’s hierarchy of cultural val-
ues. It was not included with those classified as ‘industrial arts’, such as lithography
and engraving, but neither was it presented alongside ‘great art’. The solution was
a compromise: its status would not be diminished by association with the ‘lesser’
arts, but it would be presented in a space apart, that is, separate from the objects of
the more legitimised culture37. The critical reaction to this inclusion, from certain

35. ‘Assemblée générale de la Société française de photographie, 21 novembre 1856’, Bulletin de la Société fran-
36. Idem.
37. The photography exhibition took place in the Palace of Industry, alongside the space occupied by the Salon.
sectors, was unsurprising. The immortal phrase of Charles Baudelaire in the article ‘Le public moderne et la photographie’ is certainly the best known of these reactions: that the photo would be art’s most humble servant.

The necessity for the contagion of legitimacy from one space to another can also be observed in the legal context, above all in the Fine Art Copyright Act of 1862. The trial between Nadar and his brother Adrien Tournachon throughout 1856 and 1857 was a significant landmark. After two years of working together, the pair had dissolved their photographic firm to embark upon separate paths. Nadar demanded the exclusive use of the artistic name ‘Nadar’, whose origins dated back to his time as a caricaturist. His celebrated ‘manifesto’, *That which cannot be learned in photography*, won him victory at court, thanks to its argument that commercial photography could not be practiced by the layman—in other words, his brother—as it demanded an aesthetic sensitivity similar to that of the great artists:

Ce qui ne s’apprend pas, je vais vous le dire: c’est le sentiment de la lumière, c’est l’application artistique des effets produits par les jours divers et combinés, c’est l’application de tels ou tels de ces effets selon la nature des physionomies qu’artiste vous avez à reproduire.

As stated above, Nadar’s example was a precedent in the most important legal battle in early photography: the judicial process initiated by the photographers Mayer and Pierson to include photography in the law of ‘Propriété exclusive des œuvres littéraires et artistiques’, established in 1793 and undergoing extensive revision in 1862. In the 1860s, the business of the photographic portrait was undergoing massive commercial growth, thanks largely to the introduction of the inexpensive format of the *carte de visite*. The illegal copying of photographs by other portraitists, a widespread practice in this setting, made a legal framework necessary to protect authors’ copyright over their images. To achieve this inclusion, however, it was necessary to demonstrate that photography could, in fact, be an artistic practice. Imagination, artistic genius and the capacity to generate perfect works in formal terms were the arguments employed to defend the creative status of the photographic operator. In the words of the lawyer M. Marie:

Sans doute, le photographe ne crée pas, n’invente pas comme le peintre, et au même degré. Mais lorsqu’il voudra prendre une vue, un paysage, agira-t-il sans discernement comme le fait un manœuvre? Non, il fera ce que fait le peintre, si c’est un homme de génie, si c’est un homme de sentiment, si c’est un homme de goût; il combinera heureusement l’ombre et la lumière; comme le peintre, il fera son tableau dans sa pensée, et quand il l’aura composé dans son imagination, il prendra son appareil pour lui faire rendre ce que son intelligence a conçu et ce qu’il veut faire passer dans son œuvre. Voilà l’artiste photographe, voilà son œuvre. […]

However, as noted by Paul Louis Roubert, there existed no form of spatial connection between the two exhibitions, nor did photography appear as part of the event’s official programme. *Roubert, Paul Louis: ‘1859…’ op. cit. 38. Marie, M: Code des photographes, 1862. Text compiled in Rouillé, André: op. cit.*
The definitive inclusion of photography in said law provoked a violent reaction from certain groups of artists, the majority from *L’Institut de France*, headed by Ingres, who lodged a legal protest. Their argument claimed that despite the manual operations and the knowledge required to carry them out, photography was by no means the fruit of intelligence, nor the study of art, to which end ‘les artistes soussignés protestent contre toute assimilation qui pourrait être faite de la photographie à l’art’. The list of signatories did not include names like Eugène Delacroix, without a doubt one of the painters most involved in the processes of defence and diffusion described throughout this article. The protest was eventually dismissed.

Far from the belief that the world of painting rebelled against a practice that robbed it of its mimetic function, its tensions with photography reveal the true situation: high culture generated obstructions to the emergence of languages tied too closely to the quotidian, utilitarian and scientific. After all, it had been defined in exact opposition to these values and was still firmly within its developmental stage. But the organisation of the world of photography reveals a state typical of modernity: the definition of the dominant culture was accompanied by the birth of distinct, intermediary cultural spaces organised in a hierarchical nature, and along with these spaces, the dialogues and exchanges between them. The question of just which language is art can be answered by analysing the limits of the field and the practices and agents that enter and depart from its borders.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Throughout this paper, we have attempted to unravel how photography became such a ‘prodigy’ among the nineteenth century’s wealth of inventions. To this end, we have carefully observed the space of mediation, hypothesising that this would provide us with certain keys that a historical-contextual, technical or stylistic analysis would not offer with such clarity. With this aim, we have analysed the moment at which the modern world of art was born, commonly referred to as the autonomy of art or, in the words of Pierre Bourdieu, the establishment of the artistic field. We went on to analyse the beginnings of photography on one hand, and the shaping of its space on the other, to determine whether this represented an effectively autonomous sphere, such as that of art, or if it was obliged to borrow values alien to its technological and aesthetic logics in order to become legitimised as the prodigy it was. Once the specifics of both spaces had been examined, we compared them, not only to observe their idiosyncrasies, but also to evaluate the important relationship that existed between the two spheres, which helped us to understand photography’s position among the many products of modern culture in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Observing and comparing the birth of these spaces allowed us to focus on the mediatory system. As we have stipulated throughout this work, this system not only informs us about the many agents that, in one way or another, influenced the development of the cultural product, but also represents, to the scientific observer, a privileged space to measure the state of the field, its logics, its agents and its associated values. In this sense, photography is analysed as a product of complex social logics, not in terms of the nature of the photographic process itself nor the contextual characteristics of modernity. To this end, we reconstructed the state of relationships between the field’s agents: producers and consumers of culture, but above all protagonists in the space of mediation, such as inventors, photographer-artists, commercial photographers, politicians, lawyers, journals, critics, Salons, associations and scientists.

The photographic required the logics of the scientific, for its value as an advance of human knowledge; of the technical, for its utilitarian value; and of the political, for its service to society; moreover, photography forged an alliance with the values of the art world, differentiating it from other inventions of the era. Once again, we saw how the agents who participated in photography’s maturity, diffusion and organisation can reveal and explain its mysteries. In the case of art, the relationship is fundamental as, paradoxically, photography’s dependence on artistic values is also what illustrates its specificity. This contagion of legitimising power, which we have exemplified here with the insistence of the photographic world’s agents on participating in the Salons of the Académie des Beaux-Arts, are examples of the dominance-based relations typical of the hierarchy of western culture.

The encounter between the photographic and the dominant space of the artistic —the latter revolving first around the academic system, and later around the logic of the field of art in the late nineteenth century— occurred as a result of the dialogue between the global value represented by high artistic culture and the local value characteristic of spaces of lesser renown, and with shorter historical careers in the field of culture, than literature, painting or sculpture. The prevailing logics in the field of the dominant culture were imposed upon society as a whole thanks to the elevated levels of legitimising power that its institutions and agents possessed. The space of the photographic, shaped by photographers, artists, journalists, associations and intellectuals in general, was nourished by these dominant logics. Nevertheless, the most interesting process to observe is how, despite this rich contagion and intense interrelation, the world of photography also developed specific, local logics, with less power and sometimes seated partially outside the realm of high culture — as exemplified by commercial photography. In time, these local values permitted the development of a space that is, effectively, specific to the photographic.

While in the twentieth century the main museum to embrace photography’s diffusion was the MoMA in New York, the first museum of modern art⁴⁰, the

---

⁴⁰. In the introduction to this paper, we remarked that the processes of the constitution of design and cinema are similar to those of photography. It is significant, then, that from a very early stage the MoMA has set aside a
photographic would come to develop its own spaces of diffusion and consumption, such as its own festivals, galleries, journals, critics and more: spaces never entirely independent of the world of high art, but in which the dialogue between the prevailing, dominant culture and less established languages became evident. The documentary photography that triumphed in the twentieth century is unsurpassed in its illumination of the definitive relationship between the diverse fields, evaluations and mediatory logics we have analysed from the beginnings of the photographic: the artistic, the informative, the utilitarian, the political, the social and even, on occasion, the commercial, found a formal symbolic solution that they positioned beside, and apart from, high art.
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Abstract
Since its inception as a public institution in the eighteenth century, the museum has favoured multiple interpretations of the work of art, changes implying both a shift in the semantics of the artistic object and a revision of the very concept of art. These metamorphoses take place not only within the walls of the traditional museum, but also in the many varieties of museums without walls. Concepts such as the imaginary museum, a virtual and endless repertoire of works of art, open countless perspectives on the perception of the museum space as a receptacle of western memory. This paper focuses on the role of the museum as a stage for metamorphosis, through the musings of artists, writers and intellectuals who have found themselves drawn to this subject since the dawn of the museum.
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Resumen
Desde sus inicios como institución pública en el siglo XVIII, el museo ha propiciado diversas interpretaciones de la obra de arte, que entrañan tanto un cambio en la semántica del objeto artístico como una revisión del concepto mismo de arte. Estas metamorfosis se producen no solo en el ámbito físico del museo tradicional sino también en las múltiples variedades del museo sin muros. Planteamientos como el del museo imaginario, repertorio virtual e inacabable de obras de arte, abren...
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innumerables perspectivas en lo que se refiere a la institución museística como receptáculo de la memoria occidental. El presente artículo plantea un recorrido por el papel del museo como escenario de metamorfosis a través de las reflexiones de artistas, literatos e intelectuales que se han sentido atraídos por esta sugerente cuestión desde los albores de la institución museística.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The art museum effects a series of transformations on the works it houses. These changes become a class of metamorphosis —deriving as they do from the museum’s own nature as a store of heterogeneous artistic objects, removed from the place for which they were created and juxtaposed one with the other— affecting art’s perception, and even its very definition, from the birth of the museum as a public institution in the eighteenth century. The museum, a physical space resulting from the gathering of diverse pieces, carries out a ‘resemanticisation’ of the pieces’ intrinsic values, making them works of art through the mere fact of their exhibition in the museum, which itself becomes a kind of sacred temple of contemporary western civilisation.

Reflections on the museum’s role as creator of metamorphosis, in the work of art itself and its relationship with the public, have been a constant throughout modernity, as demonstrated by the contributions of the many authors (writers, artists and theorists) who, from the outset, have questioned the function and idiosyncrasies of the museum. The viewpoints are diverse: while some praise the museum’s contribution to western culture, others launch furious attacks against the institution and its role as a cemetery for works of art, the most radical proposals going as far as to suggest its destruction. Despite this variety of perspectives, however, it is possible to identify certain shared sentiments that, ultimately, highlight similar concerns about the definition of the museum as institution and its most obvious problems.

Along with these considerations, linked to the traditional museum, have emerged new ways of understanding the museum beyond its physical limits: the imaginary, imagined or virtual museum, a museum without walls that belongs to the realms of memory. The concept of the imaginary museum, first described by André Malraux, paves the way for a multiplicity of visions of the museum as an abstract entity, having nothing to do with the conservation of physical testaments to human art, but rather with the shaping of an open visual repertoire, one continually enriched and different for every individual, precisely what makes it so very interesting. This individual museum is inherently conditioned by the historical moment and the technological possibilities this affords, as well as by the specifics of western culture.

Physical, imaginary, imagined and virtual museums: in the following text we will attempt to analyse the art museum’s role as a stage for metamorphosis, in terms of the nature of the work of art, the evolution of its interpretation and the establishment of the institution as a repository of western memory.

2. DECONTEXTUALISATION OF MUSEUM ARTWORKS AS A CAUSE OF METAMORPHOSIS

The museum causes an obvious initial metamorphosis: the transformation of the artwork’s symbolism to give rise to a new semantics. Uprooted from the physical frameworks for which they were designed, the works assembled in the museum are deprived of part of their original values. This decontextualisation entails a loss
of purpose: a crucifix no longer serves to facilitate contact with divinity during prayer; a still life no longer decorates a palace wall. Both are venerated as works of art (testaments to a bygone age) for the simple enjoyment they produce, be it visual or intellectual.

This mutation is especially clear in the case of devotional objects. Relocated to the museum, these are deconsecrated and transformed into works of art; we might even say that they acquire a newly holy nature, insofar as they become ‘adored’ objects—not as divine images, but as works of art—in the near-sacred space of the museum. In a church, a crucifix is, first and foremost, an image of devotion; we can admire its formal characteristics (the quality of the carving, its expression and so forth) but it is, primarily, a representation of divinity: it is Christ crucified. In the museum, in contrast, the idea of sculpture prevails over devotional and religious values, as what we see are ‘images of things, different to the things themselves, and which take from this specific difference their reason for being’.

This conversion is inevitable; without it, the museum as we understand it today would make no sense, as highlighted by André Malraux:

> If statues could reacquire their original soul, the museums would create the most extensive oration the Earth has known; if we were to share the feelings of the first spectators of an Egyptian effigy, of a Roman crucifix, we would be unable to leave them in the Louvre.

The decontextualisation of the pieces in a museum gives rise to a second metamorphosis, concerning the definition of art itself: the objects become works of art through the mere fact of being exhibited in the museum. In the words of Santos Zunzunegui, ‘this recipient of the secularised sacred acts as a site of aesthetic ‘crystallisation’, a space where the common transmutes into art’. The key, as Malraux points out, is in observation, which acts as a transformative element converting objects into works of art, in a process similar to the one that would take place in the early twentieth century with the readymades, which also became works of art under their author’s gaze:

> At the start of this century [the twentieth], artists took note of something to which Maurice Denis’ famous phrase owes its fortune: ‘Before being a Virgin (...) a painting is a surface covered in colours arranged in a particular order.’ (...) Which is to say: we
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2. Malraux, André: *Le Musée Imaginaire*. Paris, Gallimard, Col. Folio Essais, 1965, p. 198. The first French edition of Malraux’s *Imaginary Museum* was published in 1947 and the second in 1951 (as part of the *Voix du silence*). A revision of the latter, modified by Malraux himself, came to light in 1965. It has not proved possible to obtain Spanish translations of this edition, much more complete than its predecessor, with existing translations corresponding to the 1951 version, such as the one produced by the Buenos Aires publisher Emecé in 1956, translated by Damián C. Bayón & Elva de Lóizaga (MALRAUX, André: *Las voces del silencio: visión del arte*. Buenos Aires, Emecé, 1956). We have therefore decided to work with the original French edition of 1965, edited by Gallimard, and to offer our own translation of the text. We apologise in advance for any possible inaccuracies we may have introduced.


call canvas, sculpture, work of art—and not God, divinity, crucifix, effigy or Black Madonna—that which we view in such a manner.

This question, of the decontextualisation of works of art in museums, seems to have been a constant in theoretical considerations of the institution ever since its inception. To some extent, art museums can be defined as a gathering of a collection of artistic objects torn from their places of origin; here, then, is the fundamental principle of all museum spaces, with the possible exception of certain specific practices such as house museums, where objects remain more or less in context. This operation, the extraction of the works of art from their original locations, is the cause, according to Santos Zunzunegui, of both the museum’s exaltation as a privileged space of perception and the traditional criticism of the museum experience, ‘which eradicates a work of art’s original locus, changing both its initial purpose and its original conditions of reception’. Architecture loses its role as framework, as described by the poet Paul Valéry, for whom the decontextualisation of works of art by the museum was the root of the institution’s failure:

I perceive, all at once, a vague clarity. It insinuates within me a response; it steals slowly over my impressions and demands to be pronounced. Painting and Sculpture, the Demon of Explanation tells me, are abandoned children. Their mother is dead, their mother Architecture. While she lived she gave them shelter, utility and limits. Their liberty to err was denied. They had their space, their well-defined light, their alliances… While she lived, they knew what they wanted…

In the museum, the works of art are found not only out of context but also en masse, forming a ‘strange, ordered disorder’, in the words of Valéry, who coincided with Malraux in employing a musical image to portray the museum as an improbable gathering of artworks. For the Asiatic world—which, Malraux claims, would only recently have encountered the museum—this must have been ‘an absurd concert, with the sounding and mixture, without interval or end, of contradictory melodies’. Valéry, in a similar manner, stated that the intellectual effect produced by the museum, through the mediation of the gaze, was like that of an ear obliged to ‘listen to ten orchestras at once’. Certainly, an overabundance of works of art can often have an overwhelming effect. There comes a point where one’s

6. Quatremère de Quincy’s reflections on the loss of significance of works of art, as a consequence of the pillaging seen during the French imperialist politics of the early nineteenth century, are already established as classics. According to Ángeles Layuno, Quatremère de Quincy ‘levelled an allegation against the works removed from their original context, from the purpose and the value for which they were created, thereby losing, if not their substance, their spirit and their significance’ (Layuno Rosas, María Ángeles: ‘El museo más allá de sus límites. Procesos de musealización en el marco urbano y territorial’, Oppidum, 3 (2007), pp. 135–164, especially p. 134).
9. Ídem, p. 137.
gaze is exhausted by such an array of masterpieces, and no longer knows where to turn within this ‘tumult of frozen creatures, where each demands, to no avail, the non-existence of every other’12. This translates into a considerable difficulty when it comes to perceiving any one work in its totality.

Marinetti, in fact, had already advanced this criticism, of the amalgamation of works of art in the museum, in his ‘Futurist Manifesto’ published in 1909, where—in the violent style typical of the movement—he compared museums with mass graves: ‘Museums, cemeteries!... Truly identical in their sinister promiscuity of unknown bodies, public dormitories where one sleeps eternally alongside other despised or unknown beings’13. The powerful, expressive comparison of the museum to the necropolis is a recurrent theme in historiography, a classic resort for those who wish to belittle museums as mere warehouses, full of testimonies to an irrecoverable past14. Futurism called for nothing less than the destruction of these institutions of the past:

Forward, you great fire-raisers with your blackened fingers! Here! There! Burn the libraries with the fire of your lightning! Divert the course of canals to flood the cellars of the museums! Let the glorious canvases swim hither and yon! Take up your hammers and pickaxes! Dig out the foundations of the venerable cities!15

While perhaps Paul Valéry was not entirely mistaken in his mistrust of that ‘assembly of independent but competing marvels’16 produced in museums, it is certain that without this process of decontextualisation and juxtaposition, many of the works of art we can admire today would no longer exist. Rejecting the gathering of works of art in museums means rejecting the institution’s role in the construction of our collective memory, of our imaginary museum, as we shall go on to see.


Since its creation, the museum has contributed enormously to modifying our relationship with the work of art, favouring a more direct link to paintings and sculptures, which had formerly been the exclusive domain of kings, nobles and

14. For Valéry, for example, museums had ‘something of the temple and the gallery, the cemetery and the school’ (VALERY, Paul: op. cit., p. 137).
15. GóMEZ dE lA MATA, G. & HERnándEz, N. (ed.): op. cit., p. 133. The Spanish translation in this edition of the Manifiestos (here re-translated into English) is not entirely exact: the original phrase ‘Et boutez donc le feu aux rayons des bibliothèques!’ should be translated as ‘Set fire to the shelves of the libraries!’ and not ‘Burn the libraries with the fire of your lightning!’ as it was actually translated.
ecclesiastical hierarchies. The museum replaces the satisfaction of possession with the simple pleasure afforded by contemplation, given that ‘we do not possess the works whose reproductions we admire (almost all being found in museums) and we know that we will never possess them’\(^{17}\). In fact, our contact with works of art occurs largely through the mediation of the museum (and the exhibition halls), the space par excellence for artistic ‘consumption’.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the work of art has itself evolved with the passage of time. As Malraux recalls, ‘Works of art are resurrected in our world of art, not in their own’\(^{18}\). The Victory of Samothrace serves to illustrate this new dimension of the work of art. The sculpture of today is not the same one that was created around 190 BC, for various reasons: firstly, because it has lost its head and arms; secondly, because it has been removed from its original environment; and thirdly, and most importantly of all, because today we are able to contemplate it in a privileged space, that magnificent stairway of the Louvre transformed into an effective, impressive and sensationalist exhibitory space.

The Victory has acquired a new semantics, no longer representative of the Greek sanctuary of the isle of Samothrace from which it originates —very few of the tourists who photograph it every day in the Louvre would be able to specify its original function— but of the entirety of Greek art, of which it becomes a symbol in the eyes of the contemporary visitor. The potency of the image is partly due to the fact that it is incomplete, a fact which awakens in us a Ruskinian taste for ruins; in fact, the hypothetical proposals for the sculpture’s reconstruction lack the expressive force of the mutilated statue. The sculpture also owes much of its power to the scenographic placement it enjoys today, having experienced several relocations: one need only contemplate old photographs of one of its first tentative locations, in a courtyard of the Louvre in 1879, to perceive the importance of surroundings.

The museum, and by extension the public’s relationship to the work of art, have also experienced changes since the institution’s beginnings. Museums frequented by a nineteenth-century Parisian, such as the poet and art critic Charles Baudelaire—a great lover of art from his infancy, his father being appointed as curator of the Musée du Luxembourg—are different to those a European would have seen in 1950, and even more radically distinct to those we know today, above all in terms of museographical tendencies and the arrangement of the works of art. The museum of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was characterised by an enormous profusion of works of art, which occupied almost all of the available space. The result was such an accumulation, with paintings crowding above each other at various heights, that the visitor would have had genuine difficulty in assimilating everything on display; it is easy, therefore, to understand Paul Valéry’s impression, who left ‘with my head shattered and my legs trembling from this temple of the noblest pleasures’\(^{19}\). Baudelaire, however, who had experienced the same class
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\(^{17}\) Malraux, André: op. cit., p. 160.

\(^{18}\) Idem, p. 257.

\(^{19}\) Valéry, Paul: op. cit., p. 140.
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of museum as Valéry, appeared not to share this aversion for the accumulation of pieces, Martinovski indicating that ‘according to the testimonies of his contemporaries, Baudelaire rarely passed by the Louvre without spending at least a handful of hours within’.

In the 1940s and 1950s, following the Second World War, museology was refined. The new tendencies came to favour quality over quantity: the aim was no longer to exhibit everything, but to carefully select what would be exhibited, to allow a greater comprehension of the artistic object and create a more agreeable visit. The museums would ‘empty’ their walls to leave a single row of paintings located at eye height. It was in this setting of incipient ‘revolution’ that André Malraux, who would later become Minister of Culture with Charles de Gaulle, wrote his essay The Imaginary Museum, whose first edition dates to 1947 but which was completed and modified in 1951 and 1965. In the second half of the twentieth century, the museum advanced towards a modern museology, with designs stripped of any element that might impede contemplation of the artworks. Little by little, a museography emerged that would reach its minimal expression in the white cube experiences of the sixties and seventies, one of whose paradigms was Paris’ Centre Pompidou.

The museum as institution contributed decisively to the definition of the concept of art. The birth of the museum as a public space enabled the intellectual transformation of diverse objects into works of art, whose contemplation had previously been the exclusive privilege of the more affluent classes. Through the simple fact of being in the museum, the object is enhanced in status, becoming worthy of inhabiting the most elevated position in western culture. When we enter an art museum, we implicitly accept that we are going to contemplate masterpieces; even in the case of museums of ethnology, the everyday objects of our forebears are bestowed with an aura of importance that makes them superior to those we have seen in the homes of our grandparents, however similar they might be.

The museum of the modern era advances towards the abolition of traditional limits and the integration of artistic manifestations from other cultures, in parallel with the progressive questioning of the Eurocentrism established by the European powers in the imperialist era. In the twentieth century, art museums opened their doors to African, Oceanic and Pre-Columbian art, among others. Western art would no longer hold a monopoly in our museums. This integration of non-occidental arts, which conceptually redefined museums, occurred alongside the revision of the concept of beauty as an unambiguous characteristic, a viewpoint that reached its climax with the avant-garde. In this context, movements such as Futurism would be fervent supporters of the destruction of traditional models of beauty:

We affirm that the beauty of the world has been enriched by a new form of beauty: the beauty of speed. A racing car, with its box that glistens with fat pipes resembling

---


21. A more accurate translation of the original ‘coffre’ would not be ‘box’ but rather ‘boot’ or ‘trunk’.
a serpent with explosive breath... a roaring automobile, which seems to ride on grapeshot, is more beautiful than the Victory of Samothrace.22

This calling into question and redefinition of the beautiful, and consequent-ly of the very notion of the work of art, would lead to various experiments in the complete trivialisation of art. Duchamp, with his *Fountain* of 1917, a *readymade* consisting of a urinal (one of the most prosaic objects of everyday life) acquired the status of work of art because the artist pronounced it as such. Duchamp’s experiment is related to performance art by its explicit desire to create controversy: the artist submitted the piece for an exhibition on whose board of selection he sat, and whose organisers had promised to exhibit any work given to them providing the author assumed the associated costs. This act’s importance resides in its throwing open the doors to the inclusion of the banal in museums: all manner of quotidian objects could henceforth metamorphosise into high art through the transformative miracle of the museum. *Readymades, objets-trouvés* and assemblies exploded onto the artistic scene of the twentieth century with such force that, on occasion, they gave rise to ‘banal and even mediocre results’, in the words of Simón Marchán.23 The theoretical development of Duchamp’s work was reflected in a text published in May 1917 in the art magazine *The Blind Man*, of which Duchamp never acknowledged authorship, but which critics consider as a genuine account of his motives and a reaction to the piece’s rejection by the selection committee:

Whether or not Mr. Mutt has produced the *Fountain* with his own hands is irrelevant. He has chosen it. He has taken a normal element of our existence and displayed it in such a manner that its determination of purpose disappears beneath the new title and novel perspective; he has found a new imagining for the object.24

Through experiments like Duchamp’s, the work of art ceased to be a representation (until then, a portrait of Louis XIV had represented Louis XIV) to instead become an idea in itself. As André Malraux points out, ‘Until the nineteenth century, all works of art were the image of something that existed or sometimes did not exist, before being works of art.’25 This artistic proposal, furthermore, results in a conceptual leap of great magnitude: the displacement of interest from the object to the artist, the true protagonist of the work. On presenting a urinal as sculpture, Duchamp brought attention to himself as a creative artist, possessed of the capacity to simply decide that a urinal is art: a decision not without its consequences, as ‘by declaring as artistic those realities which originally were not, [Duchamp]

24. MARChán FIz, Simón: op. cit., p. 82.
drove both a reduction of artistry in the artistic (...) and an ‘aestheticisation’ of the non-artistic\textsuperscript{26}.

The tendency to cast the artist in the starring role, in place of the work of art itself, would result, in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, in the appearance in museums of works like \textit{My Bed}: an installation by Tracy Emin, consisting of her own unmade bed, used prophylactics and underwear, which reached the final shortlist of the controversial Turner Prize. We currently live in a period of a near-absolute abolition of limits on what is ‘museum-worthy’: any artistic manifestation, whatever its characteristics (although with certain restrictions) can form part of the modern museum.

4. THE METAMORPHOSIS OF MEMORY: THE IMAGINARY, IMAGINED AND VIRTUAL MUSEUM

In his essay \textit{The Imaginary Museum}, first published in 1947, André Malraux developed the concept of a museum having neither walls nor chronological, geographic or aesthetic limits: a subjective museum, which would be different for each individual\textsuperscript{27}. Malraux refers not to any physical museum, but rather to an abstract entity composed of our artistic memory, of the works we love and have seen first-hand in real museums or reproduced in books; an open, inexhaustible museum that is perpetually enriched. The formative process of this reservoir depends on the incredibly subjective criterion of a given individual’s personal taste, as Malraux himself acknowledged when he announced the gestation of another of his imaginary museums: that of world sculpture\textsuperscript{28}.

The imaginary museums that historiography reveals to us are highly varied, indicative of the interest the topic has provoked among theorists. The imaginary museum belongs to the domain of the abstract and the incorporeal; its postulates reside in an area of the imagination that skirts the territory of dreams, to the extent that the imaginary museum shares a place in the collective memory with the utopian designs of architects such as Boullée\textsuperscript{29}, who in the late eighteenth century proposed his own imaginary museum, in this case focusing not on the content but the container, or with thought experiments such as Le Corbusier’s ‘Museum

\textsuperscript{26} MARChán FIz, Simón: op. cit., pp. 82–83.
\textsuperscript{27} According to Bernard Deloche, ‘Samuel Quiccheberg’s theatre of memory (sixteenth century), Cassiano dal Pozzo’s Museo Cartaceo (seventeenth century), the \textit{Thesaurus} by Albertus Seba (eighteenth century), Diderot’s Encyclopédie and furthermore the \textit{Musée de Sculpture} by the Count of Clarac (nineteenth century)’ were the antecedents of Malraux’s concept of the imaginary museum. (DElOChE, Bernard: ‘¿Es el museo virtual un competidor real para el museo institucional?’, \textit{Mus-A}, 5 (2005), pp. 16–21, especially p. 17).
\textsuperscript{28} ‘I have attempted to gather within it those sculptures that affect me emotionally and directly (...). Without a doubt, any other’s selection would have been different to my own.’ (MALRAUX, André: \textit{Le musée imaginaire de la sculpture mondiale}, Paris, Gallimard, 1952, p. 16). (Author’s translation).
\textsuperscript{29} Whose design would be, in the words of Ángeles Layuno, ‘an architecture utopian, sublime, monumental and symbolic’ (LAYUNO ROSAS, María Ángeles: \textit{Museos de arte contemporáneo en España. Del ‘palacio de las artes’ a la arquitectura como arte}. Gijón, Trea, 2004, p. 34).
of unlimited growth’\textsuperscript{30} or the ‘modern museum’ of Auguste Perret\textsuperscript{31}. The imaginary and imagined museum are, then, two faces of a single coin: one assembles the worldwide, inexhaustible repertoire of humanity’s artistic creation, while the other constitutes the idealised representation of the perfect museum space.

The imaginary museum, by definition, is as numerous as are individuals, and as open as the human mind itself, but is conditioned by the technological possibilities of the period in which each individual has lived. Today, of course, we find ourselves in a very different situation to that of the mid-nineteenth century, in which Baudelaire and other \textit{salonniers} wrote their artistic critiques of the ‘Salon of painting and sculpture’ held in the Louvre. As indicated by various authors, among them Malraux\textsuperscript{32} and Martinovski\textsuperscript{33}, Baudelaire would have visited only three or four major museums: primarily the Louvre, but also the Luxembourg, the Versailles Museum and the Galerie d’Orléans. It appears he knew the Louvre well, that he visited it regularly and that, once inside, he admired not only its masterpieces but also the paintings of lesser stature. His artistic culture, however, would primarily have consisted —apart from the works he had seen in said museums— of photographs, engravings and copies of masterpieces from the history of art, which were reproduced in books of engravings. His artistic culture, although rich, is that of a nineteenth-century individual, with all the limitations that entails. It is for this very reason that the virtual dimensions of his imaginary museum are restricted: his museum is bounded by the list of known artists in the cultural environment of mid-nineteenth-century Paris.

Baudelaire’s imaginary museum is reflected in his famous poem ‘The Lighthouses’, from his anthology \textit{The Flowers of Evil}, along with the musings he recorded in his writings as an art critic (above all in the Salons). Although explicit references to the concept of the museum are scarce, his texts reveal a specific conception of the imaginary museum. ‘The Lighthouses’ describes the specific expression of what Baudelaire considered the Olympus of artistic creation. The poem’s first eight quartets extol the merits of a number of artists: Rubens, Leonardo da Vinci, Rembrandt, Michelangelo, Puget, Watteau, Goya and Delacroix. As can be seen in the following fragment dedicated to Rubens, each quartet describes, rather than a specific work, the abstraction of the qualities that make the artist worthy of consideration as a ‘lighthouse’ in the history of art, through the use of ‘powerful poetic images, containing the quintessence of the corresponding plastic artist’s body of work’\textsuperscript{34}; ‘Rubens, river of oblivion, garden of sloth,/cushion of naked flesh of no

\textsuperscript{30} Le Corbusier wondered, throughout his life, how to create a functional museum that would respond to the necessities of the modern world. In his project for a \textit{Musée des artistes vivants} (1931) the architect outlined what he would later develop as the ‘Museum of unlimited growth’. The sketch of this hypothetical museum was described by Le Corbusier himself as ‘the image of an idea serenely born’. (BOLAROS, María (ed.): \textit{La memoria del mundo. Cien años de museología (1900–2000)}. Gijón, Trea, 2002, pp. 132–135, particularly p. 132).

\textsuperscript{31} The architect Auguste Perret asked, in 1929, what the modern museum should be, and in response outlined a key idea: ‘a building that is at once a site of delight and festivity and a place of study’. (\textit{Idem}, pp. 79–83, especially p. 80).

\textsuperscript{32} MALRAUX, André: \textit{Le Musée...}, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{33} MARTINOVSKI, Vladimir: \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 32–33.

\textsuperscript{34} MARTINOVSKI, Vladimir: \textit{op. cit.}, p. 37. (Author’s translation).
use to love, but where life comes and goes and trembles without repose, as the air in the heavens and the water in the sea.35

Some decades later, in the early twentieth century, the avant-garde movements would react against aesthetic tradition, proposing new artistic forms and stridently rejecting the physical museum — but also, implicitly, the concept of the imaginary museum as a repository of Western memory. One of the museum’s most violent detractors was Futurism, founded by Marinetti and his ‘Futurist Manifesto’ published in Le Figaro in 1909. For Marinetti and the Futurists, the museum was a cemetery, an inert space containing only cadavers, a battlefield of painters and sculptors, destroying one another with lines and brushstrokes in the same museum.36 For Marinetti, the useless admiration of the past was tantamount to ‘spilling our sensitivity into a funerary urn, rather than launching it forward with violent gestures of creation and action.’37 Futurism rejected the museum, being a symbol of tradition, as it did the library and the academy. This was only to be expected, as the Futurist movement was based on the exaltation of the modern world, of speed and the machine. The museum had no future in Futurism, as every work became a thing of the past the second it became part of a museum. Marinetti’s imaginary museum is a burnt, flooded place, laid entirely to waste.

A similar point of view to Marinetti’s, although less violent, is found in the basis of Paul Valéry’s theory concerning museums. For him, it represented a ‘community of dead visions’, an absurd gathering of ‘incompatible units of pleasure’. Valéry made no attempt to hide his negative opinion of the institution, his essay ‘The Problem with Museums’ beginning with the words ‘I do not much care for museums’.40 The author describes a visit to a certain museum, which is not specified but may well have been the Louvre, the paradigm of the French museum. The experience appears to have caused the poet genuine mental and physical discomfort, revealed by expressions such as the ‘intolerable impression’ of the halls of sculpture, the ‘holy horror’ that overcame him when he entered the halls of paintings or ‘the sadness, the boredom, the admiration (...).’41 that accompanied him during his explorations. To decontextualisation and juxtaposition, as reasons for the museum’s failure in Valéry’s eyes, we must add a third of equal importance: the museum would replace enjoyment with erudition. The museum’s ambition, of cataloguing the entire artistic culture of a society, would destroy any possibility of pleasure.

Nevertheless, this accumulation of artworks in the museum, plucked from their original setting, makes their survival possible. With the Roman Empire vanished, and the worship of its gods forgotten, the museum prevents the disappearance

37. Idem, pp. 132–133.
40. Idem, p. 137.
42. Ibidem.
of the sculptures of Venus, Mercury and Baco, transformed into works of art by means of the pedestal and the display case. If the physical museum possesses this capacity for salvation, how much more astounding is the power of the imaginary museum, which favours the conservation of humanity’s artistic heritage thanks to the preservative abilities of memory —both collective and individual— and saves the works from the oblivion of time? As Malraux affirms, ‘The Imaginary Museum brings back the temple, the palace, the church and the garden that have been lost; yet it frees them from the necropolis’44. The possibilities of the imaginary museum are even more important when we consider its lack of limits: alongside the physical museum, which is by definition partial —given that it gathers only a fraction of humanity’s art— the imaginary museum has the capacity to encompass it all.

The imaginary museum takes various forms; some belong to the arena of memory, but others possess a physical dimension. The theme of the imaginary museum as a repertoire for works of art, beyond theoretical constructs, is manifest in real experiments such as Marcel Duchamp’s boîtes-en-valise45. Concerned with the preservation of his works, between 1936 and 1968 Duchamp developed various versions of a portable museum containing reproductions of his own creations, including copies of his paintings and miniatures of his sculptures and readymades, such as the Fountain. It seems the creation of this portable museum came to obsess Duchamp, who created no less than 312 versions: the first twenty-four were made by Duchamp himself and contained an original work (colourised black and white reproductions), while the remainder, collected in successive series, were the work of a variety of assistants.

Duchamp’s imaginary museum is unusual in that it comprises, rather than an assembly of works by other creators, those of his own hand, in an exercise of auto-reflection that can be seen as a form of readymade containing the essence of his artistic creation. In addition, the design represents a calling into question of the museum’s protective role, which had been revealed as imperfect: let us not forget that the bombardments of the Second World War had endangered a large part of the European artistic heritage preserved in museums. It deals, finally, with questions of singularity and originality as universal artistic values: the boîte-en-valise is not a unique object —given that there are more than three hundred examples— nor an original one —as the majority of examples consist of reproductions— but it is an artistic object all the same. This multiplicity of aspects makes the boîte-en-valise a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, an evocative reflection on the conservation of works of art and the role of memory.

Evidently, imaginary museums have also evolved over time, not only as a result of the progress of the museum itself, but also thanks to the many possibilities offered by the development of disciplines such as photography. As Malraux puts it:
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44. Malraux, André: Le Musée…, p. 122.
Today, a student has colour reproductions of most masterpieces at his disposal, and can discover countless secondary paintings, the ancient arts, Indian and Chinese sculptures, Roman frescoes, and the primitive and popular arts. How many statues were reproduced in 1850? One could visit certain rooms of the Louvre, which one recalled as best one could; we now have available to us more significant works, to supplement the failures of our memory, than could be held by the greatest museum.

Photography, in parallel with the expansion of the imaginary museum —thanks to the opportunities for diffusion that it creates— has driven a change in scale of the artworks in our personal museums, thanks in no small measure to art books. In this medium, the size of an image depends on subjective criteria (its importance in the history of art, the editor’s personal tastes and the restrictions of the space) and do not always reflect their real dimensions: ‘In an album, in an art book, the majority of pieces are reproduced in the same format; (...) Works lose their scale’. Photography allowed the variation in size of paintings and sculptures, which we imagine as larger or smaller than they are in reality: who has not been surprised by the diminutive proportions of the Gioconda in the Louvre, or the enormous scale of A Burial at Ornans in the Musée d’Orsay, after having seen them reproduced time and time again in books? In contrast, stamps, coins and miniatures are enlarged in reproductions, to the point of creating ‘true fictitious arts’, in Malraux’s words, objects that photographic enlargement allows us to apprehend in great detail. A considerable proportion of the works that make up our imaginary museum possess dimensions, in our memory, that differ from reality, a loss of scale that is nothing more than a secondary effect of the diffusion of art through photography.

The scope of the diffusion of works of art —and, by extension, of our imaginary museum— increased enormously in the late twentieth century with the arrival of the Internet, which has permitted direct and effectively unlimited access to art from any corner of the world. In the words of Simón Marchán, ‘in our times the borders of the imaginary museum have stretched to almost unimaginable limits relative to those glimpsed by historicism or the lucid premonitions of A. Malraux’. Physical distances no longer exist: everything is available in a single click. We are even able to wander the halls of certain museums as if we were actually there. The contemplation of works of art on the Internet cannot replace the pleasure obtained from a first-hand viewing, but does permit the destruction of barriers in the creation of the imaginary museum. In the same way as photography enabled the democratisation of art in the twentieth century, as a ‘medium of diffusion destined to bring to light the indisputable masterpieces for those who could not permit themselves the engraving’, the Internet has multiplied the worldwide collection of works of art beyond measure, compiling a catalogue in constant expansion.

47. Idem, p. 96.
49. Marchán Fiz, Simón: op. cit., p. 79.
50. Malraux, André: Le Musée... p. 88.
New technologies and the development of the virtual have enabled new forms of understanding the concept of the museum, which modify the individual’s relationship with the work of art and enrich the perspectives of the imaginary museum. With the help of computers, smartphones and tablets as intermediaries, many museums now offer virtual visits, designed not as a substitute for the real experience (direct contact with the work continues to be —for now— irreplaceable) but as a prior or posterior complement to the visit. Similarly, ever-increasing numbers of museums have an active presence on the Internet, through their own websites —which often act as mission statements or introductory letters for the museum—and social networks. There are many variants of the cyber-museum, which Bernard Deloche defines as ‘a digitised museum, in the form of a CD-ROM or website, which supplements or completes the institutional museum’51. The possibilities offered by the technological age surpass this notion of the cyber-museum, in reality encompassing any process that implies the act of exhibition — a critical word, according to Deloche, in the definition of the true virtual museum:

The virtual museum exists and, it must be stressed, has nothing to do with a technological wonder as such, but, instead, a virtual extension of today’s museum (...). We can surely say that we are in a ‘virtual museum’ anywhere we encounter a process of exhibiting images. Storing and displaying images can be achieved in many ways, and to diverse ends: the traditional photo album, the projection of slides, etcetera. We need not ask, therefore, when and how the virtual museum was built —or even whether it is necessary to build it or simply to imagine it—as it already exists52.

5. IN CONCLUSION

The museum is by no means a neutral environment, but the stage for a series of metamorphoses and transformations driven by its own conceptual definition as a juxtaposed assembly of diverse artistic manifestations transplanted from their original locations. This process of decontextualisation makes the museum a space in which narratives of history and of culture are created and disseminated, (...) a means to etch into the public consciousness the role played, and position held, by art53. The nature of the works of art, decontextualised and juxtaposed, is affected by a process of ‘resemanticisation’ occasioned by the exhibitory act itself. This is especially evident in the case of devotional objects, which lose their function on their relocation to the museum: being vehicles for the communion between the faithful and divinity, they come to represent testaments to past civilisations that the western world holds as integral to the construction of its cultural identity.

52. Idem, p. 188.
These transformations are not only relevant as generators of novel values in relation to the work of art, but also make important contributions to the definition of the collective memory. This is evidenced by the manifold meditations of artists, theorists and literates on the museum as a setting for metamorphosis, which have accompanied the growth of the institution since its creation as a public space in the eighteenth century. Often critical of—but never indifferent to—the museum’s role in the modern world, the reflections of the various authors referenced here highlight the museum’s importance as an institution of the western world and its role in the construction of our collective culture. Behind the most radical and bellicerent positions (such as the call for the museum’s destruction by avant-garde movements like Futurism), can be seen a criticism of the more negative aspects of an entity too often anchored by tradition, obsolete and incapable of adapting to changing times, an image from which today’s museums strive to free themselves, opting to remodel themselves as more active organisms, better connected to society.

Alongside the traditional museum, understood as a building housing a collection, recent decades have witnessed the birth of other varieties of museum beyond physical limits: the imaginary and imagined museum, the cyber-museum and the virtual museum all represent new ways to understand the museum as a space within memory, an inexhaustible experience composed of the individual and collective visual legacy of contemporary society. This is possible through the works of art conserved in museums but also (and primarily) thanks to the possibilities offered by the development of photography and the Internet, which have increased access to artistic manifestations to unimaginable limits, abolishing physical distances to an extent that Malraux could not have hoped to foresee when he composed his Imaginary Museum. In the current era of the image, the traditional concept of the museum falls apart: it can no longer be defined as a receptacle of masterpieces created by man, but rather as an unlimited repository of the collective and individual memory of humankind, as ‘the expression of a human adventure, the enormous range of invented forms’54, in Malraux’s words.

54. MALRAUX, André: Le musée imaginaire de la sculpture... p. 17. (Author’s translation).
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Abstract
This article examines Swedish artist Hilma af Klint’s problematic status as a pioneer of abstract art. Her case allows us to reflect, simultaneously, upon two types of contacts crucial to the process by which artists achieved recognition in the twentieth century: on the one hand, their network of personal contacts, and, on the other, their network of institutional contacts such as museums. The basis of this study is the difference in the positions adopted by the MoMA, in the exhibition Inventing abstraction, 1910–1925, and Stockholm’s Moderna Museet, in the display Hilma af Klint: A Pioneer of Abstraction. Studying the positions of her proponents and detractors leads to the conclusion that, thus far, Hilma af Klint has had the accomplices necessary for her work to be exhibited, to achieve recognition and even, within the art world, to enjoy a degree of fame. It remains to be seen — and sociological analysis suggests a negative outcome in the short term — whether she will, in future, have sufficiently decisive accomplices to earn the prestige of being widely considered as a pioneer of abstract art.
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Resumen
Este artículo examina el problemático reconocimiento como pionera del arte abstracto de la artista sueca Hilma af Klint. Su caso permite reflexionar simultáneamente sobre dos tipos de contactos importantes en el proceso de reconocimiento del artista del siglo XX. Por un lado, la red de contactos personales, y, por el otro, la red de contactos institucionales como son los museos. El punto de partida son
las diferentes posiciones mantenidas por el MoMA en la exposición *Inventing abstraction, 1910–1925*, y por el Moderna Museet de Estocolmo en la muestra *Hilma af Klint: a Pioneer of Abstraction*. El estudio de las posiciones de defensores y detractores permite concluir que, hasta ahora, Hilma af Klint ha tenido los cómplices *necesarios* para que su obra sea expuesta, conocida e incluso, dentro del mundo del arte, hasta cierto punto famosa. Está por ver, y el análisis sociológico sugiere a corto plazo resultados negativos, si en el futuro consigue los cómplices *decisivos* para obtener el prestigio de ser considerada mayoritariamente como una pionera del arte abstracto.
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ALTHOUGH THE PRINCIPAL CASE STUDY in this article revolves around the evaluation of Swedish artist Hilma af Klint’s work, a more general objective is to draw attention to one of the elements that shape the processes of recognition in the visual arts, and whose role is rarely highlighted to a sufficient degree: the influence of personal contacts and networks of institutional contacts. ‘Agents’, ‘processes’, ‘politics’, ‘tastes’ and ‘market’ are some of the terms used by theories developed to explain artists’ success or establishment, or indeed their descent into obscurity. These are useful terms, which point to specific realities or spheres of social action, but their use may also sidestep the identification of their protagonists.

In one of my studies into artistic recognition, I emphasised how an adequate network of contacts is, in this context, a fundamental factor, both for explaining the initial phase of an artist’s recognition and for understanding those moments in which their name, and the appreciation of their work, are disseminated at a higher level:

Fledgling artists tend to seek the support of other, more renowned practitioners to obtain their approval and attempt to penetrate their circle. On arriving in Paris in 1920, Joan Miró visited Picasso. Salvador Dalí did the same on his first journey to the French capital in 1926, and three years later, through Miró, came into contact with surrealist circles. Some of the recognition achieved by various Catalan artists less famous than the aforementioned is due precisely to their relationships with them. Examples might include Apel·les Fenosa, who enjoyed the support of Picasso, or Ángel Planells, to whom Dalí lent his assistance. The increase in recognition and appreciation of the work of the ceramicist Josep Llorens Artigas, from the 1950s onwards, is not independent of his collaboration with Joan Miró.

These processes, of course, take shape through the interrelation of many factors, but there are always some that weigh more heavily than others. We can identify these, and can demonstrate that beneath terms like ‘agents’, ‘institutions’ and ‘market’ hide specific people, particular gallery owners and museums, and a network of contacts deserving of more detailed illumination.

Certain important exhibitions have, in fact, paid attention to this area in recent years. In the entrance to the exhibition Inventing abstraction, 1910–1925. How a Radical Idea Changed Modern Art, unveiled in New York’s MoMA in late 2012, a large wall displayed a diagram clearly designed to attract visitors’ attention (Figure 1). The diagram presented more than a hundred names of artists linked to abstract art

2. Two recent Spanish studies analysing the mechanisms through which art and artists are recognised are FURIÓ, Vicenç: Arte y reputación. Estudios sobre el reconocimiento artístico. Barcelona, Publicacions de la Universitat de Barcelona (Colección Memoria Artium), 2012 —which reviews diverse articles concerning artists and works ranging from classical sculpture to modern art— and PEIST, Nuria: El éxito en el arte moderno. Trayectorias artísticas y proceso de reconocimiento. Madrid, Abada, 2012, based on the analysis of a group of avant-garde artists who became known between 1900 and 1960.


between 1910 and 1925, joined by lines representing the personal contacts between
them. Highlighted in red were those artists with more than twenty-four document-
ed connections, namely Kandinsky, Apollinaire, Picasso, Arp, Léger, Sonia Delau-
nay, Van Doesburg, Tristan Tzara, Picabia, Marinetti, Larionov, Goncharova and
Alfred Stieglitz. On one hand, the diagram recalled and made reference to the fa-
mous visual scheme with which Alfred Barr had attempted to explain the evolution
of the first modern art, a scheme reproduced in the exhibition catalogue of Cubism
and Abstract Art, held in the MoMA in 1936. On the other, the diagram owes a debt
to more recent theories, such as those of the networks of intellectual connections
studied by the American sociologist Randall Collins in his monumental Sociology
of Philosophies. With this graphical summary, those responsible for the exhibition
at the MoMA hoped to highlight the idea—undoubtedly an accurate one—that
abstraction was not simply the fruit of four geniuses working in isolation, but also
of the relationships, communications and exchanges of ideas established between
a numerous group of artists and intellectuals who worked concurrently in diverse
fields, and often in considerably distant centres and countries.

One of the best-connected artists in the scheme is Picasso, who, curiously, nev-
er made abstract art, but sits in the centre of the diagram, from which we might
deduce that he represented a key figure for the majority of artists of his day: artists
who, despite their varied tendencies, all hoped to obtain his approval and support.
We have already seen how Miró and Dalí, on arriving in Paris, went to visit Picasso.

Monarchs and popes, nobles, influential artists and humanists, and the staff who
oversaw the art academies were, in the past, the individuals responsible for building
the reputations of artists. With the inception of modern art we must add art critics,
art dealers and gallery owners, the collectors of this new art and, in a secondary
phase, the directors of major museums, the authors of landmark monographs and
the exhibition curators and organisers. Certain names are widely known, such as
Henry Kanhweiler and Gertrude Stein, who supported Picasso; Leo Castelli, the
main champion of Jaspers Johns and other practitioners of pop art; and the col-
lector Charles Saatchi, whose name immediately evokes Damien Hirst and the
Young British Artists. Nevertheless, only a minority of these have acquired any real
visibility, when we consider that all of the twentieth-century artists who achieved
widespread recognition had the support of agents and institutions, without whom
it is doubtful they would ever have enjoyed such success.

When focusing on the art of the twentieth century, it is the art dealers and
gallery owners who are the best-known agents. I have cited some of the names
that flourished at the beginning of the century and during pop art’s peak in the
1960s. Curiously, however, the names of the gallery owners who contributed to

---

5. The exhibition Cubism and Abstract Art, organised by Alfred H. Barr, was held in the MoMA in the months of March and April of 1936. Barr’s diagrams was reproduced on the catalogue’s jacket. In the catalogue Inventing Abstraction is a study of this diagram: Glenn D. Lowry, ‘Abstraction in 1936: Barr’s Diagrams’, p. 359–363.

the recognition of internationally renowned artists between the two World Wars have achieved far less visibility.

Edward Hopper did not achieve his first commercial and critical success until forty-two years of age. When he did so, it was with an exhibition of watercolours held in 1924 in the Rehn Gallery. This would be the gallery that represented the artist for the rest of his life. It is difficult, therefore, not to credit the gallery owner Frank Rehn with some responsibility for Hopper’s subsequent reputation. It was Rehn who sold the painting *House by the Railroad* to the collector Stephen Clark, who in 1930 donated it in turn to the Museum of Modern Art, where it became the first painting to form part of the museum’s permanent collection. Hopper’s acknowledgement as an important American painter took place in the early 1930s7.

Salvador Dalí became internationally established between the late 1930s and early 1940s, the gallery owner Julien Lévy playing a key part in this process. It was Lévy who aided Dalí’s entry into the United States, and who organised his first private exhibition there in 1933, followed by five more until 1941. The mounting of the ‘Sueño de Venus’, for the New York World’s Fair held in 1939, was also promoted by Lévy, as was the design of the showcases the following year8.

As for collectors, we once more find only a handful of recognisable names, like those of Gertrude Stein in the early twentieth century or Charles Saatchi at the start of the twenty-first. Marcel Duchamp never had dealers or an organised market for his works, but he did have Louis and Walter Arensberg, a pair of collectors always attentive to his output, allowing him to work in freedom without needing to concern himself with the demands and vagaries of the art market9. From their first meeting with the artist, the Arensbergs were devoted patrons of Duchamp, explaining his ability to remain strategically distant from the market. What was once their collection of Duchamp’s works, in fact, is today found in the Philadelphia Museum of Art, said institution owning the world’s most comprehensive collection of Duchamp’s art. One particular name stands out among the collectors who, between them, acquired a large part of Constantin Brancusi’s body of work: the American lawyer, John Quinn. On Quinn’s death, his collection of Brancusis numbered twenty-nine works: a collection that, in 1926, encountered a distinct lack of buyers, eventually being acquired by none other than Marcel Duchamp, who thereby established himself as a dealer-cum-collector of his friend’s work.

While from 1933 until the early 1940s Dalí’s work was successfully promoted by Julien Lévy’s gallery, his two key collectors were, firstly, the English patron Edward James and, from the 1940s, the married couple of Reynolds and Eleanor Morse. The Morses were assiduous buyers of Dalí’s work until his death, and his greatest collectors, to the extent that in 1971 they founded Cleveland’s Dalí Museum with their collection, later relocated to Saint Petersburg (Florida). Without Edward James,

---

9. For the role of the Arensbergs, collectors of Duchamp, and John Quinn, Brancusi’s foremost collector, see PEIST, Nuria: *op. cit.*, pp. 111–118.
Julien Lévy and the Morses, who knows whether the work of this artist from Empordá would have achieved the fame it enjoys today? Any mention of Dali’s success naturally implies a consideration of Gala, yet Gala is not the only romantic partner to play a prominent role in an artist’s recognition. A complete study of this topic would yield a great many examples. The individual who provided Frida Kahlo with the majority of her contacts — contacts that enabled her to achieve substantial visibility in the art world of the late 1930s and throughout the 1940s — was her husband, Diego Rivera; nor is it idle speculation to ask what Jackson Pollock might have achieved without the support of his wife, Lee Strasberg, also an artist, who sacrificed her painting career for his sake while they were together. Louise Bourgeois acquired her international recognition thanks to the impulse of feminism throughout the 1970s and the retrospective dedicated to her by the MoMA in 1982. In her early career, however, it was her husband who supported her and introduced her to New York’s art scene: the art historian and exhibition organiser, Robert Goldwater. Eva Hesse acknowledges that when she met her future husband, the sculptor Tom Doyle, she was seeking the influence of an individual more artistically mature than herself, and it was in fact he who put Eva in contact with the relevant network of artists of the day. Bill Viola’s current recognition and renown owes much to the work of his wife, Kira Perov, also an artist, but above all a curator, cultural manager and his official representative. Kira has managed the Bill Viola Studio since 1978. The posthumous fame of certain artists also owes a great deal to their partner’s or family’s efforts towards diffusion. Following the death of Robert Smithson, his wife, the artist Nancy Holt, organised his archive and took charge of the publication of his writings, which made it possible for Smithson’s work to be studied by authors such as Rosalind Krauss and Craig Owens, in the 1970s and 1980s, and advanced as a paragon of post-modernism.

From the 1960s, the modern curator entered the art world in force, organising countless exhibitions and fairs, Harald Szeemann being among the most famous names. Less well-known, however, is David Ross, the first major exhibitor of video art, and director of a number of American museums. He organised Bill Viola’s first solo exhibition, and also his first major retrospective, in the Whitney, *Bill Viola: a 25-Year Survey*. David Ross, along with the artist’s wife, Kira Perov, have been two supporters of unquestionable importance in the career of today’s most famous video artist. The key individual when considering the bibliography on Richard Estes is John Artur. In the first ten years of his career, Estes had his photorealistic work displayed in important museums and collections, and in this sense his painting enjoyed a certain international diffusion within the market circuit. However, in the

---

12. A brief biographical outline of Kira Perov can be found on Bill Viola’s official website: [http://www.billviola.com/biograph.htm](http://www.billviola.com/biograph.htm). Her biography, in fact, is found in the same entry that features Viola’s own biography. From time to time, she is interviewed about her husband’s video artworks concerning questions of technique and arrangement. See [http://www.eai.org/resourceguide/preservation/installation/interview_perov.html](http://www.eai.org/resourceguide/preservation/installation/interview_perov.html)
A decade of 1968 to 1978, no articles of consequence were published about his work, only sporadic reviews. From 1978, this began to change. This date marked the start of his solo travelling exhibitions, his appearance in catalogue introductions and the monographs tackling his painting and graphical work. The principal curator and author of the bulk of these exhibitions and texts was the painter John Artur. Until the close of the 1990s, the predominance of his name in the bibliography dedicated to Richard Estes is readily apparent, as is the scant importance assigned to Estes’ work, and to photorealism in general, in some of the more recent books, written by prestigious authors, that summarise the history of twentieth century art.

Decades before the figure of the curator or organiser of exhibitions was institutionalised, Homer Saint-Gaudens (1880–1958) already played a very similar role. The director of Pittsburgh’s Carnegie Institute from 1922, he and Mrs. Margaret Palmer, his representative in Spain, were key figures in the recognition achieved in the United States by Hermet Anglada Camarasa, Marià Andreu and Joan Junyer, to name but a few. By 1910, Anglada Camara was already a renowned artist in many European countries, but it was Gaudens who encouraged her participation in a collective exhibition at the Carnegie in Pittsburgh, allowing the Catalan artist to make contact with representatives of the Van Dyck Galleries, who organised various exhibits for her in several American cities, as a result of which her fame spread also throughout the United States. Joan Junyer met Homer Saint-Gaudens in Paris, who suggested he enter the competition for 1929’s Carnegie Prize. Junyer ended up taking second place, but through the competition acquired valuable contacts allowing him to exhibit in various American cities in the 1930s. In 1945, works by Junyer related to the world of dance came to be exhibited in the MoMA itself. From 1929 to 1939 Marià Andreu took part in the Carnegie Institute’s contests, winning prizes on two occasions. At the time, meeting Homer Saint-Gaudens and Margaret Palmer, and participating in the exhibitions organised by the Carnegie Institute, would help to further establish Andreu’s reputation in the American art world.

16. Some examples of the texts John Artur has dedicated to Estes: Richard Estes: The Urban Landscape, 1978–79 (Museum of Fine Art of Boston, Toledo, Kansas City and Washington D.C); Richard Estes: A Decade, Adam Stone Gallery, New York, 1983; Richard Estes 1990, 1990 (Museum of Art of Tokyo, Osaka and Hiroshima); Richard Estes: The Complete Prints, American Federation of Arts of New York, 1992 (travelling exhibition through various American museums between 1992 and 1995). In the catalogue from the exhibition of the artist’s work held in Madrid’s Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza in 2007, cited in the previous note, John Artur’s presence can still be felt: two of the articles in the catalogue are his.
17. He is not cited, for example, in the 700 page volume of Foster, H., Krauss, R., Bois, Y.A. & Buchloch, B.: Arte desde 1900. Barcelona, Akal, 2006 (2004). It is significant, in the contrasts of recognition evident in Estes’ case, that John Artur is a painter, curator and advisor for private collections, galleries and museums, rather than an academic author who counts among the illustrious names of the critics and historians of contemporary art.
Inventing Abstraction, 1910-1925
How a Radical Idea Changed Modern Art
MoMA, 2012.
Institute, was one of the main channels available to Spanish artists for securing recognition in the United States21.

Thus far I have referred to dealers, collectors, curators, the artists themselves and, on occasion, their partners, as accomplices in the success enjoyed by many creators. I will now focus in more detail on the case of Hilma af Klint, for whom this article is named, as this will permit us to simultaneously consider two types of contacts crucial to the process of recognition of artists in the twentieth century. On one hand, these artists’ networks of personal contacts, and on the other, their institutional contacts — in a word, museums. I refer the reader once more to the interesting diagram (see Figure 1) displayed at the entrance to the exhibition, cited earlier, Inventing abstraction, 1910–1925. How a Radical Idea Changed Modern Art, held at the MoMA22. I will now refer to this important exhibition and its catalogue (Figure 2), and to the fact that neither the display nor the volume of studies published for the occasion cite the Swedish artist Hilma af Klint, an artist who, in contrast, is championed as a pioneer of the abstract in another exhibition, entitled Hilma af Klint: A Pioneer of Abstraction, held at almost the same time in Stockholm’s Moderna Museet (Figure 3)23.

The MoMA’s exhibition of the roots of abstraction highlights Picasso’s role and preserves Kandinsky’s well-established position, alongside other pioneers of the movement such as František Kupka, Francis Picabia and Robert and Sonia Delaunay. Another of the display’s strong points is the highly relevant role it attributes to Guillaume Apollinaire, for providing the phenomenon with a new name to distinguish it from Cubism and for his defence of ground-breaking approaches. Finally, the exhibition also distances itself from the view of abstract art (and painting in particular) as a process consisting of little more than an internal purification of the medium, as if it were an isolated language, highlighting instead the mixed nature it shares with other media such as music, poetry, photography and dance. Abstraction was an innovation shared by different artists in diverse creative fields.

Yet in this magnificent exhibition, and in the catalogue that accompanied it, one name is absent: that of the Swedish artist Hilma af Klint. It is surprising, and even intriguing, that an exhibition which aims to pontificate on the beginnings of abstraction makes not the slightest mention of af Klint. This could reflect the impossibility of offering a complete vision, an all-encompassing account, but could also be a deliberate exclusion. Recent events surrounding Hilma af Klint’s work are most interesting, especially when observed from a sociological viewpoint attentive to the mechanics of establishing artistic recognition, the precise viewpoint that justifies my analysis of this case. Hilma af Klint (1862–1944) was a painter of landscapes and portraits in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century (Figure 4). She also, however, created a separate class of paintings, decidedly different,

21. For Margaret Palmer, see PéREZ SEgURA, Javier: La quiebra de lo moderno. Margaret Palmer y el arte español durante la Guerra Civil. Córdoba, Fundación Provincial de Artes Plásticas Rafael Botí, 2007.
FIGURE 3. COVER OF THE CATALOGUE HILMA AF KLINT: A PIONEER OF ABSTRACTION
composed of circles, ovals and spirals, which portrayed forces from beyond that she claimed she, as a medium, could perceive, in addition to making reference to ideas based on Theosophy and other variously esoteric tendencies. Af Klint, however, chose not to display these works to the public, and stipulated in her will that they were not to be exhibited until twenty years after her death. Yet in reality, the bulk of this secret production was only made public very recently, the paintings being exhibited for the first time in the spring of 2013, in a major exhibition dedicated to the artist by Stockholm’s Moderna Museet, organised by Iris Müller-Westermann. It would seem that prior to 1915 af Klint had already painted more than two hundred of these apparently abstract compositions (apparently because some of the designs seem to derive from and hint at organic and botanical elements, and because there are authors who doubt that her work represents abstract art in a strict sense), some of which she had created as early as 1906: in other words, before Kandinsky. I must add, as it is an important detail, that although the full magnitude of this work was only recently revealed, a number of her pieces had already been displayed in an exhibition held in 1986 in Los Angeles24, with specific works later appearing in distinguished exhibitions in Stockholm, Frankfurt, New York, London and Paris.

The two exhibitions, at the MoMA and the Moderna Museet in Stockholm, practically coincided in time (December 2012 to April 2013 in the case of the MoMA, and February to May 2013 in Stockholm). The key question, naturally, is whether the MoMA —whose power and influence in shaping the canon of modern art, despite being less than it was decades ago, continues to be considerable— was unable, or unwilling, to present af Klint’s work, and for what reasons. I began to take an interest in this question in early April 2013, at which point my only sources were newspapers, in one of which it was claimed that the MoMA chose not to include Hilma af Klint’s works in the exhibition due to the reticence of the organisers25. It is clear that, had they been included, this would have dramatically changed the story of abstract art’s origins and those who were the true pioneers of this revolution.

As an art historian, it seems obvious to me that the case of Hilma af Klint must be studied to assess whether or not her work should be included in the exciting story of the invention of abstraction. If so, where, and how? If, on the other hand, the answer is negative, we must explain why. It is difficult to justify her exclusion based on her belief that she saw the spirit world, as there is ample documentation of the irrationalist roots, and the influence of spiritualism and other esoteric doctrines, in the first avant-gardes and in abstract art in particular. Alberto Luque, for example, in his book Arte y esoterismo, thoroughly documented the early avant-gardes’ ideological links with occultism26.

Fundamental to any assessment of the MoMA’s exclusion of Hilma af Klint’s work is an understanding of the organisers’ motives, which are mentioned in neither of the two catalogues. Certain reviews and newspaper articles hint at these
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FIGURA 4. HILMA AF KLINT IN HER STUDIO, C. 1895
From Moderna Museet catalogue.
motives, but I wished to verify them through one of the agents directly involved, to which end I wrote to one of the organisers of the exhibition in Stockholm. Jo Widoff kindly informed me that those responsible for the New York exhibition chose not to display Hilma’s works as she had not formed part of the network of connections that was the exhibition’s fundamental concept. Jo also indicated that, like myself, the Museet had been surprised to learn that Hilma had not even been cited in the MoMA’s catalogue.

The MoMA’s argument is interesting and deserving of discussion. Firstly, however, I believe it is fair to say that it would have been more honest for the MoMA to at least make some reference to Hilma, accompanied by their reasons for choosing not to include her. The result of this deliberate silence is that, today, Hilma af Klint simply goes unacknowledged by the New York museum in relation to the invention of abstraction: she does, however, enjoy this recognition on the part of the Moderna Museet in Stockholm.

The MoMA’s explanation gives rise to a number of questions. One of these is whether the concept of an artist’s voluntary avoidance of such networks, and their consequent exclusion from the dominant history of art, might be extrapolated to other artists. Here I refer not to those writers or painters who, in life, were unable to publish or to exhibit, or who attempted to do so and were denied, only achieving recognition posthumously. Of these, there exist countless examples. I speak, rather, of creators, above all in the field of visual arts, who chose to remain outside the artistic networks of their time, and who, despite their wishes and their absence from these networks, art history has incorporated a posteriori into those movements with which they refused to identify.

The second question to be resolved is whether Hilma af Klint was really so radically disconnected from her contemporaries who collaborated in the invention of abstraction. The catalogue of Stockholm’s Moderna Museet states that af Klint twice made contact with Rudolf Steiner, in 1908 and 1920. In the first she invited him to her studio and, one assumes, showed him her work, but Steiner was critical of her activity as a medium, and it is claimed that this affected her in a deeply negative manner. In any case, while Hilma af Klint’s relationship with Theosophy and its leaders is well documented, there is no trace of any connection with artists working towards or in abstraction. Hilma af Klint is absent from the diagram that headlined the exhibition in the MoMA, but it seems this absence is warranted. Curiously, on searching the MoMA’s catalogue for the names Steiner and Blavatsky, in the hopes of some allusion to the artist via the channel of Theosophy, it transpires that these, too, are missing, and not one chapter of the New York catalogue deals with the spiritualism and esotericism of the pioneers of abstract art. It appears, then, that it is precisely this problem that the MoMA marginalises or excludes.

27. Hilma af Klint. A pioneer… pp. 41 and 50.
28. It is, in fact, a common tendency among art historians to look down on this relationship or consider it irrelevant. In a recent interview, Maurice Tuchman affirms that ‘spiritual is still a very dirty word in the art world’ (RACHLIN, Natalia: ‘Giving a Swedish Pioneer of Abstraction Her Due’, The New York Times, 29/04/2013). It would be interesting to identify the networks of museums and other sectors of the art world that have aligned themselves
Hilma af Klint’s exclusion by both the MoMA and canonical art history is a fact that fits perfectly with one of the ideas argued by Nuria Peist in her book *El éxito en el arte moderno*. According to the author, for a modern artist to become established it is essential that said artist has formed part of what she calls the initial artistic nucleus during the first phase of recognition: in other words, that they have acquired sufficient visibility in the network of relationships formed by artists, dealers, critics, collectors and similar agents. If the MoMA did indeed dismiss Hilma af Klint for not belonging to this initial network, this reinforces the truth behind the mechanisms of recognition and establishment advanced by Nuria Peist, albeit through an example of non-recognition. It would be interesting to compile, if they exist, other cases similar to that of the Swedish artist, to be able to complete or extend this theory. Perhaps Hilma af Klint will remain in the ‘realms of consolation’, as Gerard Mauger puts it. If this were the case, one might attempt to identify and analyse the agents, institutions, arguments and channels of diffusion of those who have fought for Hilma af Klint’s recognition, but who, perhaps, are losing, or will lose, the battle.

If the diagram of contacts reproduced here went further, and added —in addition to the lines of communication between artists— museums’ alliances and positions of power, one line, possibly a broken one, would connect the MoMA to the Moderna Museet in Stockholm. Such a diagram should also feature another indicator to show that the position the MoMA occupies, and its degree of power, are far beyond those of Stockholm’s museum, and, as a result, that the New York account of events has many more spokespeople and greater diffusion.

In the MoMA’s version of the birth of abstract art, Picasso and Apollinaire ascend in importance, Kandinsky maintains his position and Hilma af Klint is ignored. The Stockholm exhibition will travel to other European cities in 2013: firstly Berlin and later Malaga. Its visitors, then, will be able to evaluate whether its title, *Hilma af Klint: A pioneer of abstraction*, seems an accurate one, and, thereby, whether or not the MoMA’s exhibition has deprived us of part of the story. Yet the public who visit exhibitions through cultural interest have far less weight in the construction of an artist’s recognition and establishment than those agents and institutions who

with and against the early avant-gardes’ links to occultism, as here too there are sociological conclusions to be drawn. The first exhibition deserving of mention is that of 1986 in the Los Angeles County Museum, *The spiritual in art: Abstract painting 1890–1985*, organised primarily by the aforementioned Maurice Tuchmann, which, we should recall, included the exhibition of works by Hilma af Klint. Another landmark exhibition concerning abstract art was that created in 1996 in the Guggenheim Museum, organised by Mark Rosenthal, *Abstraction in the Twentieth Century: Total Risk, Freedom, Discipline*, The Solomon R. Guggenheim, 1996. The exhibition and its catalogue aimed to depict the historical development of abstraction in its rich variety of forms, but Hilma af Klint is not cited in the chapter dedicated to ‘the pioneers’, nor indeed in any other, and references to Theosophy, Blavatsky and Steiner are minimal. In 2007, Bang Larsen considered that in recent years the theme of occultism had intensified in the world of art (Bang Larsen, Lars: ‘The other side’, *Frieze*, No. 106, April 2007, pp. 114–119), a position also held by Pasi, Marco: ‘A gallery of changing gods: Contemporary art and the cultural fashion of the occult’, CESnUR, 2010). Alberto Luque, however, doubts this supposed intensification (Luque, Alberto: ‘Un dudoso reciente auge del esoterismo en el arte’, http://konstelacio.blogspot.com.es/2013/06/un-dudoso-recente-auge-del-esoterismo.html consulted 03/06/2013). Luque also points out that between 1986 and 2013 the biography dedicated to Hilma af Klint has seen little growth, with hardly a dozen studies not written in Swedish.

29. Peist, Nuria: op. cit.
actively participate in these debates, especially when evaluations are made from dominant positions.

In my opinion, the acceptance of Hilma af Klint as a pioneer of abstract art and an artist of the first order, as well as evaluations that choose not to concede her this role, are opinions corresponding to the positions of power of museums and other implicated agents. A clear identification of the two parties—that is, which museums, exhibitions, organisers, art historians and critics are in favour and which against—would permit an advance in our comprehension of the two competing versions and in the analysis of the direction they have taken and might take in future. It is significant, for example, that the Hilma af Klint exhibition in Spain will take place in Málaga’s Museo Picasso, and not the grand centre of twentieth-century art that is the Museo Reina Sofia. In all likelihood, the Moderna Museet in Stockholm and the Museo Picasso of Málaga have formed an alliance through shared interests and compatible positions in the network of modern art museums: interests and positions quite different to those of the MoMA or the Reina Sofia.

Although this part of the article—the section dedicated to Hilma af Klint’s recognition—is a work in progress, and although when published we will naturally have more information available than what we have thus far been able to employ, its sociological analysis allows us to make certain observations that, if correct, could become predictions. At this time, the museums scheduled to exhibit the Swedish artist’s work in 2013 are not decisive institutions, not members of the upper echelons of the aforementioned museum network. We might expect, from a gender perspective, that support for Hilma af Klint and her art as pioneers of abstraction will increase. As for the statement that the position of museums in the international network is a critical factor—and that this position and the struggles it implies tend to be concealed—I can provide a pair of observations to reinforce this.
claim. The Stockholm museum’s representative who confirmed the MoMA’s reasons for dismissing Hilma af Klint chose not to respond when, in my subsequent email, I asked why, from the wealth of Spanish museums, Malaga’s Museo Picasso was chosen to display Hilma af Klint’s work in Spain. I directed the same question to the museum in Malaga. There I did obtain a response, but hardly a specific one, namely that the selection had been due to ‘common interests’. This, then, was privileged information — perhaps because to reveal it would allow the precise identification of these common interests, and might also show that personal and institutional contacts are more decisive than they appear in the artistic recognition of both artists and museums.

My hypothesis, then, is that the battle for the acknowledgement and appreciation of Hilma af Klint’s work has begun, and will no doubt continue through institutions and agents who occupy non-dominant or secondary positions in the current power structure of modern art. Here I should touch upon another agency of recognition: the art market. It is no small matter, in this context, that Hilma af Klint’s work has thus far remained more or less outside the market: that is, through belonging in large part to a foundation, her work has not been purchased, to the best of our knowledge, by any major collectors or museums. In this sphere, too, the Swedish artist’s work has failed to circulate at the highest levels. Returning to the topic of museums, I was finishing this article when I discovered an addition to the circuit of museums that would exhibit af Klint’s work, in this case in 2014: Denmark’s Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, situated in the north of the country, in the region of Zealand. I believe this fact is coherent with the model expounded here (observe the sequence of institutions: Stockholm’s Moderna Museet, Berlin’s Hamburger Bahnhof, Málaga’s Museo Picasso and Denmark’s Louisiana Museum). I also recently became aware —recall the contemporary nature of many of the topics I am tackling here— that works by Hilma af Klint would be displayed at the Biennale in Venice, from June to September of 2013. Venice’s Biennale is, of course, a key event in the world of contemporary art, leading me to wonder whether my hypothesis might collapse. It appears, however, that the inclusion of five of af Klint’s works in a pavilion of the Biennale was unrelated to any recognition of her role as a pioneer of abstraction. The Biennale’s curator, Massimiliano Gioni, described the motives for her selection in the following manner:

This year’s Biennale poses questions about how dreams and visions are represented: ultimately, it is an exhibition of the kingdom of the invisible and the territories of the imagination. In this field of work, Hilma af Klint is entirely fundamental as the starting point for an investigation into the many ways in which images have been used to organise the knowledge of our experience of the world.32

In other words, although a top-level platform is exhibiting five works by Hilma af Klint, it is doing so for motives of lesser import: because they fit into the theme

of ‘how dreams and visions are represented’, ‘of the kingdom of the invisible and the territories of the imagination’. Note how the organizer Massimiliano Gioni highlights that it is in this field of work that the Swedish artist’s output is fundamental. Even on the web page of Málaga’s Museo Picasso, the exhibition (which will doubtless attract headlines and visitors) is announced with a prominent statement that the Swedish artist’s work belongs ‘to the framework of Nordic mysticism’ and later adds, in a conditional manner, that the artist could be situated alongside fundamental creators of the modern artistic avant-garde, such as the Russian Wassily Kandinsky or the Dutchman Piet Mondrian. I remember watching the director of Barcelona’s Museo de Arte Contemporáneo, Bartomeu Marí, opining on television on the works of Hilma af Klint exhibited in Venice, which reminded him of the mandalas and other esoteric images that hung from his bedroom ceiling as a youth. The MACBA does not share the MoMA’s lofty status, nor does it encompass the same chronology, yet the artistic and ideological tendencies upheld by its directors, and thus its evaluations, are probably similar. In an interview in The Wall Street Journal, we can read how Leah Dickerman, the individual who organised the MoMA’s exhibition Inventing Abstraction, defends her decision to exclude Hilma af Klint as follows: ‘I find what she did absolutely fascinating, but I am not even sure she saw her paintings as artworks’.

In summary, until today —June 2013— Hilma af Klint has had the necessary accomplices for her work to be exhibited, to achieve recognition and, within the art world, to enjoy a certain level of fame. It remains to be seen —and sociological analysis suggests otherwise— whether in the future she will acquire the decisive accomplices she needs to become widely considered a pioneer of abstract art.

POST SCRIPTUM

I finished writing this article more than six months ago. Its sociological focus did not require me to venture an opinion on the aesthetic value of Hilma af Klint’s works, or on the abstract/non-abstract debate. However, I was able to visit the artist’s exhibition in Málaga’s Museo Picasso in early February 2014, shortly before it closed. This direct viewing of her paintings allowed me to evaluate their aesthetic effect, while also helping refine my appreciation of their artistic value and, of course, her status

33. The text that appears on the placard accompanying Hilma af Klint’s work in Venice is very revealing. It begins by stating that the artist ‘experienced visions as a child’, later adding that from 1906 she ‘began to produce an extraordinary series of esoteric paintings and drawings’, and concludes, in its final lines, by relating how when these paintings were finally revealed in the 1990s, ‘af Klint was at last recognized as an independent pioneer of abstract art’ (the italics are mine). It is difficult not to think that leaving this statement until last and qualifying the artist as an ‘independent’ pioneer is a form of compromise, avoiding any clear inclusion or exclusion.
36. Accepted by the journal’s editor (13/02/2014).
(or lack of) as a pioneer of abstract art. As I have dedicated not insignificant hours and effort to studying this case, I will, here, allow myself a more personal opinion.

Did Hilma af Klint, along with the other four women who formed the group of ‘Las Cinco’, create abstract works before 1910–11? Yes. Did she create abstract works after 1910–11? Again, yes. In both cases she alternated these with more figurative works, most likely indicating that abstraction was not her principal objective, but rather one of the many embodiments of her spiritual beliefs and practices.

Hilma af Klint was a talented artist, who broke away from the academic painting of her time and, from a particular moment in time, displayed a surprising and audacious change of register. She explored and fervently practiced a type of painting whose arrangement and aesthetic effects are truly notable (in the Museo Picasso’s exhibit in Málaga, the hall housing the great paintings of the series Los diez mayores produces a powerful effect, similar to what we might call a ‘Rothko effect’). This is a type of painting, furthermore, that bears the hallmarks of the most appreciated concepts in modern art: experimentation and innovation. There is no doubt that her case involves problematic aspects, difficult to assess, or that we are lacking in detailed information. But even in the face of these uncertainties, I believe Hilma af Klint should be included, with all her idiosyncrasies, in the collective of artists identified as pioneers of abstract art. Quite apart from this —and I wish to emphasise this point— her painting is aesthetically and historically valuable, even if we ignore the debate about who came first and simply observe her production between 1907 and 1925. I have shown that, in the short term, it will prove difficult for the majority of modern art’s centres of power to accept that the artist was a pioneer of abstraction. Thus far, she has been and continues to be promoted only in secondary networks. It is my opinion, however, that if in years to come other important museums should organise exhibitions similar to the MoMA’s Inventing Abstraction, Hilma af Klint ought to be considered. For now, I vote in her favour. However, I am not the director of the MoMA. With this, I conclude my post scriptum, before straying too far from sociological analysis.
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