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Cardinal Federico Borromeo (1564-1631) is best known as the founder of the Ambrosiana, the first public library and art gallery in Milan (1603-1618). As cousin of St. Charles Borromeo, he is also considered as an energetic ecclesiastic personality instrumental in bringing about the religious reforms postulated by the Council of Trent. Both St. Charles and Federico Borromeo took a deep interest in art as a form of religious propaganda, but while St. Charles' treatises are occasionally mentioned in the history of artistic theories, Cardinal Federico's literary works are somewhat neglected. His De Pictura Sacra of 1624 has received only two lines in Schlosser's Kunstliterature,
and his Musaeum of 1625 is hardly recorded in bibliographical repertories. In Holt's Documentary History of Art Cardinal Borromeo is not even mentioned, and Lionello Venturi in his History of Art Criticism views Cardinal Borromeo's De Pictura Sacra and the "treatise" written in collaboration by the Jesuit Ottonelli and the painter Pietro da Cortona (1652) as examples of moralistic literature that "have no direct aesthetic interest." Curiously, Pevsner's classic History of the Academies of Art (1940), while it gives a brief but precise account of Federico's institution of the Milanese Academy, makes no reference to any of the Cardinal's writings on art. Well-known art historians such as Panofsky, Lee, and Clark, who have made the Late Renaissance and Early Baroque the object of special and fundamental studies, have no references to Federico Borromeo's writings. And yet, Eugenio Battisti in a chapter of his Rinascimento e Barocco (1960), inspired by Panofsky's Idea and Lee's Ut Pictura Poesis, has shown how profitably those writings could be taken to illustrate important aspects of the "concept of imitation" in Italian Cinquecento Art. Scholars directly or indirectly associated with the Ambrosiana, such as Luca Beltrami, Monsignors Galbiati and Castiglioni, and Professor Nicodemi have contributed much documentary
evidence on Cardinal Borromeo's art patronage and aesthetic views. Such a "parochial" interest has recently led to the special studies by Simonetta Coppa, Ambrogio Palestra, Vittorio Ingegnoli, and Silvana Modena, published in Arte Lombarda, which have proposed a place for Cardinal Borromeo in the history of taste, art criticism, and museology in Lombardy in the early Seicento. But a comprehensive study of his career as an art collector and a scholar is still lacking. Above all, his views on art need to be analyzed in the context of contemporary thought to explain the intellectual background out of which was to come the Milanese Academy of Fine Arts as a complement to the didactic program of the Ambrosian Library and Gallery.

The present dissertation approached these problems as an introduction to a full English translation of the Cardinal's Musaeum, which was published in 1625 as a guidebook to the original nucleus of his art collection. This greatly differs from his other work, the De Pictura Sacra of 1624, in that the Cardinal assumes a less rigid position towards the subject of art as a means of religious propaganda. Here the Cardinal fully reveals his exquisite taste as a collector and his keen sense of history, while his psychological insight in the way of relating works of
art to the problem of the artist's creative process and programmatic motivations, provides an extraordinary and inspiring document for the study of his personality as a patron. His personal relationship with contemporary artists resulted in Jan Brueghel's production of a series of highly sophisticated landscapes of precious Flemish detailing, contrasted as they are by the powerful, monumental little still-life by Caravaggio, which the Cardinal aptly designated of "matchless" beauty and which he wanted exhibited accordingly – in isolation.

His observations on the works of Leonardo and his Milanese followers, on Raphael, Michelangelo, and finally on Titian and other Venetians, are all focused on his personal experience in gathering such celebrated masterpieces as Leonardo's Musician, Raphael's cartoon of the School of Athens and Titian's Adoration of the Magi. His approach to problems related to principles of design is basically conditioned by his knowledge of the theoretical work of Federico Zuccaro, whose Roman Academy founded in 1593 under the aegis of Cardinal Borromeo was to provide a model for the Ambrosian Academy.
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PART ONE

INTRODUCTION
A. FEDERICO BORROMEO AS A HUMANIST AND A PATRON

I. Early Education

Cardinal Federico Borromeo (1564-1631) was a man of multiform accomplishments and showed incredible and inexhaustible energy and insight in the attention he paid to religion, science, art, and culture. One cannot help but glorify his name and memory as Beltrami, Castiglioni, Galbiati, Nicodemi, Ratti, and others have done in the studies cited in the accompanying bibliography. In retrospect, Manzoni's words seem particularly accurate and appropriate:

*His life is like a brook, gushing limpid from the rock without ever going stagnant or turbid, until, after a long passage through many a field, it flows limpid into the river.*

He was a fountainhead of humanism and erudition able to refute tendencies toward a general intellectual and artistic decline. And he was much more. He was not a "carbon copy" of his famous cousin, St. Charles, as Quesnel asserts, but a singular individual who, as Castiglioni has also stated, is worthy of the pain of close scrutiny. Like his cousin St. Charles, however, he himself was a great example for the Milanese people as well as all Italians and his legacies in the form of the Ambrosiana, church projects, and pastoral
activities are testimonies to his extraordinary benificial.

Federico was born in Milan on August 18, 1564 on the eve of St. Charles' triumphal entry into that city. His father, Giulio Cesare, and his mother, Margherita Trivulzio, were Milanese patricians whose families had long historical ties with Italy and Milan. The Borromeo family could, in fact, trace its ancestry back to the sixth century Vitaliani family and could boast, thereafter, of a distinguished number of religious and civic leaders including Frederick Barbarossa and St. Charles. The history of the Trivulzio family is also very old and prestigious. In the future, Federico would use those advantages of great wealth and position in what Manzoni calls, "the quest and practice of the good," considering "how he could make his life useful and holy."²

As Achille Ratti (Pius XI) tells us, St. Charles was a fundamental influence on Federico's spiritual and intellectual growth. Federico considered him "a second father" while St. Charles himself thought of Federico as "his beloved cousin, disciple, and almost son, his successor in his office and his work."³ Federico's first inclination, however, was to follow in the footsteps of his father, Giulio Cesare. In

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Milan and Bologna, he studied civil science. However, not long after, he began to apply himself to religious studies. The move was not unprecedented. In his decision, Federico was following the religious tradition of the Borromeo family, the devout and pious sentiments of his mother, and the example of St. Charles.

When Federico was fourteen years old, St. Charles encouraged him to study at the University of Bologna. There he studied rhetoric, philosophy, and mathematics under the watchful eye of St. Charles' personal friend, Archbishop Gabriele Paleotti (1522-1597). Paleotti had been one of the more zealous executors of the Tridentine Reform and a famous canonist. His moral theology, *Intellectual Discourse of Sacred and Profane Images*, of which only two of the originally intended books were published, appeared in 1582. The moralistic and didactic reflections expressed by Paleotti would later reappear in Federico's *De Pictura Sacra* (1624), more of which will be said later.

Federico had firmly committed himself to the ecclesiastic ministry by 1580. Shortly after, he was sent by St. Charles to the college which St. Charles himself had founded, the Collegio Borromeo at Pavia, in order to complete his education in theology and philosophy. There, in the spirit of St. Charles, he
founded, in 1582, the Accademia degli Accurati for students of theology. The Academy was visited even by the young St. Luigi Gonzaga and Nicola Sfondrati (later Gregory XIV). Also of monumental importance was Federico's growing concern and passion for religious works of art. During this period, Federico writes:

... I remember that at that time I had conceived a passion for sacred pictures of really good workmanship. And having gone one day to Milan and being a guest in the house of St. Charles, I had a great wish to become possessor of a painting representing the Nativity of our Lord, and when someone present with perhaps excessive boldness interposed on my behalf, I asked for the gift of it. Then the Saint told me in the most kindly way, that it was indeed a noble piece of painting and it was not little that I demanded; but, having with his words, as it were, raised the price of the picture and after keeping me for some time in suspense, he then of his own accord made me a present of it. I later placed this same picture in our house and it was indeed a souvenir to be jealously guarded in memory of its donor, St. Charles.

This is an early reference in the writings of Federico Borromeo to Federico Barocci's famous and beautiful Nativity, which he had intended for the Ambrosiana as early as 1607. By March 9, 1585, Federico had been awarded a doctorate in theology.
II. Rome, 1586-1595

A number of momentous events were soon to follow. After the death of St. Charles in 1584, the Borromeo family began to strive for religious recognition from the Pope in Rome. Federico would take "the habit from the hand of his cousin Charles, already proclaimed for some time by universal renown as a saint." Encouraged by Cardinal Altemps, Federico went to Rome in 1586, stopping in Ferrara to pay a visit to Torquanto Tasso, then in prison. The future Cardinal-Archbishop would always covet his friendships and relationships with contemporary authors, scholars, scientists, and artists.

He remained in Rome until 1595, except for two trips to Lombardy during 1592. Due to the strife between the Milanese and Spanish government, he returned again to Rome in April, 1597. Here he was to remain for another four years. On December 22, 1587, he was named Cardinal by Sixtus V and in 1595, upon the death of Cardinal Gaspare Visconti, was made Archbishop of the Diocese of Milan by Clement VII.

The general effect of his sojourns in Rome upon his intellectual, religious, and aesthetic development was considerable. His daily life unfolded in a disciplined program of vita activa and vita contemplativa. Beginning
at dawn, his "vita dei negozi" consisted in actions and external operations which were connected to the demands of his rank and office. This was followed at night until almost morning by the "vita degli studi," which consisted of explorations into the fields of theology, philosophy, literature, pedagogics, science, aesthetics, and classical antiquity - all investigated with remarkable insight and in certain areas, given some new solutions.7

He allied himself with the intellectual circle of Romans. During the period of the Counter Reformation this band of saints and scholars fostered the flowering of a new, intensified religious piety in all areas of daily life and in religious activities. They combined learning and scholarship with an awareness of the need for social reform. Among them were personal friends of St. Charles: Cardinals Baronius and Bellarmino, St. Philip Neri, S. Giuseppe Calasanzio, and others. Federico would continue the special affection that they had expressed for St. Charles.

Cardinal Cesare Baronius, the scholarly author of the Ecclesiastical Annals, and the editor of codexes in the Vatican Library, was the "good angel" of St. Charles and Federico. A full account of his relation to the Borromeo's is given by Achille Ratti.8 It was
Baronius who saw in Charles' younger cousin the great virtues of his saintly cousin come to life again. That St. Charles had chosen Federico as his favorite pupil and the object of his most tender cares justified with admirable fidelity the forethought and hopes of his saintly master. It was Baronius who had acted as spokesman for Federico before Pope Clement VIII and before Pope Leo XI and was the most active promoter of St. Charles' canonization. The respect and friendship between the elder Cardinal and Federico was so exalted that Federico included Baronius' portrait in the Ambrosiana while Baronius himself dedicated the second volume of his Annals to Federico.

Of interest is the link between Baronius, St. Charles, Federico, and St. Philip Neri. Baronius had been an Oratorian and St. Philip's protégé. He had even on certain occasions fulfilled the duties of a cook in St. Philip's Oratory. Philip himself was a man of admirable sincerity and singular sanctity, who as the "Apostle of Rome," directed the care and zeal of his apostolate to the youths of his time, as well as to the clergy. A man of his times, he helped bring the Catholic church into the modern world by establishing the order of the Oratorians. These non-monastic secular priests were virtuous beings who displayed humility,
dedication in a messianic sense, and erudition. The special affection between St. Philip and St. Charles was continued after St. Charles' death by his younger cousin, Federico, and is testified by the ample correspondence between the two in the Ambrosiana. Of significance is St. Philip's paternal role as confessor and counselor to the two Borromeos. As St. Charles had done in the past, Federico often frequented the Oratory at Vallicella considering it as his own home and where the priests acted as brothers to him. St. Philip himself encouraged Federico to the See of Milan and suggested the example of St. Charles as a model for Federico's own life. In Milan, Federico was a promoter of the Oblate order which St. Charles himself, despite some difficulties, had established. After St. Philip's canonization in 1622, Federico erected a church in Milan dedicated to the Virgin and St. Philip Neri. The church was rebuilt in 1680. Supposedly, Federico also commissioned a portrait of St. Philip in colored wax.

The Cardinal's associations and friendships also included the celebrated Latinist Silvio Antoniano, and Antonio Querengo; the scholarly theologian, archaeologist, Oriental linguist, and Director of the Stamperia Vaticana, Pietro Morino; the noted bibliophile and
humanist-collector, Fulvio Orsini; Cardinals R. Acquaviva and Cinzio Aldobrandini; the scholars Bellarmino, Agellio, Maldonato, Valverde, and Toletto; the poet and Florentine patron, G. B. Strozzi who later acquired books and manuscripts for the Ambrosiana; and the Florentine Giovanni Ciampoli, whose scholarly sphere included Maffeo Barberini, Alessandro Rinuccini, and Fulvio Testi. To this list may be added the names of other "intimates:" Gian Vincenzo Pinelli; Lodovico Settala; the philosopher and poet, Francesco Patrizi; Duke Giovanni d'Altemps, Orazio Cavalcanti, the two Cesi, Domenico Cittadini, Andrea Cioli, Giovanni di Guevara, Paolo Gualdo, Filippo Magalotti, Curzio Picchena, Lorenzo Pignoria, Ottavio Pisani, Giusto Riquio, Giovanfrancesco Sagredo, Tommaso Segget, Tiberio Spinola; the flemands Justus Lipius and Hendrick van der Putte, and above all, Galileo Galilei. Of interest is the correspondence between Galileo and the Cardinal, his impressive gifts of printed works sent to him, and the mention Galileo makes of Federico in his *Istoria e dimostrazioni intorno alle macchie solari*, Rome, 1613.

His interest in the arts brought him into contact with numerous distinguished artists including Federico Zuccaro. In 1593, the Academy of St. Luke was founded
under the patronage of Cardinal Borromeo. Thus, as Nicodemi suggests, the idea of promoting a similar version in Milan was born. In his letter to the "principe e signori amatori dei disegno, della pittura, della scultura e dell'architettura," sent from Mantua to the printer, Francesco Osanna, in 1605, Zuccaro proposed the Roman Academy as a model for versions "in more places" in Italy as well as in Milan (to be under the protection of Federico). Cardinal Borromeo is mentioned in 1599 in the dedication of L'Origine e progresso dell'Accademia del Disegno, de' Pittori, Scultori ed Architetti, the collected discourses of the Roman Academy compiled by Zuccaro's secretary, Romano Alberti. Zuccaro's name is further connected to the Borromeo family. Together with Cesare Nebbia, Zuccaro decorated the reception room of the Collegio Borromeo in Pavia with didactic frescoes relating to the creation of the cardinalship of St. Charles between 1602 and 1604. Still further, if not belated, homage is paid to Zuccaro by Federico who took the former's L'Idea de' Pittori, Scultori ed Architetti of 1607 as a model for his Musaeum of 1625.

The Cardinal's passion for art and his personal esteem for numerous artists motivated his affectionate interest and patronage of the noted painters, Jan Brueghel,
Paul Brill, and Johann Rottenhammer. The three artists were his guests first in his home in the Piazza Navona from 1593 to 1595 and later in the residence of the arcivescovado in Milan. The fact that he considered Brueghel almost a son is testified by their reciprocal esteem. Paintings as the Elements and other works which the Cardinal commissioned from Brueghel for his Gallery of Painting and Sculpture in the Ambrosiana and the voluminous correspondence between the two, published in 1868 by a prefect of the Ambrosiana, Giovanni Crivelli, are evidence of a mutual esteem which turned into friendship.

In connection with his love for art were his frequent explorations of the catacombs in Rome. In the Ambrosiana is a notebook of Federico's containing notes and sketches of works of art and monuments in that city, especially those located near ruins. Many of the sacred and profane images, notably in the catacombs, are described with relish in the pages of his later De Pictura Sacra. An image of Orpheus with the lyre between two saints and prophets of the Old Testament, is carefully described by the Cardinal in a letter of 1605 to the erudite German, Marco Velsero, and can be seen in a copy he secured, now in the Ambrosiana.12
III. Milan, 1595-1631

After his return to Milan on August 29, 1595, until his death on September 21, 1631, Cardinal Borromeo was one of the most distinguished religious reformers and patron of the arts in Milanese history. Again, the example of St. Charles comes to mind. Federico relentlessly endeavored to apply the canons of the Tridentine Council in every field of religious life and ecclesiastical activity. Faced with the onslaught of civil authority, he defended and upheld, as St. Charles had done, the point of examination of the church. He founded numerous churches and colleges often at his own expense. On July 27, 1621, he founded the Accademia degli Ermatenaici for students of theology, and in those years established in the heart of the Collegio dei Nobili, the Accademia dei Perseveranti. He also established the archbishopric and built the hospital at Gianpielo. Of his participation in fourteen diocesan synods, the provincial council of 1609, and his other pastoral activities sufficient reports are to be seen in the Treccani Storia di Milano, and in more specialized studies by Galbiati, Castiglioni, and others cited in the bibliography. Well-known, too, are his activities in connection with the famine in Milan of 1627
and 1628 and the Milanese plague of 1630.

His preoccupation with aesthetics and architectural theory may be seen in his attempts to build, restore, and beautify many sacred edifices. A full account of Federico's conservation and beautification projects is given by Ambrogio Palestra in an article in *Arte Lombarda*. These concerns have much in common with those of St. Charles and are in keeping with St. Charles' attitudes toward aesthetics and architectural theory as expressed in his *Arte Sacra*.

IV. The Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 1603-1609

a. The Program

The Ambrosian Library, founded in 1603 and solemnly inaugurated on December 8, 1609, was outstanding among Cardinal Borromeo's cultural interests. As a young man his humanism developed into a passion for, and knowledge of books, which he called his "friends." He began to collect them early, especially during his stay in Rome between 1580 and 1590. It was there that he purchased antique codices and books to be forwarded later to the Arcivescovado of Milan and, eventually, the Ambrosian Library. His program was undoubtedly inspired by the
example set by his cousin St. Charles, whose library he had even thought of transferring to the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, and above all by such illustrious precedents as the Vatican Library, opened by Nicholas V (1447-1455) "pro communi doctorum commodo," and expanded by the acquisition of the vast libraries of Cardinal Antonio Carafa in 1591 and Fulvio Orsini in 1600; the library put together by Cosimo and Lorenzo de' Medici and later developed into the public collection housed in Michelangelo's Laurentian Library; the fabulous collection of manuscripts gathered by Federico da Montefeltro at Urbino from after 1450 and later acquired by the Vatican, and finally the manuscript collection of Cardinal Bessarion which was to constitute the original nucleus of the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice (1468). Such public libraries in Rome as the Casanatense, the Angelica and those founded by the Jesuit order to promote Catholic education are more or less contemporary with the Ambrosiana.

Shortly before leaving Rome in 1595, Cardinal Federico wrote to a friend "that such crude centuries may not return, the ancient barbarism that our grandparents or great grandfathers saw, towards which Italy seems to be declining, although she has been the nurse and mother of all the graces and all civilized customs."
In this corner of Italy, on her frontiers, at the foot of the Alps and of mountains once hard to cross, we shall try to keep the fine arts with us, however much they want to escape over the mountains or beyond the sea. The passage alludes to the complex aims of the founder of the Ambrosiana. The library was meant not only as a center of Catholic learning for the repudiation of heresy and the propagation of the faith, but also as a revival of the glories of the Renaissance, in a way that was to provide an energetic stimulus to the cultural and artistic activities in his time. Far from adopting an antiquarian approach to the study of Classical and Medieval authors, he brought to life the lesson of antiquity in the form of an intellectual ferment which characterizes his relationship with both Italian and foreign scholars. In his modesty, he called his library not "Federiciana" but "Ambrosiana", recalling his beloved St. Ambrose, the fourth century bishop who gave his name to the Milanese church, and the ancient library that stood at one time near the temple of St. Ambrogio of which some remains are in the tabularium of the presbytery of the Basilica. However, the Ambrosian Library was much more due to the far-sighted genius of its founder. Financed almost entirely by Cardinal Federico, it was the
first public library, open to scholars and students alike (four hours a day - now increased to five) and was the first in which the books were not chained to the desks. Early travellers confirm these facts. Richard Lassels reports in his Italian Voyage (1698) that the "Bibliotheca Ambrosiana... is one of the best libraries in Italy, because it is not so coy as the others, which scarce let themselves be seen; whereas this opens its doors publicly to all comers and goers, and suffers them to read what book they please." 16

In order to separate the functions of administration from those of research, the Cardinal provided an original solution. In September, 1607, he added to the rules and constitutions of the library a College of Conservators, a body of seven men to superintend the maintenance of the library and a College of Doctors. All members of the College of Conservators were appointed for five year terms except for the senior member of the Borromeo family who was a member for life. The College of Doctors consisted of nine members, scholars who were financed by Federico himself during his lifetime; after his death, however, due to insufficient funds, these were reduced to two. These eminent and able men were responsible for research in specialized branches of knowledge - theology, history, letters, ecclesiastical
history, Greek, and oriental languages - and were to publish their efforts at least within three years of appointment. The latter were also in charge of the care of books and manuscripts, with the help of writers and distributors; were to provide assistance to both students and scholars, and were to profit by their relationships with Italian and foreign scholars in order to learn of the latest scientific advances. To them Federico gave the motto, "Singuli singula," indicating that each Doctor was to devote himself to a specific area of knowledge and research; it was also placed as a frontispiece to their meeting room. The founder also provided them with a printing press, still operable today, not only for the Italian and Latin languages but also for Oriental ones - Hebrew, Chaldaic, Arabic, Persian, and Armenian - and attached it to the library. Antonio Olgiato, Antonio Salmazia, Giuseppe Ripamonti, Antonio Giggio, Francesco Bernardino Ferraro, Benedetto Sossago, Antonio Rusca, Francesco Collino, and Giuseppe Visconti comprised the original list of doctors. Since its first Prefect, Antonio Olgiati, the history of the Ambrosiana is linked to many eminent scholars among its doctors - Giuseppe Ripamonti, who published several books on Milanese history; the famous historian Lodovico Antonio Muratori; Francesco Rivola, who printed his
Grammar and Armenian dictionary; Pier Paolo Bosca, who published the history of the library itself and studies on the Ambrosian martyrology; Angelo Mai, decipherer and editor of the Bobbio palimpsests and later Cardinal-Prefect of the Vaticana (1810-1819); G. Antonio Sassi, who wrote a history of Milan and biographies of the archbishops of Milan; Giovanni Crivelli, who published the correspondence between Cardinal Borromeo and Giovanni Brueghel; Achille Ratti (Pope Pius XI); Cardinal Giovanni Mercanti; Giovanni Galbiati, and today Angelo Paredi. Of course, many other names can be included in this list of distinguished men.

To the library, the founder also added a trilingual college for the study of Greek, Latin, and Italian and a school, the "Collegio degli Alunni," in which to learn these languages and subjects; from its ranks, in turn, were drawn its future teachers.

b. The Book Collection

The Cardinal developed a systematic plan for the collection of books and manuscripts, originals and copies. Between the years 1601 and 1609, he sent eight men, experts and men of learning, with detailed instructions to Italy, France, Spain, Germany, Flanders, Greece,
Lebanon, and Jerusalem to acquire for his library books and manuscripts. He sent his secretary, Giacomo Grozi, to the principal cities in Italy; Antonio Olgiati who became the Cardinal's first Librarian and first Prefect of the Ambrosiana to Germany; the Milanese, Francesco Bernardino Ferrari, later Olgiati's successor as Prefect, to Spain; Antonio Salmazia, later an Ambrosian doctor, to Albania, Corfu where he acquired one hundred and thirteen codices between 1607 and 1608, the Peloponnesis, Negroponte, Morea, the island of Eubea, Zante, and Macedonia; Grazio Grazi, to Calabria and Abruzzi; Giovanni Battista Besozzi and Fabio Leuco to Naples; Michele Maronita to Syria and other portions of the Orient; Gian Giacomo Valieri, Canon of Santa Maria della Scala and noted collector, to Bobbio. Few served the Cardinal unfaithfully with the prominent exception of the Greek, Francesco Notara who "ate the denari" meant for the purchase of books. Other "hommes de confiance" included bishops, missionariers; a converted Rabbi, Domenico Gerosolimitano, who obtained Hebrew manuscripts and some rare printed books from Jewish communities in Bologna and other Italian towns; agents whom he continually maintained in Rome; Tuscans, Neapolitans, captains of the Genoese, Tuscan, and Neopolitan navys, and Venetian residents of Alexandria,
Cairo, Cyprus, Damascus, and Aleppo secured books and manuscripts for the library mostly singly or in small numbers. Many works for the library were also obtained from churches and monasteries of northern Italy; from the north and from western Europe came many Latin manuscripts; and from the south of Italy and from the archipelago came many Greek codices. Seventy-six of the "bobbiesi" manuscripts from the Benedictine monastery of Bobbio and a large portion of the library of Gian Vincenzo Pinelli were acquired for the Ambrosiana at this time. The latter was bought for 3,050 scudi at auction in Naples and shipped to the Ambrosiana in seventy chests, and were among those works which survived the vicissitudes of Pinelli's library after his death. Unsuccessful attempts to purchase the libraries of Cardinal Ascanio Colonna in Rome and that of Giacomo Barocci were also made. The founder, however, at great expense, had succeeded in assembling around 30,000 printed books, originally housed in Room M or the Sala Antica and 14,000 manuscripts including over one thousand in Greek, sought after as the Renaissance custom; in Oriental languages, rarely given greater prominence; and in Latin, Italian, Persian, Turkish, and Arab. Later additions to the library include the library of the Marchesa Clerici and Contessa Bigli in 1770 and
Signori Simonetta in 1762, the collection of the Greek and Latin Fathers of Migne, 23,000 volumes from the Marchese Fagnani, 20,000 volumes from the Baron Pietro Custodi, and many more. As we shall see, these additions required building expansions which came to affect the original plan.

c. The Leonardo Collection

The Ambrosian Library is best known for its Leonardo collection. Today it consists only of the famous Codex Atlanticus and a number of individual drawings, this being the part of the Napoleon booty that was returned in 1815, while eleven notebooks are still in the Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France in Paris (Fig. 1). The history of these manuscripts is well-known. The collection was acquired by Count Galeazzo Arconati from the estate of the sculptor Pompeo Leoni in 1614 and was given to the Ambrosian Library in 1637, six years after the Cardinal's death. Arconati had refused a tempting offer from Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, who was after the Codex Atlanticus and who already owned the other Leonardo manuscripts and drawings which are now in England, but in spite of his generosity Arconati did not make a straightforward donation. He reserved the right to take any of the donated manuscripts home, and there
Fig. 1. The Leonardo Manuscripts in the Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France, Paris.

This photograph taken by Professor Pedretti in 1962 shows for the first time a display of all the Leonardo Manuscripts which were once in the Ambrosian Library, Milan. In the center, standing against the box, is MS. C, on the binding of which is visible the 1603 dedication of Guido Mazenta to Cardinal Federico Borromeo. It was the first Leonardo Manuscript to enter the Ambrosiana as a gift of Cardinal Borromeo in 1609. The other manuscripts, including the Codex Atlanticus which was returned to the Ambrosiana in 1815, were the gift of Count Galeazzo Arconati in 1637, except for the small note-book shown on the far left, next to the box, which is MS. K, the gift of Count Archinto in 1674. The original gift also included the Codex Trivulzianus which is now in the Sforza Castle, Milan, and which was replaced by Arconati himself with MS. D (right foreground) sometime after 1637.
is evidence that he did not donate all the manuscripts in his possession - in fact the fifth item in his deed of donation is the manuscript now known as the Codex Trivulzianus (Sforza Castle, Milan), which at some time Arconati had substituted with MS. D, a small treatise on optics. 20

Undoubtedly, the Leonardo manuscripts have always had a great appeal to collectors, independent of their monetary value, and this has been the cause of much dispersion and even loss. Cardinal Borromeo himself was no exception. One of the manuscripts now in Paris was not part of the Arconati donation, but entered the Ambrosian Library in 1609 as a gift of Cardinal Borromeo. This is MS. C, recorded in early sources as a treatise on Light and Shade (De Ombra e Lume). It was presented to the Cardinal in 1603 by Guido Mazzenta, who had obtained it from the Melzi estate at Vaprio d'Adda and who had it properly bound in leather with decorative impressions and the inscription: VIDI MAZENTAE /
  . PATRITII . MEDIONLANENSIS . / LIBERALITATE / AN. M.D.C.III. The manuscript is dated by Leonardo himself 1490-1491, and still carries the early designation ".G." (Libro G) given by the compiler of Leonardo's Treatise on Painting. Professor Pedretti has shown that none of the Leonardo notes in that manuscript was trans-
cribed in the Treatise, and yet he has called attention to the list of the manuscripts used in the compilation, in which MS. C. (Libro G) appears coupled with another manuscript designated as Libro W:

Libro de Ombra e lume segnato .G.  
Un altro del medesimo segnato .W.

Thus the suggestion that both manuscripts were originally together and that only the materials in the lost Libro W was transcribed into the Treatise on Painting. Professor Pedretti has further shown that such material would date from a late period of Leonardo's activity, about 1508-1510, at the time of Leonardo's compilations of such treatises as the Codex Leicester on water, which is of the same format as MS. C. The suspicion that Cardinal Borromeo was given both manuscripts in the way they were originally together (and as such bound by Arconati), was confirmed upon examination of the manuscript in the Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France, which shows that the spine of the binding is large enough to contain another such manuscript, and that the fly leaves are torn off and the manuscript itself is somewhat loose inside the binding. 21 Finally, Professor Nicodemi informed Professor Pedretti that in 1958 he had heard of the existence of an unpublished Leonardo manuscript on Light and Shade in one of the private libraries of the Borromeo family in Lombardy. Nothing has yet come out
of this mysterious and fascinating story. The discovery of one such manuscript would offer a most important element for the study of Leonardo's artistic theories, but would also throw a somewhat dubious light on the splendid record of Cardinal Borromeo as a Maecenas - and it is easy to predict that it will never reappear.

The second item of Arconati's deed of donation is not a Leonardo manuscript but the famous *Divina Proportione* by Luca Pacioli, for which Leonardo is said to have provided the illustrations. A splendid facsimile edition of this manuscript has been recently published as one of the *Fontes Ambrosiani* (Vol. XXXI).

One of the Leonardo manuscripts now in Paris had not entered the Ambrosiana with the Arconati donation of 1637, but with the donation of Count Archinti in 1674. This is MS. K, which consists of three pocket-size notebooks bound together and dating from 1503-1505 and 1506-1507.

The Leonardo collection at the Ambrosiana include important apographs of Leonardo's writings, among which is the manuscript copy of the *Treatise on Painting* compiled by Cassiano del Pozzo and with Poussin's original drawings. These manuscripts were formerly in the Albani library in Rome and were taken to France as part of the Napoleon booty; they were sent back to the
Ambrosiana in exchange for the original manuscripts. Curiously, they had originated in the Ambrosiana in that it was Arconati who had them compiled from the original manuscripts at the request of Cardinal Barberini in Rome. Arconati had also acquired some Leonardo cartoons from the same Leoni estate, including the Burlington House cartoon of the Virgin and Child with St. Anne which is now in the National Gallery in London and which will be considered in Section B below.

There is no evidence about the time the individual Leonardo drawings entered the Ambrosiana, but this must have been at a later time, as is certainly the case with those from the Codex Resta. Some are small fragments, and Professor Pedretti has shown that at least two of them were taken from sheets of the Codex Atlanticus when the Codex was not yet there.23

d. The Architectural Plans

Cardinal Borromeo had the library built between 1603 and 1609. While in Rome, he had been present during the construction of the new Salone Sistino (1585 to 1590), the great library hall on the upper floor of the Vatican Library, whose architect was Domenico Fontana and whose frescoes depicting themes of Roman monuments and ancient
libraries, ecumenical councils, and portraits of the traditional inventors of the alphabets were by Cesare Nebbia, Giovanni Guena and their assistants. This must have been an additional instigation to carry out his program of building a public library in Milan, in which to place the books and manuscripts he had collected.

All the architects whom he consulted agreed that the site near the left side of the church of S. Sepolcro was ideal because of its central location (near the Cathedral) and because it was readily available. The narrow lot (13.60 x 70 mt.) stretched from the south side of Piazza S. Sepolcro along the present Via dell'Ambrosiana and included three small houses of the Oblati. The north end of this lot consisted of the site of the old Scuola Taverna (Fig. 2, nos. 6-10) which was separated by the small church of S. Maria della Rosa (1456) by a passage (Fig. 2, no. 11). The remaining property was purchased in 1811, and from 1829 to 1836 the architects Santagostino and Moraglia carried out the definitive systematization of the area, which resulted in the building complex as known today (Fig. 3): this incorporated the church of S. Maria della Rosa, which was demolished in 1828, and S. Sepolcro. Existing buildings such as the oratories next to S. Sepolcro (Fig. 2, nos. 12, 13) were incorporated and modified in.
Fig. 2. Plan of the original buildings of the Ambrosiana, 1603-1609 and 1611-1630.

Fig. 3. Plan of the Ambrosiana buildings after the definitive arrangements of 1928-1932.
the definitive plan. And with the bequests of Marchese Fagnani (died 1840) and Baron Pietro Custodi (died 1843) the rooms which had been built for the Gallery (nos. 9, 10) were turned into the "Sala Fagnani" and "Sala Custodi". Accordingly, the area of the garden, porch and Sedes Graphidis (nos. 6-8) was turned into the large "Sala Iemale."

If the question of the site was easily solved, the problems of aesthetics and architectural principles inherent in the project required intense consideration. Several projects were submitted, with solutions ranging from centralized to axial buildings. But the Cardinal had clear ideas about the plan and the choice of architect. This was Lelio Buzzi, who is mentioned by Girolamo Borsieri as a renowned Milanese architect along with G. Meda, Martino Bassi, P. A. Barca, A. M. Corbetta, Aurelio Trezzo, and Francesco Maria Richino. Formerly a city architect and engineer, and at various times connected with projects for the Cathedral and the archbishopric, Buzzi had worked for the Ambrosiana as early as 1602. As Borsieri also confirmed in 1619, the original architect of the library project was Buzzi and not - as generally believed - Fabio Mangone. It was only at the end of 1608 that Mangone, then twenty years old, was to become the architect of the Ambrosian Library and was
given Francesco Fontana as an assistant. As shown in the plan reproduced by Bosca in 1672 (Fig. 4), the original library (1603-1609) consisted only of the vestibule, "salone" (library), atrium, and two smaller "stanze," the hall of the Collegio Ambrosiano and the "Aula Imaginum." The dominant longitudinal axis of this plan runs parallel to the nave of the Romanesque church of S. Sepolcro, which is now incorporated in the complex of the Ambrosiana buildings as developed subsequently (Fig. 2), and which had so much bearing on the activities of both St. Charles and Cardinal Federico Borromeo. It was there, in fact, that St. Charles founded the Order of the Oblati, which provided the Ambrosian Library with a number of manuscripts and printed books. And it was the room of the Oblati that in 1810, at the suppression of the Order, was added to the Ambrosiana and with it the large Luini fresco of the Coronation of Christ with Thorns of 1521. The lunette over the main entrance of S. Sepolcro was originally painted with Bramantino's Deposition of about 1495, a fresco greatly admired in the sixteenth century for the perspective background and for the foreshortening of the Christ's body. It is now a detached fragment kept in the Ambrosian Gallery. Works by Leonardo's pupils at S. Sepolcro include a triptych by Marco d'Oggiono and a Nativity by Giampietrino, which
Fig. 4. Plan of the original Ambrosian Library. After Bosca, 1672.
are now in the Ambrosian Gallery. Finally, the architecture of the church greatly interested Leonardo who recorded the plans of both the lower church (crypt) and the upper one on folio 57 recto of MS. B, a manuscript which was once in the Ambrosian Library and is now at Paris.\(^{24}\)

Since the period of St. Charles' leadership in the arts in Milan, a certain austerity or strictness pervaded up through the turn of the century. Milan became what Wittkower calls, "the stronghold of uncompromising classicism" in architecture.\(^{25}\) The Counter Reformation postulated that every aspect of church building and religious services should be as impressive and dignified as possible. These sentiments were certainly expressed by St. Charles in his *Arte Sacra* and by Gabriele Paleotti in his *Discorso intorno alle Imagini Sacre e Profane.* The natural choice was an austere classicism which reigned in Milan in the architecture of St. Charles' protégé, Pellegino Tibaldi., e.g. his project for the facade of the Duomo (c. 1567) with its colossal order of Corinthian columns, through the period of Federico's favorites: Lelio Buzzi, Francesco Maria Richini, Fabio Mangone, and Lorenzo Binago, called Biffi, all of whom executed projects for the Duomo and who practiced one form or another of classically inspired designs.
The original facade of the Ambrosian Library, on Piazza S. Sepolcro, was conceived as the reminder of that austere classicism practiced in Milan. It was designated as a temple front approached by steps (1613-1620 addition). On the front of the projecting vestibule, the building projects slightly and displays marble pilaster strips in two long rows alternating with window spaces and crowned by a triangular tympanum. Above the projecting vestibule appears a large semi-circular window which alludes to the barrel vaulted room behind (the "Library"). Not only does the design recall the style of Tibaldi but also the influence of Palladio's church facades, despite its somewhat harsher classicism. As Wittkower states, Milanese architects drew inspiration from the antique via Palladio as "symbols in line with the spirit of reform of the city." It also recalls Mangone's design for S. Maria Podone of 1626 (Fig. 5). A statue of Cardinal Borromeo by Costantino Corti of 1865 carries on the base a well-known eulogy by Manzoni.

The arrangement of the library as shown in the plan given by Bosca in 1672, has a Palladian sense of symmetry, axial planning, harmonic proportions and the classical purity of the block and supporting members, as in Palladio's "urban" type villas for narrow and deep plots in Vicenza as the Palazzo Iseppo Porto and the Palazzo Porto.
Fig. 5. Facades of S. Caterina di Brera, S. Maria Podone and Biblioteca Ambrosiana. Milan, Civica Raccolta delle Stampe, Castello Sforzesco.
Breganze. It also recalls the plan of Sammicheli's Palazzo Pompei at Verona, and of the library of the Escorial inaugurated by Philip II in 1584.

The interior of the vestibule measures 6.50 meters by 4.00 meters and was reached through the entrance door. It was illuminated by seven windows. A passage in the back wall placed in line with the entrance portal led to the main and largest room of the Ambrosiana, the Library (26 x 13 mt.), which was designed by Lelio Buzzi and Francesco Maria Richino. Two open windows at the height of the walls provided light while the room was crowned by a high barrel vault that rested at the top of the cornice. Fifteen thousand manuscripts and thirty thousand printed books were shelved behind brass grills in bookcases running the height of the soffit of the vault. Morigia remarks in his Nobiltà di Milano (1619) that the library was marvelous since it was not half full of desks with untied and chained books and that these books were distributed in an ordered and proportioned fashion, thus marking the books readily accessible.27 Drawings for the brass mesh for the lower shelves to the decoration of the soffits remain.28 Two friezes of author's and artists' portraits, mostly copied from Paolo Giovio's famous series at Como, ran along the gallery and above the bookcases. To the rear
of the library, also planimetrically aligned with the entrance wall, was a square peristyle or atrium enclosed on three sides by a portico. This peristyle consisted of eight columns and from one of its sides gave way to a stairway leading to the rooms above and below ground level. The underground basement was a marvel - humidity controlled and adequate storage space for the archive cards of the library and "prohibited" books. On the other side of the peristyle was the entrance to the "Hall of the Collegio Ambrosiano" (7.80 x 5.40 mt.) which served as a meeting room for the Conservators. Through its rear access was a room designed to house manuscripts. These rooms still remain and are the only ones which reflect the original plan.

By 1611, it was necessary to enlarge the library due to the growing number of books and manuscripts. Beginning in 1613, Fabio Mangone completed the four rooms and garden to the rear of the original project. He added the small garden (ca. 13 x 13 mt.) with its series of rectangular flower beds and unusual "palm" fountain. This garden gave access to the street via a gate. Federico appealed to the fathers of the church of S. Maria della Rosa and requested a small residence of Count Marliani's located to the east of the Ambrosiana. Through a portico carried on two columns, one approached a door
leading to the Academy of Painters, more of which will be said below, while the two end rooms occupied the remainder of a long narrow building adjoining the church of S. Maria della Rosa. These are the rooms of Cardinal Borromeo's Museum or Gallery of Painting and Sculpture.

V. The Pinacoteca Ambrosiana, 1607-1618

a. Program and holdings

The Cardinal's love of art, intimately correlated with science as previously mentioned, was above all fostered during his stay in Rome, by family tradition, and by the example of his cousin, St. Charles. His connection with the Roman Academy, and such distinguished artists as Jan Brueghel, Brill, and Rottenhammer has also been noted. The Cardinal's interest and patronage of the arts continued in Milan between 1594 and his death in 1631. Under the leadership taken by the Cardinal in the arts, Milanese art, according to Waterhouse, "rose above the mediocrity during what has rightly been called the 'Borromeo period,' and its solemn and rather passionate tongue, perhaps tinged a little with Spanish gravity, is the direct reflection of the spirit of Federico Borromeo." With the Deed of Gift of April 28, 1618,
Federico presented to the Ambrosiana the nucleus of what was destined to become the first public art museum in which works of art were collected, preserved and exhibited as a means of public edification. The Deed of Gift contains a list and summary description of works of art given to the Ambrosiana by Federico under the following classifications:

A. Gli originali degli artefici maggiori che contengono istorie e ritratti. (Originals by major artists which represent istorie and portraits.)

B. Gli originali dei pittori men celebri che contengono istorie. (Originals by less celebrated painters which represent istorie.)

C. Gli originali dei paesi. (Original landscapes.)

D. Le copie fatte con diligenza. (Copies made with diligence.)

E. Ritratti fatti da pittori men celebri. (Portraits by less celebrated painters.)

F. Le opere di minature. (Minatures.)

G. I disegni. (Drawings.)

Altogether there were over one hundred fifty items, in addition to those already given in 1607 and 1611, which included Barrocci's Nativity and Caravaggio's Basket of Fruit.

The catholic tastes displayed by the Cardinal are further elaborated in the descriptions contained in the pages of his Musaeum published in 1625 as a guidebook to his collection. We are told of the original arrangement of works of art in his Gallery of Painting and Sculpture.
We have seen that Cardinal Borromeo housed his museum in two end rooms, presently called the Sala Fagnani and the Sala Custodi, which were separated from the north wall of the library by a small garden. Mangone had built these rooms at the Ambrosiana between 1613 and 1630. From the passages contained in the Musaeum, we are able to construe the location, and in many cases, the placement of the works of art he had collected.

In the first room were the paintings of Titian: the Adoration of the Magi ("seen first" and "in a distinct place"), the Deposition into the Sepulchre, an "unknown subject" (facing the above on the opposite wall), a Madonna and Child with St. Catherine and St. John, and another painting of the same subject, and a Monk; paintings by Jan Brueghel: a Storm, Winter Landscape, Daniel in the Lion's Den, the Elements: Fire, Earth, Air, and Water, a Madonna and child in a Garland of Flowers, the Mouse and Rosebuds, Paradise (with Rottenhammer), and a "small garland;" Bonifacio Veronese's Sacred Family with Tobias and the Angel (Cardinal Borromeo calls it the "design of Giorgione and the color of Titian"); Bassano's Annunciation to the Shepherds (in a "distinct place and in excellent light"); Luini's Savior with the Lamb; Michelangelo's Head of an Old Man for the Last Judgment; Giovanni Ambrogio De Predis' Beatrice d'Este (Cardinal Borromeo
calls this a "portrait of one of our Princesses" and attributes it to Leonardo, miniatures by Agosto Decio and Gerolamo Marchesini, and copies after Raphael, Luini, and several by Lodovico Carracci. "Immediately after" was the second room with other magnificent works of art including Luini's Holy Family (seen first), a Magdalen at the feet of the Savior disguised as an Ortolan, and a Magdalen; Titian's Holy Family, Magdalen, and Ecce Homo; Paul Brill's View of the Sea; Jan Brueghel's "twelve small works" including "horns of plenty, the tarter, a storm, some woods, fire" ("in another part") Allegory of Winter ("birds by Rottenhammer and flowers by Brueghel"), and the "Battle of the Flowers" (Vase of Flowers); Caravaggio's Basket of Fruit, which stood near the copies made by Muziano; "two cartoons" by Raphael, to be identified as the famous cartoon of the School of Athens which was in two sections; copies after Leonardo da Vinci's Last Supper executed by Vespino (at the "highest part of the room"), after eight paintings in S. Raphaele in Milan painted by Gaudenzio Ferrari and copies by Antonio Mariano and Muziano. Copies of sculpture after the antique and Michelangelo in gesso and clay executed by Leone Leoni, Michelangelo's models of Dusk and Dawn, and other works by Giovanni Bellini, Parmigianino, Giulio Romano, Leonardo, and Perugino were also part of the original collection found in the Cardinal's Museum.
b. The Copies

Cardinal Borromeo placed an extraordinary emphasis on copies and the importance of conservation. The copies of the more celebrated paintings show his desire to preserve a record of works of art which in his day had shown signs of a fatal deterioration, and to provide didactic material not only for his Academy of Fine Arts but also for contemporary Milanese artists.

It is in the Musaeum (pp. 12-13) that the Cardinal discusses with great passion the need of collecting copies "that will perhaps one day be in the place of the celebrated originals," just as the manuscript copies have preserved many of the literary monuments of antiquity. Raphael's masterpieces in Rome had for him an almost visionary appeal:

While one day I observed it and thought of its approaching disappearance, I thought I heard the voice of the artist who beseeched me to save it and I was so moved that I ordered that it should be copied. (Musaeum, p. 14)

This shows that the idea of collecting copies of masterpieces must have come to the Cardinal during his Roman years. It was there that he had copies made of Raphael's prophet Isaiah, a fresco on one of the pillars of S. Agostino, the Sybils in S. Maria della Pace, and the famous group of Aeneas and his father from the Fire in the Borgo in the Vatican.
Four pages in the *Musaeum* (pp. 26-30) and a long passage in the *De Pictura Sacra* (II, iv) are dedicated to Leonardo's *Last Supper*, the famous mural in the refectory of S. Maria delle Grazie. The progressively ruinous condition of the masterpiece exerted a profound impression on Cardinal Borromeo who wrote an inspired analysis of the action and expression of the figures, which was singled out by Bossi in 1810 as an exceptional and unprecedented approach to Leonardo's style and as evidence of the Cardinal's understanding of Leonardo's intentions. There is no doubt that the ruinous condition of the *Last Supper* was the major factor that prompted the Cardinal to undertake an extensive and systematic program of copying masterpieces. The program was entrusted to the Milanese painter Andrea Bianchi called Il Vespino, who produced about twenty copies after celebrated paintings, as listed in Section D of the 1618 Deed of Gift. The first in the series of his copies (second in the section) is the *Last Supper*, which was done on canvas and which did not include the architectural background.

Cardinal Borromeo's account of the condition of the *Last Supper* is a precious document in the history of the mural, and has been singled out by Beltrami in one of his notes to the *Musaeum* (reproduced as note 36 in Part 43).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Two below), to show that the blurred effect described in early sources was caused by the mold which was developing periodically on the mural's surface and which Vespino was able to remove temporarily in order to detect the shape and features of the figures. The film of mold contributed to the impression that the mural was slowly and hopelessly disappearing, when in actuality the major damages were caused by restorations and repaintings. These have been recently removed and much of Leonardo's original color has reappeared, while the air conditioning in the room prevents the formation of mold.

Cardinal Borromeo praises Vespino's work as a faithful rendering of Leonardo's original, and adds that this cannot be doubted because "it agrees with the models found among Leonardo's papers" (Musaeum, p. 27). This seems to be hinting at sketchbooks with studies for the heads of the Apostles in the Last Supper, otherwise unknown to us. But another item in the section pertaining to copies in the 1618 deed of Gift reads as follows:

Due teste d'Apostoli, copiate da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, dalle opere di Leonardo, in un sol pezzo alto un braccio e largo un e mezzo, senza cornice.

From Edward Wright's Some Observations made in travelling through France, Italy, etc. (London, 1730), p. 470, we learn that in the Casnedi House in Milan there was a drawing collection which included cartoons of the
heads of the Apostles in the Last Supper, said to have come from the Arconati collection. They were probably the ones Cardinal Borromeo alluded to as "the models found among Leonardo's papers" (it was in fact Arconati who owned the greater bulk of the Leonardo papers), and Vespino must have copied the one which included the heads of Judas and Peter, as shown in one of a series of cartoons after Leonardo, formerly at Weimar and attributed to Boltraffio.32

The third item in the list of the copies is described as follows:

Una Madonna grande di Leonardo copiata da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, sopra una tavola alta braccia tre, et once due, e larga due braccia, senza cornice.

This reproduces the famous Virgin of the Rocks, and precisely the version which is now in the National Gallery at London and which at an earlier date had replaced the Louvre one in the Church of S. Francesco Grande at Milan. Had Vespino reproduced the whole altarpiece, including a number of smaller panels in several sections of the elaborate frame, his copy would have been of extraordinary documentary value, in that the altarpiece was disassembled at the suppression of the Confraternity in 1781, when the central panel was sold to an Englishman and the two side panels with angels playing musical instruments were sold to the Duke Melzi-d'Eril. The church itself, which stood
next to S. Ambrogio not too far from S. Maria delle Grazie were Leonardo's Last Supper is, was to be demolished shortly afterward, in 1810, and all possible information about the original iconographic program of Leonardo's altarpiece in the Chapel of the Immaculate Conception is now lost. Professor Pedretti is at present engaged in a research aiming at reconstructing the lost altarpiece on the basis of indirect documentary evidence.

One of the Vespino copies is listed in the 1618 Deed of Gift (fourth item in Group D) as a painting after Leonardo's St. Anne, the description of which contains the reference to a Leonardo cartoon:

Una Madonna con S. Anna e Christo Bambino, che scherza con l'Agnello dipinta da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, non copiandola da altro quadro simile dipinto, ma solo imitandola da cartone di Leonardo. E' senza cornice, et alta braccia due e mezzo, e larga due.

This describes the subject of the Louvre St. Anne, which in fact includes the lamb, and yet Cardinal Borromeo specifies that Vespino based his copy not on such a painting but on the Leonardo cartoon. The Burlington House Cartoon, which was then in the collection of Count Arconati in Milan (see Section B below), does not include the Lamb, hence the reference could be taken as a record of the lost cartoon for the Louvre St. Anne. But this is not the case. Cardinal Borromeo must have intended the cartoon at one time in the possession of Leonardo's
pupil Marco d'Oggiono, and then of a Maestro di Campo Arese who gave it to the painter Bonda from whom it was acquired by Padre Resta in the eighteenth century. It is a school work once attributed to Leonardo and known as the Easterhazy Cartoon, which in fact reproduces the subject of the Louvre St. Anne. The Cardinal's specification that the copy was "not from another similar painting, but from the cartoon" is reasonably to be taken as a reference to the one time famous painting after Leonardo's St. Anne which was in the church of S. Celso in Milan and which is now in the depot of the Art Gallery at the University of California at Los Angeles.33

Cardinal Borromeo chose only those works of art which he considered worthy of imitation. To this end, he had copies made of images in the Roman catacombs during his stay in Rome and which are described by him in Chapter II, Book II of his De Pictura Sacra. To this he added copies of paintings and frescoes by Raphael, Luini, Correggio, and Gaudenzio Ferrari executed by Antonio Mariani, the Carracci (probably Lodovico who had remained in Bologna), Muziano, and Agosto Decio. Beltrami has shown by the correspondence between Cardinal Borromeo and the painter Mariani that the Cardinal secured from him in Rome works of art.34 In his Musaeum (p. 31) he also notes that Mariani...
"deserves to be remembered for his diligence and skill" in executing copies.

The bulk of the Cardinal's statue collection consisted of the copies that Leone Leoni (1509-1590) had made of antique statuary in Rome and of Michelangelo's sculptures in Florence. The Cardinal's account of this collection is wrong. He states (Musaeum, pp. 35-36) that Leoni was commissioned by Francis I to make copies after the antique, and Beltrami himself comments that the resulting bronze casts are found in the Louvre (see note 43 in Part Three below). These of course are the well-known copies by Primaticcio, and there is no evidence that Leoni was ever involved in the Primaticcio project, nor that he went to France before 1549 to meet the King (who died in 1546). It is known, however, that while in France Leoni had considered the Primaticcio copies and planned to make mouilages of them for the Palace of Ferrante Gonzaga at Guastalla, but the copies which eventually were acquired by Cardinal Borromeo must have been the ones that Leoni had made in Rome in 1560-1562 after the antique and for his own house in Milan.35

In 1630, in a letter to Giuseppe Ripamonti, a doctor of the Ambrosiana who later came into disfavor with the Church, Cardinal Borromeo expressed his concern with rescuing paintings abandoned in private houses at the end
of the terrible plague in Milan. Thus, the same motivations which had prompted his program of collecting both originals and copies of works of art for his Gallery of Painting and Sculpture, were at work in his decision to safeguard the artistic and cultural heritage of his town.

c. Later Acquisitions

Cardinal Borroméo continued to acquire paintings, drawings, and books, at great personal expense, up to the last years of his life. After his death gifts continued to pour into the Ambrosiana in tribute to its founder. Galeazzo Arconati's famous donation of 1637 has been mentioned earlier. In 1668, Antonio Busca, the Milanese painter, presented paintings by Cairo to the Ambrosiana. Pictures and other objets d'art from Italian and more exotic sources were bequeathed to the Ambrosiana by Manfredo Settala, a personal friend of the Cardinal's, in 1672. However, this encyclopediac collection including pictures by Daniele Crespi and others, mathematical and astrological instruments; Egyptian, Etruscan, and Roman antiquities; crystals, elaborately decorated weapons, rhinoceros and hippopotamus teeth, fossils, clocks, and other works of beauty given by the
"Milanese Archimedes," were not transferred to the Ambrosiana until almost a century later. After a period of legal altercations, Manfredo's heirs relinquished the collection to the Ambrosiana in 1751.\textsuperscript{37}

Other important additions were made in 1827 with the marvelous gifts of C. Giovanni Edoardo Pecis (Jan Brueghel's \textit{Madonna with Garland of Flowers}, \textit{Terrestrial Paradise}, and the \textit{Peccato Originale}; Luini's \textit{Madonna del Latte}; Bronzino's \textit{Ritratto Virile}; Muelich's \textit{Man with Gloves} and the \textit{Man with Glass}, Kessel's \textit{Ducks}, Zenale's \textit{St. Louis of Toulouse} and \textit{St. Bonaventura}, marble self-portraits by Thorvaldsen and Canova, and many others); of Federico Fagnani in 1840 (Magnasco's \textit{Osteria con Donne e Soldati} and other paintings, engravings, and objects of art); of Baron Custodi in 1856; of Duke Lodovico Melzi d'Eril in 1872 (Vivarini triptych and an earlier gift of Bramantino's \textit{Virgin Enthroned between St. Michael and St. Ambrose}); of Luigi Danioni in 1907 (Lomazzo's \textit{Christ in the Garden}, Mazzoni's \textit{Portrait of a Gentlemen}, Nuvolone's \textit{Susanna at the Bath}, and Cariano's \textit{Christ and the Pious Woman}); and of Attilio Brivio in 1959 (Ghirlandaio's \textit{Adoration of the Magi}, a \textit{Savior} attributed to Cesare da Sesto, Bachiacco's \textit{Holy Family with St. Elizabeth and St. John}, Palma il Giovane's \textit{Paradise}, saints by Giovanni di Francesco and Giovanni Angelo and other works).

Unfortunately, some of Federico's paintings such as Luini's
Holy Family and Brueghel's Four Elements, Daniel in the Lion's Den, Raphael's cartoon for the School of Athens, and books and manuscripts were carried off by the French in 1776. Many of these returned to the Ambrosiana later; however, some remained in France.

Other vissitudes relating to the history of the Pincoteca occurred beginning in the last century. The Museum came under a general rearrangement. A new facade fronting the Piazza Pio XI was constructed by Moraglia in 1831-1836 and incorporated the older structure. The lack of architectural unity is prevalent internally due to later addition of rooms to house the new bequests.

VI. The Academy of Fine Arts, 1621

a. Didactic Motivations

Cardinal Borromeo envisaged his Museum as the complement to an art school, so that the didactic nature of the paintings and sculptures he had collected could be made the means of a Christian defense against Protestantism. The idea of art as the handmaiden of religion was heralded in the reforms begun by the Council of Trent, was to take shape in the works of St. Charles, Paleotti, Borghini, Gilio da Fabriano and others; and was of course to be advocated by Federico Borromeo in his De Pictura.
Sacra. The Trattato della pittura e scultura by Pietro da Cortona and the Jesuit G. D. Ottonelli (Florence, 1652) is also a well known example of religious propaganda in full operation.

The Milanese Academy went through a first brief period of activity, from 1621 to 1625; it opened again in 1669 and was terminated in 1690. The motivations that had prompted Cardinal Borromeo to institute it are shown by the "rules" given in the act of foundation:

For no human cause have I disposed myself to organize the present Academy of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture, other than the purpose of inducing artists to perform, through its help, better than they had done before in those fields which pertain to the divine cult . . . For these reasons, I have given order that few persons will gather for a certain period of time to discuss not so much about the science of producing figures which represent objects as about the ways to impress in the minds of the artists themselves the images of the virtuous and Christian deeds, and pious thoughts.38

Such aims were best exemplified by the work of Cerano who was to dominate the program of the Academy during the first phase of its activity. Artists were led to stress that aspect of the artistic education that was to provide them with the tools for religious propaganda; accordingly, practice had priority over theoretical digressions on principles of design. This was to be inevitably reflected in the type of works produced - overwhelming in programmatic content, and impersonal, almost tedious in the unfolding of the narrative.39 Cardinal
Borromeo had made it clear that in the treatises to be adopted and in the speeches to be delivered to the students, no "vanity of words" should be found, and in fact he directed that "the teaching of technique and subject matter be conducted in such a way that the students would learn the precepts out of simple words, thus finding out the secrets of these three so worthy professions."^40 An architect associated with the Academy, Francesco Castelli, wrote a treatise of practical geometry which is well in keeping with such directives. This is known in a manuscript which has entered the Ambrosian Library only recently, apparently as a gift of Luca Beltrami.^41

It was only during the second phase of its activity, after 1669, that the Academy resumed a more traditional and exuberant teaching pattern, dominated as it had become by the theories which were to be codified in Scaramuccia's Le finezze de' penelli italiani, published in Pavia in 1674. The author, whose drawings are found in the Ambrosiana,^42 excerpted Leonardo's Treatise on Painting for the practical purpose of offering a suitable compendium of precepts for the teaching of art.

b. Antecedents

The first academy of fine arts in Milan, an Academy of
Architecture, was founded by Gian Galeazzo Visconti in 1380. A successor, which was presided over by Leonardo da Vinci under Lodovico Sforza in the 1490's and the Milanese group centered around Lomazzo and the Accademia della Valle di Bregno in the mid-sixteenth century, were also antecedents. Pevsner observes that Leonardo's importance, however, lay in his emphasis on art theory. Thus, he prepared the way for the development of academic training in art up to the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{43} To these one may add Bertoldo's early art school in Florence, which was sponsored by Lorenzo de' Medici in the 1480's, the two Bandinelli "academies" in Rome and Florence, and finally Vasari's Accademia del Disegno in Florence, which was to foster the development of the modern art academy. Zuccaro himself was a member of this Academy in 1565 and again in 1575-1578.

Zuccaro's theories and thoughts on art have a direct bearing on those of Cardinal Borromeo. They deeply affected the Cardinal's taste and were to guide his actions as a patron of the arts in Milan and his activities as a writer. We have seen that Zuccaro almost singlehandedly founded the Roman Academy in 1593, and served as its first president from November 1593 to October 1594. Documentation pertaining to Zuccaro's early years at the Academy of St. Luke is scarce, making it
difficult to assess the actual impact of his theories on the Roman school, but his aims are well-known: he wanted to bring painting as a liberal art into "learned and literary circles" and to raise the status of the artists in society. His goal was the education and instruction of young artists based on studio practice. He, as well as the Cardinal, had been aware of the decline of art since the days of Raphael, Michelangelo, and Titian. This is the main theme of Zuccaro's short poem, the Lamento della Pittura, published in Mantua in 1605. In it Zuccaro states that through the activities of the Academy he hopes to save the arts from further deterioration. Thus Zuccaro and the Cardinal share similar intentions in the creation of their respective academies.44

In keeping with the tradition of Alberti and Leonardo da Vinci, both Zuccaro and Borromeo postulated a scientific approach to the teaching of art, and proceeded to establish norms and methods in order to condition a new generation of painters and to attain their ends. Both the artist and his audience were required a considerable cultural preparation. Zuccaro himself was an intellectual painter whose sober style as seen at the Collegio Borromeo, Farnese Palace, Vatican, and other places is connected to late Mannerist attitudes. It
relies on some degree of mysticism, philosophical inquiry, allegorical allusions, and borrowings from Roman and Venetian traditions. According to Blunt, both Zuccaro and Lomazzo as painters were "half in sympathy with earlier Mannerism and half against it," and compared to Caravaggio showed what Mahon calls "mild views toward the imitation of nature."

Mahon also points to the distinction between Zuccaro's paintings and his theories. His theories, in fact, had little impact on contemporary art itself. Again from documents, Mahon concludes that due to his brief tenure as president of the Roman Academy and his emphasis on abstract philosophical and speculative theories, Zuccaro was a "flash in the pan" even amongst his fellow members. Cardinal Borromeo, however, was one of the rare instances in which Zuccaro's direct influence relating to questions of art practice and theory can be felt.

It is to be remembered that the "Vasari of the Roman School" published a series of small treatises dealing with questions of art. His views were first manifested in the minutes of the Academy as found in Romano Alberti's Origine e progresso dell'Accademia del Disegno published in 1599, and then were fully expounded in treatise form in his Idea de' Pittori, Scultori e Architetti published in Turin in 1607. Both Zuccaro and Federico Borromeo
agreed that art was an intellectual activity, the spiritual element of which could only be identified with the Divine. Lomazzo himself had stated in his *Idea del Tempio della Pittura* of 1590 that painters should be well versed in theology. Hence the general agreement was that painting was controlled by human and divine intellect. In his *Idea* Zuccaro considers the source of artistic inspiration, "disegno," a word said to be derived from "segno di Dio," and explains the fundamental principle of all creation, the representation of the harmony in nature and the essence of all things. The term approximates our own word "idea."

According to Zuccaro, the *idea* is transmitted hierarchically. First conceived by God, it is reflected in the mind of the angels, wherefrom it is transferred to the mind of man. As he addresses artists, Zuccaro avoids the word "idea" using instead the term "disegno," which he defines as "disegno interno" and "disegno externo." The subject of the first book of the *Idea* is "disegno externo." "Disegno interno" represents the formal idea infused into the artist's mind by divine intellect. The idea is transmitted through the above mentioned hierarchy of divine, angelic, and human intelligence and is Neoplatonic in overtone. Thus, "disegno interno" represents the unadulterated idea, an activity of genius, while
"disegno externo" derives from the senses. The "disegno externo" represents the projection of "disegno interno" or the expression or presentation of the idea.50

In his Musaeum, the Cardinal pays homage to Zuccaro also by an assessment of his artistic merit and reference to the artist's prowess as a theoretician:

Federico Zuccaro, a painter who in our times acquired some glory for drawing, used to say that he who is capable of drawing all that can be drawn, deserves the highest praise. Because, he added, there are some whose abilities are so limited that, they being so accustomed to painting the human figure if they must represent a landscape or other things, have others help them, or carry it out so badly, that because of that unsuccessful part, the painting, commendable in all else, remains spoiled. Zuccaro rightly affirmed that the artist ought to be at least mediocre in any given part of his art, and that the different parts must agree with the whole, so that the work does not in one part appear beautiful and proper and in another ugly and improper. (Musaeum, pp. 6-7)

In his Idea of 1607 Zuccaro insists on the need for the painter to acquire proficiency in every aspect of the profession in a way that echoes Leonardo's precepts on the "pittore universale," but nowhere in Zuccaro's writings is to be found the specific statement quoted by Cardinal Borromeo about painters who need the assistance of others for those parts in their work in which they are not proficient -- a statement that seems to allude to the landscapes painted by Bernazzano as background to such Milanese works as those of Cesare da Sesto; nor is there
in Zuccaro's writings any statement to the effect that mediocrity in every aspect of the art of painting is better than excellence in only one. Again one is reminded of Leonardo's precepts in his Treatise on Painting, e.g. the one on fol. 31 v of the Codex Urbinas (McM 91):

That painter is not praiseworthy who executes only one thing well, such as a nude, a head, draperies, animals, landscapes, or similar details; for that is not a great talent which, devoted to a single object only and always at work on it, executes it well.

Indeed, the Cardinal must have quoted Zuccaro's own words, to which he refers in the marginal catch-words on p. 6 of the Musaeum as "Zuccari Pictoris dictum." Only one painting by Federico Zuccaro is found in the 1618 Deed of Gift. It is listed in Section B among the works of "less celebrated painters" as a "St. Francis who looks at the stigmata in his hands."

The example of the Roman Academy of St. Luke and the Cardinal's relationship with Federico Zuccaro were positive stimuli to the formation of the Academy in Milan. Particularly influential was the emphasis Zuccaro had placed on art instruction: lectures had been given by some of the renowned members of the Academy, such as the three Alberti (Cherubino, Romano, and Durante), the Cavalier D'Arpino, Giovan Battista Montano, Flaminio Vacca, Giacomo della Porta, and Onorio Longhi. Study from plaster casts and life had been emphasized as well
as discussions on art theory.

The Accademia degli Incamminati del Disegno in Bologna, called the "Carracci Academy," founded in the mid 1580's, was an additional more or less contemporary influence. The close connection between the Bolognese Academy and the Ambrosian Academy is testified by the Cardinal's request of the "rules" of the Carracci School, which were sent to him in 1613, and by a letter of February 20, of the same year, in which Galeazzo Paleotti, writing on behalf of Lodovico Carracci informs the Cardinal about a shipment of casts of statues belonging to the Academy of the "Progressives." 51

Next to these academies of fine arts, and in much greater number, there were the literary academies which were being instituted during the Cardinal's time. In his Storia della letteratura italiana (first edition, Modena, 1782), Gerolamo Tiraboschi lists no less than one hundred and seventy one literary academies existing in Italy in the late sixteenth century. The Accademia degli Insensati at Perugia where Federico Zuccaro was a member, and the Accademia degli Innominati at Parma where he was also a member, and the Academy of the Gelati in Bologna were literary not art academies. One must bear in mind that Zuccaro failed to establish academies of art throughout Italy after the model of the Roman Academy of St. Luke.
The great flowering of art academies in Europe did not take place until after the death of Federico. Notable examples are the Academy of Painting and Sculpture in Turin (1778), the Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando in Madrid, established by Philip V; the Royal Academy of Arts in London in 1768; and others including the Académie royale de peinture et de la sculpture in Paris in 1648, founded by Louis XIV. Denis Mahon has pointed out the close relationships and dissimilarities between the latter and the Academy of St. Luke in the second half of the Seicento.52

c. The Program

Special studies by Nicodemi, Pinardi, and Rosa, in addition to manuscripts in the Ambrosiana such as the official deed of foundation and the rules of the Academy, provide accurate information concerning the events of the Academy of Fine Arts.53 In keeping with his religious sentiments, the Cardinal established in 1617 a "Congregatió pro construendis, instaurandisve et ornandis Ecclesiis sacrisque aedibus." This council was the precedent to his Academy which he instituted by the notarial deed of June 25, 1625. The doors of the Academy were open to students in 1621. As previously mentioned,
Mangone had linked Federico's Academy to the Ambrosian Library. The art school was approached through a door leading from a portico carried on two columns.

The art school was governed by six Conservators. Three of this body were clerics and three were "Magistri." Each Magister was a department head and an artist associated with the late phase of Mannerism. Giovanni Battista Crespi called "il Cerano" was head of the painting school and was also the Principe of the Academy. Andrea Biffi led the school of sculpture, and Fabio Mangone with Carlo Buzzi directed the school of architecture. The Academy placed importance on the practical aspect of learning: life drawing, modelling reliefs, copying the beautiful and exemplary models in Federico's collection in the Ambrosiana, and working from plaster casts. As mentioned earlier, statues belonging to the Carracci Academy were sent to Federico while Leone Leoni provided the Cardinal with copies of famous antique works of art and copies after Michelangelo. Today a cast of the Laocoon group is to be seen on the landing of the staircase leading to the Pinacoteca, while other casts, including those of the Farnese Hercules and a head of Nero, are now in the Scuola Beato Angelico in Milan. These were given by the Ambrosiana as a gift to that school in the early 1960's.
Prizes were awarded by the Magister on the basis of artistic merit. Lectures were given to the twenty-four fortunate tuition-free students who had been admitted to the Academy. Included in the list of its first graduates were such celebrated artists as Daniele Crespi, Ercole Procaccini, Carlo Biffi, and Francesco Nuvoloni. Around this illustrious group flowered another cluster of Lombard painters, sculptors, and architects loyal to Federico. These included Camillo and Giulio Cesare Procaccini, Pietro Francesco Mazzucchelli called "il Morazzone," Camillo Duchino, Gerolamo Giosso; Guglielmo Moncalvo, Jan and Anthony Ravensteyn, Giovanni Battista Secchi, Andrea Vespino, Gian Domenico Pellegrini, Carlo Antonio Procaccini, Cesare Nebbia, and others. They were instrumental in carrying out the Cardinal's program of overcoming the decadence in the arts.

Unhappily, after the death of its founder in 1631, frequent interruptions including war, plague, famine, and various political differences during the third quarter of the seventeenth century led to the downfall of the Academy, which was closed for approximately forty years. It opened again in April, 1669, only to be terminated in 1775 after a somewhat turbulent history. In that year the Austrian Government established the Brera Academy.
B. FEDERICO BORROMEO AS A CRITIC OF THE ARTS

I. Religious Propaganda

Over one hundred written works by Cardinal Federico Borromeo remain and are housed in the library which he founded. These include printed works, usually in limited editions, and also unpublished manuscripts. They are in Italian or Latin and include his immense correspondence with writers, ecclesiastics, politicians, scholars, scientists, and artists which are alphabetized by author in volume XXXIV of the Fontes Ambrosiani. Moral treatises, sermons, mystic works as the correspondence between the Cardinal and Caterina Vannini (he served as her spiritual counselor), dissertations on sacred and profane history, literature, art and other topics as catalogued by Sassi. At the end of his account of Cardinal Borromeo's life and activities, in chapter XXII of the Promessi Sposi, Alessandro Manzoni asks a question which is still unanswered:

And how come - will this reader of mine ask - how come that so many works are forgotten, or that they are so little known, so seldom sought after? How come that with so much ingenuity, so much study, so much familiarity with men and things, and so much meditation, so much passion for the beautiful and the good, so much candor, and with so many of the qualities which make up the great writer, how come that this writer, with a hundred works, has left not even one of those which may be reputed famous even by those who do not approve of them in full, and which are
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known by the title even by those who do not read them? How come that all together these works have not been enough, by their number at least, to procure to his name a literary fame among us posterity?

Time and again, it has been shown that the Cardinal was an unusually complex figure encompassing many areas of intellectual endeavor which included religion, history, literature, art, science, and customs. Each of these areas would provide a vast field of study, and while a comprehensive knowledge of them is necessary for an assessment of Federico's personality, the present study may profit from a limitation in scope in order to focus on the problem of the Cardinal's place in the history of art criticism. His Musaeum (1625) and his De Pictura Sacra (1624) are certainly the best sources for a study of his artistic views.

As mentioned earlier, the Musaeum is essentially a guidebook to the paintings and other works of art which he donated to the Ambrosiana, and yet it contains personal judgments on the works of art taken into consideration. His views on art, as fostered by many factors, are essentially in line with contemporary thought. Occasionally they even contradict the Council of Trent's dogmatic way of advocating art as a tool to teach religion, arouse piety, and aid salvation. In fact, his individualized approach combines humanism and connois-
seurship with religion and science, often in direct
contrast to the sentiments professed in his De Pictura
Sacra, where he reveals a more militant and official
approach to the doctrines of the Council of Trent.

According to the canons and decrees of the twenty-
fifth session of the Council of Trent, held on December
3 and 4, 1563, "all bishops and others who hold the
office of teaching and have charge of the 'cura animarum'"
were to instruct above all "the faithful diligently in
matters relating to intercession and invocation of the
saints, the veneration of relics, and the legitimate use
of images." The Council confirmed the didactic nature
of art selecting the proper kinds of religious images
and removing them from any charge of idolatry in order
to guarantee their due respect and veneration. The
Council also endeavored to prohibit "heretical or
secular paintings" or those susceptible to charges of
profanity or indecency. These items are echoed in the
already cited examples of Counter Reformation treatises
and in Cardinal Borromeo's De Pictura Sacra and to some
degree in his Musaeum.

The Christian dream of art is clearly spelled out at
the beginning of the De Pictura Sacra:

Thus, omitting any other introduction of our
study, what is to be its breadth, we say with-
out further aids, that it will be divided in two
parts. This first will contain certain precepts
common to every art and which confer to the perfection both of sacred painting and sculpture. The second purpose is to teach painters and sculptors of sacred subjects how they may represent the mysteries of our holy Faith and the image of the Saints, according to historical truth so that Christian piety may be formed also by the arts themselves. We will therefore treat the one and the other as if they were a single art. (De Pictura Sacra, I, i)

His dependence upon the teachings of the Council of Trent are further disclosed in the concluding paragraph of the same chapter:

In speaking of such things, we further are confident that we are complying, in this field also, with the decrees of the sacred holy Council of Trent, in which they inculcate on the Bishops to teach the people the truths of the Faith and sacred history not only with words, but also with paintings and whatever other representation which is useful in exciting the soul and sentiments of the faithful to the veneration of the mysteries of our religion.

The belief that sacred images teach religion, arouse piety, and aid salvation, benefits the unlearned and is analogous to the orator who moves the soul by words:

Whence it happens that even the people and the ignorant multitudes understand the language of painting and for this reason with no less effectiveness than in prudent men, so that Gregorio Nisseno rightfully said that painting speaks silently and through it holy walls become flowering fields. Just as the task of the orator it is very important that things be said with such expression and feeling as to move the soul so it will be a great merit of painting if the colors and features will inspire more feelings, fear and pain, according to the requirements of the subject matter. And to continue the simile to the last, one can add that the study and diligence with which painters try to put in a proper light so that the artistic excellence stands out
more is, in a way, similar to orator's devices who with their voice, their gestures, their delivery, with the movements of their person strive to adorn their speech and to impress their listeners. (De Pictura Sacra, I, xi)

In his De Pictura Sacra, Cardinal Borromeo set up norms, guidelines, and values for artists to follow. As previously mentioned, he had also been inspired by the fear that an artistic decadence might extend into the sphere of religion. He deplored this decadence and among other reasons founded his Museum and the Academy of Fine Arts as a valid aid to his pastoral ministry and in line with his role as a patron of the arts. Thus, his De Pictura Sacra also served as a form of lesson to the students in the Academy. This intent relates to the preamble and rules of the Academy. In the preamble, he declares that the purpose of founding his Academy was to prepare artists to take inspiration from religion and to improve upon the past in those arts.

In Book I of the De Pictura Sacra, Cardinal Borromeo pays particular attention to questions concerning the proper attitudes for artists to take when approaching the depiction of sacred images. This vast cultural preparation includes subjects relative to beauty, "errors of the ancient gentiles," nudity, attire, age, the "pictional field," "difficulties in portraying the soul's sentiments," piety as a necessary attitude to the painter, and
athletic and immoral figures. These themes comprise thirteen chapters in the first book of the De Pictura Sacra. He proposes models for the depiction of religious subjects in the second book. These include examples of images of the Holy Trinity, the Savior, the Crucifixion, mysteries of the Savior, the blessed Virgin, Angels, sacred emblems, portraits, images of St. Gregory and Charles the Great, Saints, and other topics. An almost archaeological reconstruction of the scene is necessary to give the appearance of truth. Thus, the De Pictura Sacra satisfied his critical sense concerning the true spirit of religious art and discloses his religious and artistic intentions and theory. Several of these themes reoccur as aesthetic pronouncements in his Musaeum and had already appeared in the pages of G. B. Armenini, Gregorio Comanini, Giovanni Andrea Gilo da Fabriano, Lomazzo, the Flemish Johannes Molanus, Gabriele Paleotti, and the Jesuit Antonio Possevino. They are also found in the dramatic and emotional religious cycles painted by Cerano in the Duomo, Taddeo Zuccaro at Caprarola (according to Annibale Caro's program), and elsewhere. There is no doubt that these latter works impress and instruct.

It is necessary that the artist be inspired by an authentic religious piety because only then will he, in
turn, be able to infuse it into his work and move his audience. Thus, it is necessary that the artist raise his eyes to heaven in order to achieve excellence in heavenly subjects:

"... just as the effort of the orator to move the soul is vain if he himself is first not moved, so I feel that something similar happens to painters, so that, if they have not first striven to excite the feelings in their own soul, they will not be able to transfuse into their works what they themselves do not feel, that is piety and noble sentiments of the soul. (De Pictura Sacra, I, xi)"

The Cardinal continues by reciting anecdotes concerning ancient and more or less contemporary examples of Christian piety. Of particular interest is his story regarding the sculptor and gem engraver, Annibale Fontana, for whom he had particular affection:

“Our city in truth boasts of an artist, excellent in art no less than in piety, illustrious for his modesty of soul and duly praised. This man was Annibale Fontana, known to all, though taciturn and solitary; of gentle nature and completely dedicated to art; he was not usually liberal and munificent with his art towards Princes and other great names, as often happens, but only towards God, almost as if he were offering to the great Artist and Author of everything good tributes to adore him. In fact, when he had finished a statue, he demanded the right price for his work so that it be an honor to him, to art and to work. Then, honestly rejoicing, for a few days, of his fortune and reward for his work and his genius, he silently and in hiding would place a goodly part on the altar, from which he recognized that he had received it all. (De Pictura Sacra, I, xi)"

Best known for his work at San Celso, Milan, Annibale Fontana (ca. 1540-1587), belongs to the group of Milanese
artists who were ranked by Ambrogio Mazenta in 1635 as Leonardo's late followers. He was certainly acquainted with the local Leonardo tradition which Cardinal Borromeo strived to preserve by collecting his manuscripts and drawings. In fact Mazenta speaks of Fontana as the eminent sculptor who used to state that "all he knew he had learned from Leonardo's work."  

II. Beauty and Decorum

The Cardinal felt beauty deeply and realized its importance in religious works of art. For him, beauty was inseparable from questions of morality. This, in turn, would provide inspiration to the faithful by elevating their passions and sentiments. The notion that painting aims at some form of moral improvement and goes hand in hand with teachings and instructions of the Church is a concept consistent with the viewpoint of the entire Counter-Reformation and echoed in the treatises of Comanini and others. The Catholic Church was equated with supreme intellect and "the mother of all knowledge both sacred and profane."  

In speaking of the strength and nature of beauty, the Cardinal notes its ethical scope, identifying it with decorum, harmony, honesty, splendor, virtue, and even
with good health:

Even in the customs of men one searches for that which one calls decorum, and it is most pleasing to the spectators' eyes; that is, that splendor, that light or flower which issues from every movement or gesture, a light and flower in which the soul find joy . . . We feel that we have already sufficiently demonstrated with enough clarity the strength and the essence of Beauty, having defined it as the splendor and the most delightful flower resulting from the manners of men, . . . Beauty in every order of things is only that which fully harmonizes itself so that it appears to be such that nothing can be added to, or taken away from it . . . These definitions clearly demonstrate that any virtue is always circumfused with decorum, since its excellence lies in a perfection which lies somewhere between too little and too much . . . it is impossible to disassociate it from honesty . . . Beauty is never separated from virtue . . . Beauty then is to be found in that Happy Medium, lacking which, human bodies are said to be and are diseased. (De Pictura Sacra, I, ii)

He continues by stating:

Nevertheless dead colors and mute marble do not disdain the laws of decorum, in fact, they need more of them. And in fact, whatever sin against decorum is committed in works of art remains perpetually and is insuppressable, while it is relatively easy to change one's manners and the former quickly disappear from sight as soon as the latter have been struck . . . This lack or offense or defacement of beauty, if it occurs in a profane subject, is undoubtedly worthy of reproach, but how much more so when committed on sacred and divine subjects. (De Pictura Sacra, I, ii)

Cardinal Borromeo repeats the theme of decorum as a characteristic of beauty in several passages of his Musaeum. Concerning a comparison between Correggio's La Zingarella and Luini's Savior, he says:
Called the Gypsy because the painter violating the laws of decorum and because of this removed from the work itself a great part of glory he represented the Virgin in the figure of a little Egyptian thief. The afore-mentioned Luini acted differently when in painting the Savior in his first flower of youth between seventeen and eighteen years of age was still able to preserve completely his majesty. (Musaeum, p. 15)

In reference to Luini's Holy Family, Cardinal Borromeo states:

The Virgin Mother of God is so much more admirable in her singular charm, she inspires a sacred respect and sweeps out of every mind every unchaste thought: this is a result that one can call superior to nature. (Musaeum, p. 22)

One wonders whether in the back of the Cardinal's mind was Leonardo's Burlington House cartoon of the Virgin and Child with St. Anne (Fig. 16), which Luini had taken as a model and which he, the Cardinal, must have seen in the Arconati house, as mentioned above. In fact, Leonardo's treatment of the figure of the Virgin is one which he hardly would have approved of on account of the light and close-fitting drapery which somewhat deliberately reveals the form and sensuous attitude of the body underneath - form and attitude that Professor Pedretti aptly relates to the principles of the figura serpentinata inherent in the naked Leda. For the Cardinal, in fact, the suggestion of a naked body imagined through tight drapery is even more insidious and unacceptable in the representation of the Virgin:
... Instead, someone of our artists will not be ashamed to dress the Virgin with clothing so tight as to reproduce all the forms of the body, as if they were hidden only by a very tenuous veil. (De Pictura Sacra, I, vii)

This mention of "someone of our artists" can be taken as a reference to Leonardo, the underscored words making the reference to the Virgin in the Burlington House Cartoon almost a certainty. By contrast, the Cardinal praises Titian's representation of the nude Magdalen:

In this painting one must admire exceedingly the fact that the artist knew how to maintain decorum in a nude. (Musaeum, p. 24)

Michelangelo's Last Judgment and Veronese's Feast in the House of Levi had already been the objects of well-known attacks on the grounds of their lack of decorum.

In relation to his investigations into the nature and strength of beauty, Cardinal Borromeo also expresses his approval of pious images executed by only the best hands:

The first and supreme precept of the ancients regarding these most noble arts was that the images of the Gods should be made by the hand of the most noble of all: this custom was observed by the Gentiles, because they believed that they could express more surely and with greater ability their beliefs regarding the divinity through the genius of such artists. (De Pictura Sacra, I, ii)

Cardinal Borromeo cautions artists to take advantage of all sacred sources and to read the Bible and the interpretations of it in order to avoid the "errors of the ancient gentiles," the "falsification of history," and the profanation of sacred works of art. He states:
The maximum liberty was always conceded to painters and poets, but such liberty should never reach the point at which the venerable and sacred laws of the Catholic Faith, also reason (both of which prohibit, both in every discourse and in painting the mixture of the sacred and the profane) be trodden upon. Those who work thus err too temerariously and too openly. (De Pictura Sacra, I, iv)

He continues with references and observations on ancient customs and representations of Hercules and Cleopatra and to images by Philostratus and statues by Callistrates.

In order to avoid heresies, the story must be depicted in the clearest and most accurate manner feasible:

... one may well comprehend how certain norms and precepts and great caution are necessary so that sacred subjects be treated with decorum and truth by painters; even pagan antiquity itself, having gravely mistaken on the subject, felt the need to correct its own mistakes. (De Pictura Sacra, I, iii)

Thus, historical truth must be safeguarded to properly inspire the faithful:

So that the rights of history be safeguarded, one must keep in mind that it is certainly permissible for the painter and sculptor to embellish and to illustrate history as best he can, but it is not at all permitted to contradict the truth of the same, and to deface or not to recognize the deep-rooted tradition of any fact. With such an object in mind, the decree of the Holy Council of Trent ordained that all falsehoods and errors be banished from sacred painting so that pious pictures would not present anything which could scandalize simple souls. (De Pictura Sacra, I, iv)

According to the Acts of the Council of Trent, no image was to be permitted open to erroneous or questionable doctrine. Theological inaccuracies were to be
prevented by considering every detail of the figure or scene from sacred history. Accurate information relating to the number of figures present and their placement, attitudes, and manner of dress was required. Thus, the artist was not permitted free rein in order to strengthen the position of the Catholic Church in defiance of Protestantism. Cardinal Borromeo mentions throughout his De Pictura Sacra such condemned executions as Charon's boat in Michelangelo's Last Judgment (I, v), Jesus learning how to read on his mother's knees, and the mingling of Saints not present during certain traditional stories as the presence of St. Francis during the Nativity (I, iv), thus concluding:

But our pure Faith is so much truth's friend, and one must avoid with the greatest care the slightest thing that could give an opportunity to evil denigrators, that I can only praise those who represent the holy mysteries as they occurred, introducing or adding nothing to them. (De Pictura Sacra, I, iv)

The use of coats of arms in contemporary religious structures particularly enrages the Cardinal and he strongly reproves this vanity. For his person, he had always limited the tendency toward external grandness to how much was necessary for his dignity and See and was against pomp for its own sake. Thus, he was angered by this practice:

In our day instead, one should strongly reproach the vanity or pride of those who, as soon as they
set about constructing a building for sacred or charitable use, immediately arrange to have their insignias and coats of arms affixed thereto and standing out, and they want them placed not in a corner or in a secondary frieze, but in a clearly visible and eminent place, and perhaps the expense of only that work exceeds that used for all the rest of the building. (De Pictura Sacra, I, v)

And, in keeping with his own motto "Humilitas," he reiterates:

At one time aristocratic insignias called coats of arms were not in use either by ecclesiastics or by laymen. Today it is an unworthy ostentation of such coats of arms, which disfigure not only sacred walls but even canonical robes. (De Pictura Sacra, II, ii)

III. Sentiments and Physiognomy

In his chapter "On the Difficulties in Portraying the Soul's Sentiments," Cardinal Borromeo places great emphasis on rendering emotion in religious figures:

I would like therefore that our artists either work at expressing sentiments or, if they are not good at this, that they somehow show pain and stress, as that ancient artist did who mistrusting his ability to express the father's sentiments in sacrificing his daughter, covered Agamennon's head. This study will bear great and noble fruit. In fact, piety towards God and the Saints, praise, imitation, fear, pain, and hope are no other than the sentiments of the soul awakened by holy images, which may be called living and inspiring when they excite and stir our minds almost as with a vital breath . . . (De Pictura Sacra, I, x)
Of interest in this chapter is an anecdote concerning Paolo Giovio:

... Paolo Giovio said somewhat wittily to some artists of his day: that those same artists were skillful in representing a physician and a doctor (i.e. learned man) because that figure can be accomplished with two strokes, if on the one they draw a long beard and on the other a toga. But if they haven't striven with all their might to express sentiments, they will never appease the sound eye of the good, nor render the effect that Basil the Great searched for in his great mind. (De Pictura Sacra, I, x)

The last sentence is the Cardinal's own conclusions to Giovio's tale.

Cardinal Borromeo also provides us with exemplary models of befitting emotion. In both the De Pictura Sacra and the Musaeum, he singles out the sentiment depicted by Leonardo in his Last Supper for psychological investigation:

Which the learned of the Sacred Scriptures will know the childish opinion of those who believe that the bread was miraculously halved and that the Savior was recognized by means of that Miracle. For this reason Leonardo represents the Savior almost speaking or as soon as the prayer is finished ... (De Pictura Sacra, II, iv)

In this context, he also considers Titian's Deposition into the Sepulchre praiseworthy:

... Magdalen consumed with grief and love and full of life in the flower of youth perhaps going against the evangelical story ... St. John competes in suffering ... Having exhausted the expression of sadness in these two figures ... he painted the Mother of God in the arms of her dead Son in the act of kissing him and cloaked in darkness. In this way he expressed more than what
he painted and showed also what he kept hidden. (Musaeum, p. 9)

In keeping with late sixteenth century views, he reaffirms the position of the Counter Reformation in regard to the expression of sentiments in religious figures, thus recognizing the validity of the physiognomic studies carried out by Leonardo and Lomazzo in Lombardy, in the context of a local religious piety.60

As for the late Mannerist art, he condemns excessive display of anatomical virtuosity recalling the work of Michelangelo and the School of Fontainebleau:

Among the errors which one finds almost at every turn in the paintings of the mysteries of the Savior's life, not the least is that the artists use too much artifice. In fact, in painting the birth of the Savior, they made the shepherds' bodies too athletic, with such grandiose and vigorous figures that they attract the eye to themselves, distracting it from any other contemplation. With the Virgin Mother and the divine Infant himself on the contrary, they take very little care, searching for all their glory to portray shepherds' shoulders and extended arms with muscles and fleshy masses. (De Pictura Sacra, II, iv)

A related observation aims at detecting the reasons for the curious reduction of the head's size and the emphatic use of drapery in Mannerist figures:

... as the ancient and great artists took most care in painting heads for our modern ones (artists), neglecting that part, it is customary to employ all their skill in the other parts, not paying attention to the size and proportions of bodies, more than a few set all their skill to the painting of clothing and the body's gracefulness. (De Pictura Sacra, I, x)
And concludes:

... Our moderns, of whom I complain, purposely avoid all that which is difficult and noble, and then take only that which is striking and superficial. (De Pictura Sacra, I, x)

IV. Moral and Historical Propriety

Evoking the examples of works by the ancients and more contemporary illustrations, the Cardinal denounces the depiction of "immoral figures." In line with the reasoning of the Council of Trent and with the treatises of St. Charles and Gabriele Paleotti, he states that indecency should be avoided in churches and in the decorations of private dwellings:

I would now like to try to sharpen this dull stylus of mine against those who love to decorate their rooms with lascivious paintings and sculptures, and who search for those diabolical devices. In fact, ... they love to ferment and cultivate it, almost as if they would like, as one man said, to tease the appetite with stimulants ... The Holy Fathers made great war against such corruption, and there is a whole series of decrees against similar immorality. (De Pictura Sacra, I, xiii)

The artists who produce lascivious subjects are to be blamed more than the purchasers of these works:

The latter, in fact, for the sordid greed of gain, would be ready to make even more indecent ones, while the buyers, finally becoming aware of evil, the scandal and shame, put aside and hide those works to avoid to be offered
incentives to vice by seeking out for themselves opportunities to sin. (De Pictura Sacra, I, xiii)

Those in authority should also censure this practice and thereby avoid a public outcry:

The powerful who do this, can surely through their authority and strength hold back the indignation of the people who protest against those insults to the Divinity and the Fatherland, and thus dispoil the churches of their ornaments, but they can certainly not stop their ears so that they not hear the laments and complaints of the cities themselves, and this in no way occurs and as a result of no one's power. (De Pictura Sacra, I, xiii)

One practically never finds nudes or even partially draped figures in the art of the Counter-Reformation.

Figures were required to be suitably attired:

An even more grievous fault would be that if he who, intending to paint a panel to be displayed for worship in a church, defaces the better part of it by inserting a lascivious woman, and works passionately on that dishonest figure, beyond any need as regards the representation, which need, if it existed, would be rather to omit doing that representation. Therefore I would not permit the nude Susanna to be in such a painting, although history admits such nudity. (De Pictura Sacra, I, ix)

The problem of nudity is touched in the Musaeum in less dogmatic terms. Thus, in Titian's Magdalen, a copy of the famous painting in the Pitti, "one must admire exceedingly the fact that the artist knew how to maintain an honest appearance in a nude" (p. 24). Of Luini's Sybils, two paintings which have disappeared, it is said...
that "their highest value lies perhaps in the fact that the elegance of the forms in no way moves one to lasciviousness" (p. 14). And speaking of the Virgin in Luini's Holy Family (Fig. 15), the Cardinal feels compelled to state that she is "so much more admirable in that her singular charm inspires a sacred respect and sweeps out of every mind every unchaste thought" (p. 22). And yet he is able to detect a sensuous quality in another of Luini's paintings "One praises in it the feminine movement of the kneeling Magdalen" (p. 24).

In Book II of his De Pictura Sacra, Cardinal Borromeo furnishes pictorial norms for the proper representation of sacred images. In these succinct chapters, he emphasizes the educational function of art and provides the necessary elements of cult to understand religious subjects and to direct artistic production toward the service of the Church. The idea that priests and artists should collaborate is found in the decrees of the Council of Trent and runs throughout the pages of St. Charles' Arte Sacra. Here Cardinal Borromeo returns to that notion and considers questions relating to what kinds of images are to be retained and justified against idolatry, to the importance of historical truth in order to combat the heretical, scandalous, superfluous, or superstitious; to the choice of setting, gestures, and physiognomy, and to
other subjects explored in Book I.

In considering the physical appearance of Christ, he states:

He was of noble and expressive aspect. His height was of approximately seven palms. His hair color tended towards blonde, and it was not too thick, and slightly wavy; black eyebrows not, however, arched. From his fair eyes there flowed a marvelous grace. They were penetrating, and his nose was long enough. His beard blonde and not too flowing, rather long instead was his hair. Neither a razor nor any man's hand other than that of his mother when he was of a tender age, ran over his head. His neck was somewhat inclined so that the body's line was not too rigid or extended. His face was of the color of wheat; neither round nor pointed, but like that of his mother, extending somewhat downward and on the red side; and it emanated gravity and prudence mixed with a sweetness and placidity completely lacking in wrathfulness. In brief, he resembled in all aspects his divine and immaculate Mother and this should be enough. (De Pictura Sacra, II, ii)

The close relationship between this description and the figure of Christ in Leonardo's Last Supper is of interest. In depicting the "mysteries of the Savior's life," models for the representation of the Nativity, Adoration of the Magi, Circumcision, Temptation in the Desert, Christ Preaching in the Temple, the Flagellation, the Last Supper, the Holy Sepulchre, the Resurrection of Christ, and the Supper at Emmaus are given by the Cardinal. He points out errors and provides good examples of historical and truthful accuracy. Once again, he returns to Leonardo's Last Supper:
In the institution of the Blessed Sacrament they may place in front of the Savior, on the table at which he is sitting with the disciples, bread and wine, but they will have to beware of picturing the Savior making the sign of the cross over the bread and wine. In fact before the passion of Christ blessings were not with the sign of the cross, but with another ceremony and another rite; which the learned of the Sacred Scriptures will know. For this reason Leonardo represents the Savior almost speaking or as soon as the prayer is finished, in that famous Last Supper or triclinium which was among the beauties of our city before time consumed that marvelous work. (De Pictura Sacra, II, iv)

In his chapter "On the Pictorial Field," the Cardinal states that the "background" and "contours" should be arranged to correspond to the subject matter in accordance with historical accuracy. His delightful narration about the removal of the little dog in Titian's Adoration of the Magi (Fig. 24), however, serves as a warning against "exaggerated and too rigid" precision:

In a lower corner of that canvas a little dog had been painted with both as much naturalness and gracefulness as was humanly possible using colors and a brush. Well now, an austere and fanatical man of the Cardinal's court immediately ordered that the little animal crouching in the corner, be erased and that artistic marvel was lost. And yet that little dog could very well have remained in that painting, together with that herd of horses and camels and the numerous following of the Magi! The command given by that fanatic and the fact itself could not for long remain a secret, whence one frequently heard complaints on the part of those who, having seen the painting before, regretted that charming little figure. It is said that, on hearing of it, Titian, sighing and with tears in his eyes exclaimed that it wasn't surprising that people who were ignorant of every art could have committed
such a disgrace. (De Pictura Sacra, I, ix)

The Cardinal was certainly unaware of the exact nature of the detail removed from Titian's painting. The versions of the same subject in the Prado and at Cleveland (Figs. 25, 26) show that the dog was not in "a lower corner," and was not "crouching" in all naturalness and gracefulness. It was placed in a very prominent position at the center of the picture, facing the spectator, one leg lifted to urinate against a post of the Nativity's hut — indeed, a most irreverent amenity that the Counter Reformation (and the Cardinal himself) would not have hesitated to condemn. In fact, the Cardinal reprimands those who clutter sacred themes with superfluous details as the excessive use of "animals, plants, and rocks" displayed "in various perspectives" in the paintings of St. John in the Desert or the unnecessary display of household furnishings in paintings of the birth of the Virgin (De Pictura Sacra, I, ix). As Ccppa has pointed out, these warnings do not necessarily coincide with the Cardinal's aesthetic preferences and activities as a collector and patron of the arts, and denote the influence in the use of accumulated details of Flemish art.61 Despite the voyages of Flemish and Dutch artists to Italy during the time of Federico, collections of works of art by these artists were largely
limited to those in the Ambrosiana. Thus, the Cardinal was one of the first important collectors in Italy of Flemish art.

V. Genre Painting

We have seen that Cardinal Borromeo appreciated the work of Brueghel, Rottenhammer, and Brill, and gave flattering approval of their work in the pages of his Musaeum. These artists generally painted small romantic forest scenes having antique and Biblical subjects somewhat anticipating the ideal landscapes of Poussin and Claude. These artists often follow stereotyped formulas and emphasize reduced elements and unexpected detail. The principal events of the story are relegated to the middle ground while elements of still life, landscape, and genre are scattered in the foreground. Works painted for the Ambrosiana, including Brueghel's famous series, the Elements, and Brill's seascapes are examples of this layering effect and of a world viewed microscopically. Furthermore, John Shearman has shown that the landscapes by Brill as well as those by Gillis van Coninxloo and the Frankenthal school differ from the early Baroque landscape style in their insistence on "an abstracted, idealized, reconstructed view of the world in which
natural forms - trees or ground-planes - are wilfully shaped with a sinuous grace like that of a 'Madonna' by Parmigianino, and coloured just as artificially. Not a leaf stirs." These so-called Mannerist landscapes neither show the dynamism nor movement of light of the early Baroque style particularly associated with Rubens' landscapes.

In describing Brueghel's four scenes from the Passion of Christ enframed by chiselled silver (Fig. 6), Cardinal Borromeo writes:

... he even wished with his brush to travel over all of nature because he painted as we shall later demonstrate seas, mountains, grottoes, subterranean caves and all these things which are separated by immense distances he limited in a small space imitating nature itself not only in color but also in talent which is the highest quality of nature and of art. (Musaeum, p. 16)

He then describes the particular details that distinguish each of Brueghel's Four Elements, which he had commissioned for the Ambrosiana (Musaeum, pp. 17-18). The allegory of Water (Fig. 7) displays a great variety of fish, as well as sea shells and every sort of freaks of nature and refuse of the sea. The Earth is a detailed landscape that provides the setting for a great variety of animals, including a lion, peacock, leopard, and a wolf. The "barren and greedy" Fire (Fig. 8) is interpreted in mythological terms through the representation of the stories of the Cyclops, Vulcan, and Saturn. The
Fig. 6. Jan Brueghel, Four Scenes of the Passion of Christ enframed in a silver acquasantiera. Milan, Ambrosiana.
Fig. 7. Jan Brueghel, Allegory of Water. Milan, Ambrosiana.

Fig. 8. Jan Brueghel, Allegory of Fire. Milan, Ambrosiana.
greater praise goes to the allegory of Air for all its elements of ethereal subtlety, to which the artist is said to have paid great attention being the last work of the series with which he wished to surpass himself.

In describing a winter landscape by Rottenhammer and Brueghel (Fig. 9), Cardinal Borromeo praises again the minuteness of detail and goes as far as to attach symbolic meaning to the elements of the landscape, but with a concluding remark which is a warning to iconographers: "... to tell the truth, when I ordered the painting, I did not think at all either of symbols or of mysteries" (Musaeum, p. 25). The idea of a symbolism was suggested by the flying putti (parvuli Alites, which are wrongly interpreted as "small birds" in the Beltrami edition of the Musaeum) added by Rottenhammer, and shown in the act of spreading flowers (said to have been painted by Brueghel) over the winter landscape: "The flowers and the frost represent Spring and Winter, extreme opposites of Nature symbolizing the joy of Heavens and the sadness of the terrestrial story." Similar symbolisms are hinted at in a passage of the De Pictura Sacra (I, vi) in which the Cardinal discusses the image of the Angels, whose personification is not always in terms of human figure:

... Sometimes, in fact, they assume animal form; those divine spirits may become in the
Fig. 9. Johann Rottenhammer and Jan Brueghel, Allegory of Winter (and detail). Milan, Ambrosiana.
Holy Scriptures wheels and precious stones, clouds, winds, and flames; and such visions and images were described by not a few of our own fathers in their writings; Dionysius the Aeropagite with his lofty mind one time explained those mysteries and went after the reason why one should attribute the Angels the form of Fire.

The Cardinal collected such works without sparing costs, in contrast to his own personal denial of any exterior display. In describing Brueghel's *Battle of the Flowers*, which is now designated as *Vase of Flowers with Jewel, Money, and Shells*, he literally valued the painting as that of the jewel displayed in the foreground (*Musaeum*, p. 26). The Cardinal's taste is best exemplified by a small oval Madonna, at one time attributed to Rubens, which is framed by a garland of flowers painted by Jan Brueghel (Fig. 10).

It has already been noted that Jan Brueghel, the son of the great Pieter, Rottenhammer, and Brill were all the Cardinal's guests between 1593 and 1595 in the Cardinal's home in the Piazza Navona in Rome and later in the archbishopric in Milan. The correspondence between these artists and Cardinal Borromeo in the Ambrosiana further illuminates the cordiality and intimate rapport between the Cardinal and these painters and the Cardinal's role as a patron of the arts: friend, fatherly guide, and source of inspiration and remuneration. When Brueghel repatriated, the Cardinal wrote a flattering letter of recommendation.
Fig. 10. Jan Brueghel, Garland of Flowers framing a Madonna attributed to Rubens. Milan, Ambrosiana.
to the Bishop of Antwerp in behalf of the artist.\textsuperscript{64} The Cardinal also befriended other contemporary Flemish artists as Jan and Anthony Ravensteyn and notably, Peter Paul Rubens, who had known Brueghel both in Antwerp and in Italy. Of interest is Rubens letter thanking the Cardinal for the shipment of a gold medallion with the portrait of St. Charles.\textsuperscript{65} The Cardinal had also been on intimate terms with other noted "Flamands" as the scholars Justus Lipsius and Hendrick van der Putte. The latter celebrated humanists also served as advisors to the Cardinal in helping to develop the Cardinal's project for the foundation of the Ambrosian Library.\textsuperscript{66}

Thus, the Cardinal maintained a certain rapport with Flemish artists and scholars and showed interest not only in a religious and moralized art but also in a sort of Neo-Manneristic type of art characterized by an elegance, courtliness, and encyclopedic curiosity notably in the works of Brueghel, Brill, and Rottenhammer. He not only showed a partiality for these fashionable artists but a sincere admiration for them which was parallel to contemporary tastes in art, literature, and other cultural phenomena in Milan.\textsuperscript{67} The affinity between the poetry, namely the \textit{Adonis}, and correspondence of Marino and the painting of Brueghel has been discussed at length by Coppa.
This preference for elegant and refined works of art is also connected to the Cardinal's passion for works on crystal, elaborately framed minatures, and other examples of minor arts of small dimensions. During the second part of the sixteenth century, these flourished in Milan and again are related to contemporary tastes there. The Cardinal himself praised the minatures of Gerolamo Marchesini and Agosto Decio which he had placed in the Ambrosiana. In speaking of three minatures having unknown subjects by Marchesini, he declares that they are "of great value both because they were executed with all possible diligence and also because it is rare that one should ennoble paintings of such dimensions with minature" (Musaeum, p. 19). He also mentions that Marchesini had been his guest for some time in his home in Milan. Decio also earned the respect of the Cardinal for similar reasons. This ultimate flowering of the encyclopedic ordering of the universe based on the Medieval tradition is, thus, one major difference between the official sentiments he professes in his De Pictura Sacra and the more private aesthetic preferences he reveals in his Musaeum.
VI. Classic Art

a. Raphael and Michelangelo

Cardinal Borromeo's taste and pride as a collector also led him to acquire works of classical excellence and ideal perfection, such as drawings, paintings and sculptures by Raphael, Michelangelo, Leonardo, Bernardino Luini, Palma il Vecchio, Bassano, and Titian. With the advice of such shrewd connoisseurs as Gerolamo Borsieri, the Cardinal assembled works of art of exceptional merit, which he appreciated for their educational value, their moral beauty and physical splendor - hence worthy of imitation. This attraction to the best traditions in art may be viewed in line with late Mannerist desire to reach ideal perfection. Pattern books of illustrations extracted from works by old masters were to become an indispensable tool in art schools, as postulated by the Carracci. The Cardinal alludes to this practice both in the De Pictura Sacra (I, x), and in the Musaeum:

that which is said with regard to Michelangelo and Raphael arouses even more wonder namely that they compete with the ancients the first in the painting of feet the second the head and the upper extremities of the body. To Raphael, then is attributed pre-eminence in drawing eyes and the vivacity of looks. (Musaeum, p. 7)

As mentioned in Section A above (V, b), the Cardinal's admiration for Raphael dates from his Roman years, before 1595, when he ordered a number of Raphael's works to be...
copied. Eventually he succeeded in securing for his collection the extraordinary cartoon of the School of Athens (Fig. 11).

This cartoon is not mentioned in the section on drawings in the 1618 Deed of Gift, which however includes a fragment (mt. 0.81 x 2.45) of Giulio Romano's cartoon of the Battle of Constantine.\(^8\) And yet the Musaeum (p. 38) records two Raphael cartoons which were kept together with Michelangelo's models of Dusk and Dawn, and "which students ought to hold the dearer, the less one can doubt the author." This has been identified as a reference to the cartoon of the School of Athens, which in fact consisted originally of two separate fragments - as such being still recorded in the list of the French requisition of 1796. It is first recorded in 1610 when Count Fabio Borromeo Visconti of Brebbia was to give it on loan to the Cardinal's chamberlain, Giovanni Battista Besozzo, as "duoi pezzi di disegno di Raphaele d'Urbino in carbone, e questi richiesti in prestito dal Sig.re Card.le con promessa di restituirli ad ogni richiesta" (Two pieces of a drawing by Raphael of Urbino in charcoal, and these were requested on loan by the Cardinal, with the promise that he would return them at any request). On November 23, 1626, the widow of Count Fabio, Donna Bianca Borromeo Spinola, sold the "doi quadri de disegni
Fig. 11. Raphael, Cartoon of the School of Athens. Milan, Ambrosiana.

Fig. 12. Raphael, Cartoon of the School of Athens (detail). Milan Ambrosiana.
di Raffaelo" to the Ambrosiana Library for 600 Imperial lire. And the 1685 inventory (p. 36) records them as being in the same frame and as being protected by a green curtain: "incastrati in una stessa cornice . . . coperti di tende di cendalo verde." It may be objected that at the time he was writing the *Musaeum*, which was published in 1625, the Cardinal was not yet the legal owner of the cartoon. This is probably why he simply mentions the "two cartoons" as part of a group of didactic material which included copies of famous ancient statuary. On the other hand, it could well be that arrangements for their acquisition had already been made a year before the official purchase. The cartoon of the School of Athens was reassembled, restored and lined in France and then displayed in the Gallery of Apollo at the Louvre until it was returned to the Ambrosiana in 1816. Its subsequent history is well known.

The cartoon thus recomposed is still a fragment in that it does not include the upper part with the Bramante-esque architectural background. But the figures, which point to Leonardo's *Adoration of the Magi* as the source of their forcefulness and directness of expression, are clearly conceived in relation to a carefully planned perspective setting consisting of a network of lines which include the lower part of the vertical elements of
the missing background (Fig. 12). A large gap in the lower center, which was filled in by the French restorers, shows how the cartoon was damaged at the middle vertical fold, at the point where it eventually came apart splitting in two pieces. Another damaged area is the right margin, where the two portraits seen in the fresco (Raphael's self-portrait and the portrait of Sodoma) are missing. And yet, since there seems to be room enough for the head of Raphael, it is possible that the idea of these portraits had come to him as an afterthought, just as the prominent figure of Democritus was to be added to the foreground step as a possible portrait of Michelangelo.  

Cardinal Borromeo attached great importance to the Head of an Old Man which he attributed to Michelangelo and which appears as the first item in the 1618 Deed of Gift.  

This is now kept in storage and is ascribed to a late follower of Michelangelo. Nothing is known of the two models for the Dawn and Dusk, and there is no way to relate them to any of those which have recently received an attribution to Michelangelo.  

The Cardinal stresses Michelangelo's excellence not only in relation to Titian's (Musæum, p. 8), but also as a supreme example worthy of imitation (Musæum, pp. 37-38).
b. Leonardo and Luini

The Academy envisaged by Cardinal Borromeo was to derive great inspiration from the works of Leonardo da Vinci and his Milanese followers. Accordingly, the Cardinal was eagerly after originals or copies of the paintings of these masters, thus undertaking the program discussed in Section A above (V, b) and beginning a Leonardo collection that shortly after his death was to be made the most important in the world by the addition of the Leonardo manuscripts donated by Galeazzo Arconati in 1637.

An epigram by a doctor of the Ambrosiana, Benedetto Sossago, published as early as 1616, shows how the Cardinal's name could be associated to that of Leonardo on account of the paintings he was collecting, and how it could be related to that of Francis I - the king having been the supporter of the artist's dying body, the Cardinal being the guardian of his living mind:

De Cardinali Borromeo et Leonardo pictore.

Dum caput expirans pictor Leonarde reclinas Gallorum dominus brachia supposuit.

Ecce tuas tabulas Federicus servat ab aevo, Hic mentis custos, corporis ille fuit.

The miniature like painting with the portraits of Giovan Galeazzo Visconti and Petrarch recorded in the third item of the 1618 Deed of Gift as a Leonardo has
nothing to do with Leonardo, but is probably by a Tuscan painter of the late Trecento, as suggested by Achille Ratti.\textsuperscript{73}

The second item in the Deed of Gift (the first being the head allegedly by Michelangelo) is described as "A Portrait of a Duchess of Milan, from the waist line up, by Leonardo," a painting mentioned in the \textit{Museum} (p. 20) as "the portrait of one of our princesses, which is by Leonardo and seems to vie with the other (i.e. the Michelangelesque head) for the excellence of drawing."

The painting is now designated as the \textit{Portrait of a Young Lady} (Fig. 13), allegedly of Beatrice d'Este, wife of Ludovico Sforza. The attribution to Giovanni Ambrogio De Predis, Leonardo's associate in the 1483 contract for the \textit{Virgin of the Rocks}, was proposed by Morelli in 1886, and is accepted by most critics, except Longhi who has recently ascribed the painting to Lorenzo Costa.\textsuperscript{74}

According to Morelli, the profile was to be identified with the portrait of Bianca Maria Sforza, daughter of Ludovico il Moró, which was seen by Michiel in the Contarini house in Venice in 1525: "ritratto in profilo in sino alle spalle de madona . . . fiola del sig. Ludovico da Milano maritata nello imperatore Massimiliano, fu dè mano de . . . milanese." Some light on the provenance of the painting may be thrown by a letter of
Fig. 13. Giovanni Ambrogio De Predis (attr.), Profile of Young Lady (so-called portrait of Beatrice d'Este). Milan, Ambrosiana.
Alessandro Mazenta to Cardinal Federico written from Venice on November 23, 1613. Mazenta, "arciprete" of the Milan Cathedral, was in Venice to acquire paintings for the Cardinal and reported the shipment of three paintings by Titian, Jacopo Bassano and Raphael (or Perino del Vaga), announcing a next shipment of two other paintings, one by Luca van Leyden and one by Andrea Schiavone. The concluding sentence reads as follows: "Ho fatta diligenza de quadri che V.S. Ill.ma comado, ma sin hora per la stravaganza del prezzo non vedo si possa far partito" (I went after the paintings that Your Most Illustrious Lordship commanded me to look for, but up to now I cannot see how to obtain them on account of the exorbitant price requested). One wonders whether one of those paintings could have been perchance the portrait recorded by Michiel in 1525, but at least this detail shows the Cardinal's determination to reach out for masterpieces that he was prepared to acquire at great expenses. Another revealing detail is found in the concluding paragraph of Ambrogio Mazenta's Memorie of 1635. After an account of works by Leonardo and his followers found in Milan, Mazenta states that several small paintings in private houses in Milan are taken to be by Leonardo and instead are by pupils, and concludes: "Le più certe sono le datte da miei fratelli
al S. F Card. Borromeo hoggi pure fra' i disegni e pitture
della libraria Ambrosiana riposte." We know that it was
in fact Guido Mazenta who gave Cardinal Borromeo, in
1603, Leonardo's *Treatise on Light and Shade*, but Ambrogio's
statement implies that the Cardinal received more than
that, at least drawings. In fact, even Leonardo's famous
self-portrait now at Turin, which was seen by Vasari in
the Melzi collection, could have been among the Leonardo
material given by the Mazenta brothers to the Cardinal,
works that Ambrogio could designate as being "le più
certe" because he knew that they had come from the Melzi
estate. The list of the works requisitioned by the
French in 1796 shows that Leonardo's self-portrait was
taken out of the Ambrosiana in that year and never
reached Paris. It must have remained in Lombardy because
it was copied by Raffaello Albertolli and engraved by
Giuseppe Benaglia for the frontispiece of Bossi's
*Cenacolo* of 1810; Bossi specifies this adding the infor-
mation that the whereabouts of the original are unknown. 76
The Albertolli copy was eventually acquired by Bossi and
together with authentic Leonardo drawings owned by Bossi
went to the collection of the Venice Academy and is often
reproduced as the real self-portrait!

The famous portrait of a *Musician* (Fig. 14) at one
time considered a portrait of Ludovico Sforza as the
counterpart of Beatrice, does not appear in the 1618 Deed of Gift and is not mentioned in the Musaeum, but it is listed in the 1685 inventory as "a half length portrait of a Duke of Milan with a red cap, by the hand of Luini." Luini's name was subsequently crossed out and replaced by that of Leonardo, but the 1798 inventory designates the painting as being by the "School of Luini." In 1906 Beltrami had the painting restored causing the old repainting of the lower right hand corner to be removed. This revealed the hand of the sitter holding a sheet of music on which the fragment CANT . . . ANG . . . could be discerned. Beltrami himself put forth the theory that it was the portrait of Franchino Gaffurio, a musician at the Sforza Court and Maestro di Cappella at Milan Cathedral - the words CANT[UM] ANG[ELICUM] ac divinum opus, which was to be published in 1508. The identification is generally accepted, but a new theory suggests as an alternative the identity of another famous musician of the time, Josquin des Prez, who was also at the Sforza Court at the same time Leonardo was there. There is no evidence of the provenance of the painting, and Beltrami has called attention to the entry "la testa di B. Luino con cornice nera" (such being the original frame of the Ambrosiana painting) that the Roman engraver
Gaspare Mola was to bequeath in 1630 to the Hospital of San Carlo al Corso in Rome, an institution which was sponsored by St. Charles Borromeo.  

Leonardo had a number of pupils and followers who borrowed elements of his artistic repertory in varying degrees and with diverse successes. His best follower was probably Bernardino Luini (c. 1485-1532), who was considered for a long time one of his Milanese pupils. Cardinal Borromeo acquired several original works by Luini for the Ambrosiana. These include a Magdalen represented from the waist-line up and with a vase of alabaster in her hands, a subject known in a Luini painting in the Knoedler House at New York, a youthful Blessing Christ (inv. no. 80), a Noli me tangere described as a "Magdalen at the feet of the Savior who is disguised under the figure of an Ortolan," a painting of doubtful authenticity, but probably an early one as suggested by Ottino della Chiesa (no. 129), and a Head of St. Jerome, which is now attributed to Andrea Solario (inv. no. 83). Two Sybils mentioned in the Musaeum (p. 14) are not recorded in the 1618 Deed of Gift and are missing. Copies after works by Luini were made by Vespino and others and are mentioned in the 1618 Deed of Gift and in the Musaeum. The pre-eminence the Cardinal gives to Luini is also shown by the importance he
attributed to Luini's **Holy Family** (Fig. 15), which he calls the "quadro principale" in the Deed of Gift, specifying its dimensions: "A Madonna with S. Anne, Our Lord and St. John both children, with St. Joseph, by the hand of Bernardino Luini, a braccio and a half each side. With a golden frame."

A full account of this painting is given in the *Musaeum* (pp. 21-22) in which the Cardinal offers observations about its artistic merit and its relationship to Leonardo's work. He also specifies that it is located in the room "that comes immediately after", this being a reference to Room H as shown in the plan given in Fig. 4 above. Unfortunately, he does not specify how and when he became the owner of the work nor the exact purchase price, but states that "the painting was purchased for a great sum, is fairly large, and is valued by painters as one of the most perfect of that artist."

In 1815 the Louvre valued it at 50,000 francs - an enormous sum indeed - upon its return to the Ambrosiana along with other works requisitioned by the French in 1796.

Luini's composition is based on the Burlington House Cartoon of Leonardo's *Virgin and Child with St. Anne* (Fig. 16), a fact already recognized by Cardinal Borromeo, who was certainly familiar with Leonardo's original
Fig. 15. Bernardino Luini, The Holy Family. Milan, Ambrosiana.
Fig. 16. Leonardo da Vinci, The Burlington House Cartoon. London, National Gallery.
cartoon then in the possession of Count Galeazzo Arconati. The early history of the Burlington House Cartoon is unknown, and it is not certain that it was among the works that Leonardo had left to his pupil Francesco Melzi when he died in 1519. Lomazzo speaks of it as having come from France and as being in Aurelio Luini's hands, adding that "Leonardo expressed in the Blessed Virgin the joy and delight she felt over having given birth to so beautiful a child as Christ was." This has been taken as evidence that Aurelio's father, Bernardino, who had died in 1535, was the original owner of the cartoon and it is occasionally implied that he had obtained it directly from Leonardo. Newly discovered evidence shows that Arconati had acquired it from the estate of Pompeo Leoni, together with the bulk of the Leonardo manuscripts (including the Codex Atlanticus), which he was to donate to the Ambrosian Library in 1637. This does not explain whether Leoni had acquired the cartoon from the Melzi estate or from Aurelio Luini, who had died in 1593, but it could be surmised that Luini had it on loan. The Leoni estate as itemized in a document of 1614 includes two other Leonardo cartoons, the Leda and the Portrait of a Lady (or a Saint), which also went to Arconati and which are now lost. It is somewhat puzzling that Cardinal Borromeo should not have secured such important Leonardo items for his collection.
and as suitable items for his Academy - more so when one considers that Arconati must have been prepared to dispose of them, even as gifts. In fact, he was to write to Cassiano dal Pozzo, on November 16, 1639, to offer either the St. Anne cartoon or the cartoon with the Portrait of a Lady (which he identifies as the wife of Louis XII) as a gift to Cardinal Francesco Barberini in Rome. Nothing came of the offer, and it is well-known that the St. Anne cartoon passed on to the Casnedi family in Milan and to the Sagreto in Venice, and that it eventually went to England, where it was to be recorded in the Royal Academy in 1791.

Luini's Holy Family has long been taken as evidence of Bernardino's having been the "translator" of Leonardo's ideas, thus as the pupil who was carrying out in painting the drawings of the Master. Beginning with Beltrami's reservations in his monograph on Luini of 1911, and again in a note to his edition of the Musaeum (1909), the "Leonardism" of Bernardino Luini has become to be defined as that of a follower, not of a pupil, and in fact it is hard to place the Holy Family in his stylistic development anywhere before his decoration in the Church of San Giorgio al Palazzo in Milan of 1516, at the time when Leonardo was already on his way to France. It is a style in keeping with that of the polyptyc of S. Magno.
at Legnano of 1523, and of the Torriani polyptic of after 1523, and it is reasonable therefore to date the painting in the late 1520's together with a group of well-known Madonnas which are closely related to the 1526 Madonna in the Viscount Lee of Fareham collection at Richmond.85

It appears that it was Cardinal Borromeo who originated this misconception about the relationship between Luini and Leonardo; on the other hand, he might have simply recorded an opinion accepted at his time, just as Ambrogio Mazenta, in his Memorie of about 1635, was to give a lengthy list of Leonardo's Milanese pupils, with a prominent place given to Luini.86 Indeed, the Cardinal went a bit too far in implying that Leonardo would have recognized Luini's superiority in handling the colors, but he adds the important observation about the central element of the painting, the reclining figure of the Christ Child, as having been conceived by Leonardo out of a clay model, which apparently was still existing at the time the Cardinal was writing and which is lost. Professor Pedretti, has called attention to the British Museum sheet of Leonardo's studies for the Burlington House Cartoon as containing a sketch of a child which looks like a drawing after one such model, and has related it to Leonardo's practice of studying the composition of the Battle of Anghiari by means of wax
models. It was a practice that was soon to affect the whole of Italian art and that was to account for the great feats in foreshortening in Mannerist painting from Giulio Romano to Tintoretto.87

The first two items in Section B of the Deed of Gift ("Original Works by less celebrated Painters") may be closer to Leonardo as paintings by direct pupils of his. The first is described as a "Madonna che porge le mammelle al Bambino, la quale è di Marco d'Oggiono Discepolo di Leonardo, alta un braccio, con cornice profilata d'oro." The description seems to designate a Madonna del Latte, but the sentence "porge le mammelle al Bambino" can be interpreted to say "turns her breast to the Child." This and the dimensions (a braccio high) correspond to the Virgin and Child, inv. no. 79 (Fig. 17), now attributed to Giampietrino (0.65 x 0.47 mt.), a work that reflects Leonardo's sharp contrapposto studies for Leda, as shown in Giampietrino's painting at Neuwied Castle (Fig. 18), which is a free copy after Leonardo's lost kneeling Leda of about 1504.88 Giampietrino's Madonna in the Crespi collection, Milan (Fig. 19), and the one in the Cook Gallery, Richmond (Fig. 20), are closely related to the Ambrosian painting. The latter must be the Madonna mentioned in the Musaeum (p. 24) as "the work of one of his students who was such a perfect
Fig. 17. Giampietrino, Virgin and Child. Milan, Ambrosiana.

Fig. 18. Giampietrino, Kneeling Leda (after Leonardo). Neuwied Castle.
Fig. 19. Giampietrino, Virgin and Child. Milan, Crespi collection.

Fig. 20. Giampietrino, Virgin and Child. Richmond, Cook Gallery.
imitator of the master, that most people were deceived by it."

The other Madonna listed in the Deed of Gift as a work by "Domenico (sic, for Giovan Ambrogio) Boltraffio discelo di Leonardo" is described as being one "braccio" high and 9 "once" wide, and as representing a Virgin holding a Child to whom she is offering cherries. No such work could be located in the depot of the Ambrosiana, nor is such a subject known in replicas.

On p. 33 of his Musaeum, soon after having mentioned Caravaggio's Basket of Fruit and before discussing the marbles in his collection, Cardinal Borromeo enumerates in passing a number of other paintings by illustrious artists. Only the first one, Titian's Ecce Homo (now ascribed to Titian's workshop) is recorded in the 1618 Deed of Gift. The others are as follows: a painting by Giovanni Bellini, "a head with the upper portion of the chest elegantly painted," a description evocative of the celebrated portrait of Doge Loredan; "another figure of similar size, the work of Parmigianino" (doubtfully Parmigianino's Herodias, which is listed in the Deed of Gift as including "un 'altra donna appresso"); the Risen Saviour by Giulio Romano "with inventions by Raphael," and then a Madonna by Leonardo (a casual mention indeed, when compared to the mention of a school
Madonna on p. 24!), and a "rather large painting by Perugino who was the teacher of Raphael." None of these works, except for Titian's Ecce Homo, can be identified among those exhibited or in depot at the Ambrosiana. They might have disappeared with or before the French requisition of 1796. The requisition list includes for instance a "concerto di musica con varie figure dipinto in tela dal Giorgione. 35 x 30 1/2," otherwise unknown to us. And we have just seen that on the basis of such a list it has been possible to ascertain that Leonardo's famous self-portrait now at Turin was taken out of the Ambrosiana in 1796 and never reached Paris. Some idea about the paintings which were to be seen at the Ambrosiana before the French requisition can be derived from the account which was given in a letter by Charles de Brosses in 1739 and which is reproduced in Appendix C below. This includes "Un concert, du Giorgione, beau."

c. Giorgione and Titian

Cardinal Borromeo was most successful in collecting examples of the Venetian School, including important works by Giorgione and Titian, which he discusses at length in his Musaeum. Only a few of his attributions
have come to be revised. A case in point is the Sacred Family with Tobias and the Angel which he attributes to both Giorgione and Titian (Musaeum, p. 10: "the excellent design by Giorgione and the color by Titian"). It is now ascribed to Bonifacio Veronese (inv. no. 205).

On the other hand, a small painting which entered the Ambrosiana in 1618 with an attribution to Andrea del Sarto, and as much mentioned in the Musaeum (p. 17), it is now frequently attributed to Giorgione (Fig. 21). It represents a half bust portrait of a youth, almost front view, his right hand placed on a sphere, a subject originally interpreted as the representation of a Savior, a Salvator Mundi. According to Wilde it is to be interpreted as the representation of Paris. Coletti considers it a copy of a lost original, while Fiocco ascribed it to Domenico Mancini, but Morassi has recently reproposed an attribution to Giorgione. In spite of its stylistic affinity with the Tempest and the Dresden Venus, its attribution to Giorgione cannot be substantiated by any early documentation.

The works by Titian or attributed to him as listed in the 1618 Deed of Gift are also recorded in the Musaeum. The Deposition into the Sepulchre (Fig. 22), which is mentioned on p. 9, is a later version of the same subject as treated in two paintings at the Prado of
Fig. 21. Giorgione, Salvator Mundi.
Milan, Ambrosiana.
Fig. 22. Titian, Deposition into the Sepulchre. Milan, Ambrosiana.
1559 and 1566; its authenticity is occasionally doubted but the impasto, the greater sense of architectural setting and the intensified dramatization of flashing light effects point to a work conceptually and stylistically related to the last Pietà.

The portrait of an Old Man in Armor (Fig. 23), which is mentioned in the Musaeum (p. 32) as the portrait of Titian's father (Gregorio Vecellio) is certainly by Titian, dating from the late 1530's. And so is the famous Adoration of the Magi (Fig. 24), also known in two versions at the Prado and at Cleveland (Figs. 25, 26). It is a late painting, the provenance of which can be traced back to the artist's studio. The Cardinal's views about it deserve particular consideration, but first three other attributions to Titian must be mentioned: the Virgin and Child, with Sta Cecilia and St. John the Baptist, a painting mentioned in the Musaeum (p. 11) as a Titian, but probably a school work; the Ecce Homo (Musaeum, p. 33), also to be ascribed to Titian's workshop; and the Magdalen (Musaeum, p. 24), a school version of the famous painting in the Pitti, of which several copies exists, as known to the Cardinal himself. Finally, another work attributed to Titian is recorded as being of an "unknown subject" and described as a curiously deliberate depository of "pictorial
Fig. 23. Titian, Old Man in Armor. Milan, Ambrosiana.
Fig. 24. Titian, Adoration of the Magi. Milan, Ambrosiana.

Fig. 25. Titian, Adoration of the Magi. Madrid, Prado Museum.
Fig. 26. Titian, Adoration of the Magi (detail). Cleveland Museum of Art.
motifs," mostly elements of landscape (Musaeum, p. 23). This is probably the same painting of unspecified subject which is mentioned in the Musaeum (p. 10) as a careless and somewhat weak work.

Next to Titian's works, Cardinal Borromeo praises greatly the paintings by Jacopo Bassar. the Annunciation to the Shepherds and the Rest during the Flight into Egypt, both recorded in the Musaeum, p. 11, But it was Titian's Adoration of the Magi that the Cardinal valued most and displayed accordingly, as can be seen in the pages of his Musaeum, De Pictura Sacra, and in the 1618 Deed of Gift.

The work is said to have been commissioned by Cardinal Ippolito d'Este, who had intended it as homage to Henry II of France. Despite the Cardinal's recurrent references to Francis I as the originally intended recipient of the work, it is to be believed that the painting was to be sent to Henry II because of the bow and quiver, attributes of Diana, and the interlaced monograms with the letters H and D for Henry II and Diane de Poitiers on the carved, gilt wooden frame. However, the painting never reached its destination and was later acquired by St. Charles who left it in his will to the Ospedale Maggiore in Milan. Federico secured it for his museum as a model for his Academy of Fine Arts and the painting
has remained one of the treasures of the Ambrosian collection since then.\textsuperscript{90}

In the Deed of Gift, Cardinal Borromeo describes the number and kinds of figures seen: twelve human figures and four horses and gives its dimensions. From the De Pictura Sacra (I, ix), we already know that the little dog in the lower corner of that canvas was painted out. In his Musaeum (p. 5) he describes it as a "veritable school for painters" and praises its aesthetic merits. The Cardinal was well aware of Titian's contribution to the development of "modern art." He refers to his merging of objects in light, color, and atmosphere in order to represent distance. This concern parallels theories expressed by Leonardo and Lomazzo. Federico states:

Titian in drawing the village made use of all his skill and even from this alone you can recognize in him the great artist that he was. In fact, where the boundaries, for example the foot of the mountains and the extremities of the plains, merge, he on purpose left the canvas as it is prepared without spreading on any color, in order to express by means of that void, the dazzle which causes eyes that are looking at objects too far in the distance to be deceived. (Musaeum, pp. 5-6)

Titian's concern with impasto also helped him to control the amount and quality of light to produce the appearance he was after. The Cardinal also praises Titian's color, but criticizes his drawing, a common, arbitrary judgment
in the seventeenth century:

It is a fact that around our times Titian, who surpassed everyone in coloring and in the imitation of nature was considered less skillful in drawing. (Musaeum, p. 7)

Particularly interesting in connection with the development of Lombard painting through Cerano and Morazzone to the Baroque is his statement referring to the Negro child in the middle ground of the painting:

One may distinguish among them a young Negro whose blackness is absorbed by the surrounding obscurity so that the figure is at one moment withdrawn from view and at another reappears through the intervals of uncertain light. Since art, beginning from very little has developed so much that one now paints even that which is impossible to paint as the changing positions and going backwards and forwards. (Musaeum, pp. 8-9)

Here the Venetian tradition of Titian transmitted through works as the present one and the *Crowning with Thorns* of 1542, which was done for the church of S. Maria delle Grande in Milan and which was moved to Paris in 1797, and through pupils who had established themselves in Milan since the days of Gaudenzio Ferrari (Callisto da Lodi, Giovanni da Monte, and Simone Peterzano), was wedded to the native Lombard tradition beginning with Leonardo, Lomazzo, Ambrogio Figino, Meda and others through Cerano and Morazzone during the first decades of the seventeenth century. Peterzano himself was the teacher of Caravaggio between 1584 and 1588. Thus, this emphatic effect of
showing figures emerging into dramatic light and then re-emerging into their atmospheric surroundings previews the development to Caravaggio and his theatrical "tenebrosa" style. The same applies to the other painting by Titian, the Deposition into the Sepulchre, that the Cardinal describes immediately after. This includes a pietà showing the Virgin kissing her dead son, a scene "cloaked in darkness" which the Cardinal correctly understood as a deliberate pictorial device: "In this way he expressed more than what he painted and showed also what he kept hidden." (Musaeum, p. 9). The Cardinal's appreciation of the works of Ambrogio Figino, Cerano, and others shows the refinement and immediacy of his judgment. He was then prepared to recognize the power of Caravaggio's art, as shown by his purchase of the Basket of Fruit (Fig. 27), which he recognizes of matchless excellence.

d. The Representation of the Impossible

As Professor Pedretti has pointed out to me, the second part of the passage quoted above is not only a concluding remark prompted by the optical effect produced by the black figure on a dark background in Titian's painting, but also a remark directed to that aspect of
Fig. 27. Caravaggio, Basket of Fruit. Milan, Ambrosiana.
Baroque art theory which deals with the emphatic suggestion of an action in progress, and which amounts to the representation of the impossible - "as the changing position and going backwards and forward."

The Cardinal might have recalled the fifth lecture delivered by Federico Zuccaro at the Roman Academy on January 17, 1594, in which Zuccaro had quoted Lomazzo's definition of Painting as "an imitation of Nature by way of lines and colors and the handling of light, so that at times it may represent incorporeal things in that not only does it reproduce form on a flat surface, but also movement, and clearly shows to our eyes many emotions and passions."

An elementary pictorial trick for the suggestion of an action in progress had entered Italian painting with Pollaiuolo and had come to be codified by Leonardo. In his Battle of the Nudes (Fig. 28), Pollaiuolo had shown the two confronting figures of the fighters at the center of the engraving as two different views of the same figure, one leg of one figure overlapping the corresponding leg of the other figure so as to suggest that the group is a result of one single figure pivoting at the crossing of the legs. Leonardo did the same with a man throwing a spear (Fig. 29), to illustrate a text in his Treatise on Painting: he showed the beginning and
Fig. 28. A. Pollaiuolo, Battle of the Nudes. Engraving.

Fig. 29. Leonardo da Vinci (after), illustration to a test of the Treatise on Painting.
the end of the action in two figures which overlap their legs to suggest the movement from one position to the other. Poussin, who transcribed Leonardo's sketch into a finished drawing for the 1651 edition of the Trattato, used the device in his Rescue of Pirrus of about 1630 (Fig. 30), where the men throwing spears in the foreground look like the individual elements of the cinematographic representation of a single man's action. The same is true with Guido Reni's Attalanta and Hippomenes (Fig. 31), even though the two figures are differentiated by their sex. This recalls at once those remarkable illustrations included in the Codex Huygens (Fig. 32), a treatise compiled by a late Milanese follower of Leonardo who preserved much of what must have been Leonardo's late theory on human kinetics as recently studied by Panofsky and Pedretti. It is even possible that Cardinal Borromeo had seen Leonardo's original writings on the subject, which are no longer existing and which are criticized by Federico Zuccaro in his Idea of 1607:

. . . Equally fruitless and lacking in substance was the other work which was left of drawings together with writings in mirror script, by another man of our profession but too cunning, using merely mathematical precepts for the motion and twisting of the human figure by means of perpendicular lines, square and compass; certainly ingenious things but fantastic, without profit and substance . . . I say that these mathematical rules should be left to such sciences
Fig. 30. N. Poussin, Rescue of Pirrus (detail). Paris, Louvre.

Fig. 31. G. Reni, Attalanta and Hippomenes. Naples, Capodimonte Museum.
Fig. 32. Gerolamo Figino (after Leonardo), Study of Human Kenetics. Codex Huygens, fol. 29. New York, P. Morgan Library.
and speculative disciplines as geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and the like, which, by giving proof, satisfy the mind. But we teachers of drawing do not need such rules, but only those which Nature herself gives us in order to imitate her.\textsuperscript{94}

This is an unmistakable reference to original Leonardo's notes of the Codex Huygens type that Zuccaro and also Cardinal Borromeo might have seen in Rome. It was in Rome, in fact, that the anonymous author of the Codex Huygens, identified by Professor Pedretti with the Milanese painter Gerolamo Figino, had gone about 1560. Professor Pedretti has also shown that other unpublished material from the same codex is still found in European collections, and has even located a set of engravings after drawings in that codex, which were published by Edward Cooper in London in 1720 (Figs. 33, 34), and which were known to scholars only through the descriptions by Mariette and Gaburri in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{95}

Leonardo's scientific approach to the kinetics of the human figure, already implied in his famous drawing of the Vitruvian Man (and Walt Disney has shown how it could be easily animated), gave way to the emotional approach of the Baroque painters who had come to exploit many of his achievements. Thus Cardinal Borromeo's remark about the ultimate development in painting - the representation of the impossible - can be singled out as the most significant passage in the whole Musaeum.
Fig. 33. Edward Cooper (c. 1720), engraving after the Codex Huygens (unpublished). Chatsworth, Library of the Duke of Devonshire.
Fig. 34. Edward Cooper (c. 1720), engraving after the Codex Huygens (unpublished). Chatsworth, Library of the Duke of Devonshire.
One is reminded of Leonardo's large composition of the Battle of Anghiari which was to include the subsidiary but prophetic motif of soldiers jumping across a river with the help of long staffs. As the staffs were pointed to the same fulcrum (Fig. 35), the motif resulted in the fan-like unfolding of the action of a single figure as in a cinematographic sequence - ut depingantur etiam ea, qua pingi non possunt.
Fig. 35. Leonardo da Vinci, Study of Men Jumping Across a River (for the Battle of Anghiari). Windsor, Royal Library, no. 1232r. (detail).
C. CONCLUSION

In the concluding chapter of his De Pictura Sacra (II, xiii) Cardinal Federico Borromeo explains how Christian art differs in function from Pagan art:

The ancient Romans were choosing wide and spacious places for statues, so that the light, the form and the proportions of the ambient would be pleasing and convenient to the admirers of those statues. Well now - in the construction of our temples we should aim at offering the faithful, who congregate there almost like living statues, a place suitable to pray and worship the Divinity.

The idea of envisaging the faithful as "living statues" well symbolizes the Cardinal's attitude toward religious reforms.

An early essay by Roberto Longhi, a 1917 review of Giorgio Nicodemi's book on Daniele Crespi, presents the problem of Federico Borromeo as a reformer and a critic of the arts in terms of the basic and essential difference between the De Pictura Sacra of 1624 and the Musaeum of 1625:

Not much more can be said in praise of Nicodemi's book, which is too spoiled by certain prejudices about the historical and religious background to allow for a reasonable amount of joyfulness and liveliness in approaching the artistic subject. The question of the Counter-Reformation and the precise rules on artistic matters dictated - for us unsuccessfully - by the Cardinals Paleotti and Borromeo and by other art legislators, are an oppressive burden on the critical mind of Nicodemi, who is repeatedly quoting them for what they might be taken as
causes but not for their effects, which in fact do not exist. He could have looked more profitably into the comparison between Federico Borromeo as the author of the "gallows-laws" in his De Pictura Sacra and Federico Borromeo as a free and serene critic of the arts in his Museum, to realize how much tolerance, both wide and free, was there, even when the surface was to appear austere and inflexible. On the other hand, we do not deny that the Counter-Reformation had somewhat spoiled the good taste of Cardinal Federico - testimony to this being his passion for small paintings in a Flemish vein, with funeral-like wreaths of decaying flowers to frame anemic Madonnas with languid children; and yet, at the same time Father Morigia and Borsieri were exalting Milanese painting for its grandeur and anti-Flemish ardor, without fears of clashing against the official precepts which were almost ignored by the artists and the public. But, my God!, this depressing atmosphere evocative of the Ambrosian bishopric in times of plague, what a bad service is to art criticism!

Longhi's forceful and stimulating remarks have provided the guidelines in the approach adopted in the present dissertation, but there is more to be said about the Cardinal's place in a broader context of the development of Lombard art. He was at the forefront of the new artistic flowering in Lombardy from the late sixteenth century to the early seventeenth century. This artistic flowering was not a confrontation between art and Inquisition, but rather the emergence of new expressions of religious faith. In Lombardy this association between art and faith was previewed in the works of Gaudenzio Ferrari (c. 1470-1546) whom Waterhouse calls "the most lively influence on painting here." Gaudenzio's grand style as seen in
his works for the chapels on the Sacro Monte shows a new dramatic emphasis and lively coloring combined with realism. These works would later influence the art of Morazzone and Tanzio da Varallo. As Lanzi aptly remarks, Gaudenzio was "unequaled in the expression of divine majesty, the mysteries of religion, and the feelings of piety."99 Federico appreciated his work for such qualities and had copies made of eight of his paintings which originally hung in S. Raffaele in Milan, but now no longer exist. Lomazzo's teacher, Cerva, was a former pupil of Gaudenzio.

It was in the same church of S. Raffaele that G. A. Figino had painted about 1586-1588 a St. Matthew (Fig. 36), and soon after a St. Paul (Fig. 37), two prophetic paintings which combine a Michelangelesque sense of form and movement with a dramatic use of light - unmistakable ingredients of Caravaggio's emerging style.100 Cardinal Federico Borromeo never mentioned Figino. He donated Figino's portrait of St. Charles to the Ambrosiana in 1618 with the statement "said to be the best ever made of him," but without specifying the artist's name.101 Just a year later, in 1619, Borsieri's supplement to Morigia's Nobiltà di Milano contains a revealing comment on Figino's St. Matthew in S. Raffaele:

Marvelous is called by the students of painting the picture that Ambrogio Figino has made for the Church of S. Raphael, in honor of St. Matthew the
Fig. 36. G. A. Figino, St. Matthew. Milan, San Raffaele.
Fig. 37. G. A. Figino, St. Paul.
Milan, San Raffaele.
Evangelist, in that he has shown with it how easily the painters of our century reach the power of the major ones of the past. But I do not want to list here the best works of the latest Milanese painters because I intend to consider them in greater detail in my Image of Milan, in which I have begun to prove that Lombardy today has no need of the painters who are active in Rome, in that many of the Lombards can be ranked among the major painters, who even perform according to the innovations brought about by M. Angelo da Caravaggio and the Carracci School.102

As a pupil of Lomazzo, Figino received a training which was greatly affected by the Leonardo tradition in Milan, as clearly manifested by his drawings. His Madonna del Serpe (Fig. 38), of about 1585, again a pre-Caravaggesque conception, is mentioned by Lomazzo as an illustration of Figino's style in terms of Leonardo's subtle use of light and shade, Raphael's harmony, Correggio's color, and Michelangelo's design.103 The Leonardo component of Figino's style brings to mind the London version of the Virgin of the Rocks, which was then in the Church of S. Francesco Grande in Milan; but the problem of its effect on Caravaggio's formative years is one that cannot be considered in passing - and yet, according to Professor Pedretti, one that is time to state. In his latest book he has explained Leonardo's stylistic pronouncement shown in the Louvre St. John - the "nocturnal St. John" emerging from the darkness - as conceptually related to Brunelleschi's illusionistic experiments a century before.104 Several copies of it originated in Lombardy, and one of them found its way into the Ambrosiana, where it is recorded.
Fig. 38. G. A. Figino, Madonna del Serpe. Milan, S. Antonio Abate.
as early as 1685. It is a painting attributed to Salai, a narrow opening in the dark background showing a view of rock formation in the distance. As the seed of the "tenebroso" style this type of painting was soon to affect the whole Lombardy, and one is reminded of the story told by Ridolfi in 1648 about Tintoretto's humorous evaluation of Lombard painters in the late sixteenth century:

Having returned from a certain city of Lombardy he was looked up by Palma who wanted to hear what he thought of the merit of those painters. He answered: Nothing else can I tell you, Jacopo, but that they find themselves in the darkness (si trovano nelle tenebre).105

The "official" attitude of art patronage in Lombardy was one of impatience towards the local school and its fermenting sense of naturalism which could well degenerate in the Arcimboldo satire. Both Carlo and Federico Borromeo represented the conservative element of art patronage which was constantly aiming at foreign ideas, especially those provided by the Roman school. Accordingly, foreign artists would have been given top priority in local commissions. In 1590 the administrators of Milan Cathedral opened a commission for the decoration of the shutters of the organ, a major commission that they would have been honored to give to Federico Barocci, "sublimis et pulcherrimus pictor."106 Barocci declined the offer and the commission went to Figino who produced a series
of episodes from the Old and New Testaments which could well be taken as illustrations of the type of painting that Cardinal Borromeo was to disapprove of. The Nativity (Fig. 39), as a special case in point, shows the athletic figures of the shepherds discussed in the passage of the De Pictura Sacra (II, iv) quoted on p. 79 above. A comparison with Barocci's Nativity (Fig. 40), which Cardinal Borromeo donated to the Ambrosiana in 1607, is eloquent evidence of the change that was taking place in religious art.

The change from the austere, matter-of-fact approach of the Council of Trent to the more estatic, worldly, and anti-intellectual breed of religion took place during the last years of the sixteenth century and the elevation of the Jesuit order. Barocci parallels this trend. He was esteemed by both St. Charles and Federico. Federico's narration relating to his gift of Barocci's Nativity from St. Charles showed his early concern and passion for Barocci's art. In many ways, Barocci's style previews the development of Baroque painting and Bernini in his emphasis on fleshy, worldly figures, swirling draperies, and vivid colors. St. Phillip Neri also valued his art, as shown by the famous anecdote of his rapture in front of Barocci's altarpiece of the Visitation in Santa Maria in Vallicella.
Fig. 39. G. A. Figino, Nativity. Shutter of the organ. Milan, Cathedral.
Fig. 40. F. Barocci, Nativity. Milan, Ambrosiana.
The new emotional style was also previewed by Gerolamo Muziano who combined the color of the Venetians and Michelangelesque form. Various of his male portraits were secured for the Ambrosiana by the Cardinal as models which "can be useful to students" (Musaeum, p. 32).

Cardinal Borromeo also acquired twelve oblong cartoons for the glass windows of the Duomo and some male portraits by the hand of St. Charles' favorite, Pellegrino Tibaldi. These, too, prepared the way for the new style.

The relationship between Tibaldi and St. Charles parallels that between Cerano and Federico. Friedlaender places Cerano at the forefront of the anti-Mannerist style beginning 1580 or 1590 in Italy. "Greater pictorial immediacy and directness in dramatic presentation characterize this trend which had been prepared for by Barocci and the Venetians."108 In addition, Cerano's style conforms to the program of Cardinal Borromeo's Academy of Fine Arts. The use of dramatic-emotional images and cyclical imagery as Cerano's twenty-eight paintings on the life of St. Charles for the Duomo and his projects for the Pellegrinesque doors are indicative of this tendency. This direct approach to the art of painting is evidenced in the simple, solid forms; solemn, symmetrical compositions; bold coloring, and flickering effects of light and shade but lacks Caravaggio's particular brand of naturalism. The 1618 Deed of Gift includes
Perhaps Cerano's most impressive undertaking for the Cardinal was the project for a colossal statue of St. Charles to be erected at Arona, the Saint's birthplace. The drawings, now in the Ambrosiana, and model were executed by the artist. It is fourteen times the height of a human figure and gives honor to both Federico's school as well as to St. Charles himself whom Federico had never lost sight of in the pages of his Musaeum. Rivaling the colossus of Rhodes, it was intended as "eternal if God will accept the small gift which I offer to Him in honor of the Saint, to whom it is submitted and dedicated" (Musaeum, p. 40).

The Cardinal's interest also extended to other more progressive artists as the Carracci from whom he secured models for his Academy and copies of famous works of art as Correggio's Zingarella and the Ascension of the Virgin from the Parma Cathedral; he corresponded with Guido Reni and Rubens, and was able to acquire Caravaggio's famous Basket of Fruit sometime before 1607, when the artist was still alive.

The Musaeum ends on page 40 with a reference to a projected Third Part of the presentation, which he had commissioned from one of his following and which would have dealt with the Portrait Collection. No trace of
this has been found among the Cardinal's papers. The 
Musaeum too, as we have it in print, cannot be con-
sidered as a definitive and well organized treatise, 
being considerably amateurish in nature, and as exuberant 
as the motivations that had prompted the Cardinal to write 
it. But it is precisely this spontaneous, almost im-
provised nature, that accounts for the freshness of the 
Cardinal's approach to his own collection, showing the 
movements of his mind throughout the whole program of 
the narration, and even his emotional response to the 
individual works of art. This has resulted in a few 
anomalies which tell us more about the Cardinal's 
critical eye and aesthetic leanings. One case in point 
is his description of Titian's Deposition into the 
Sepulchre, in which the Virgin is said to be shown in 
the arms of her dead Son, "Deiparam fecit inter mortui 
Filiij brachia" (Musaeum, p. 9), whereas she is shown 
approaching her Son from one side and holding one of 
his arms - the incorrect descriptions conveying a greater 
emotional impact in terms of religious appeal; another 
case is his description of Caravaggio's still-life as 
a basket of flowers, not as a basket of fruit, "ex qua 
flores micant" (Musaeum, p. 32). An intransigent critic 
could well say that the Cardinal did not even have eyes 
to see what he was looking at! And yet, one may detect
in this mistake the movements of his mind as he was thinking of Caravaggio's still-life in terms of its place in the exhibition - a painting that should have been given a companion (possibly a basket of flowers, for the sake of variety), just as the Flemish genre paintings had come in pairs. In fact the Cardinal states that he had searched for another painting that could suitably be hung next to it, but failing to find it, Caravaggio's masterpiece was to be kept in isolation, "solitaria relict a est."

Simonetta Coppa has pointed out that the Cardinal's admiration for Caravaggio's still-life does not go beyond the surface. She states that he fails to understand its innovative charge and sense of vitality which place it far apart from the Flemish preciosities that he favors. This has led Coppa to place Federico Borromeo not in the scientific forefront of the early Seicento but in the tradition of the Medieval catholicon still persistent in the late Cinquecento and which accounts for the Cardinal's artistic taste in terms of a fastidious, intellectual virtuosity under a naturalism only apparent.

This is an acceptable conclusion, and has the merit to give Cardinal Borromeo a place in the history of art criticism. Not so Schlosser's. In his Kunstliterature he views Federico Borromeo's De Pictura Sacra of 1624
as a disappointing document in which "the theologian abjures almost completely the art lover and rejects him with severe discipline." This sharp judgment is no longer acceptable, in that the Cardinal's Musaeum, which Schlosser does not take into account, is to be viewed not only as a guidebook to the art collection assembled at the Ambrosiana, but above all as an expression of the Cardinal's inspired approach to humanism and connoisseurship. The Cardinal's cogent observations on the works he describes reveal at once his perception and personal preferences, and reflect the aesthetics of the time. As such, they contribute most effectively to our understanding of the development of art theory from the High Renaissance through the beginning of the Baroque.
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92 This is chapter Lu. 278 (McM. 369) on fol. 105v of the Codex Urbinas. Cf. Pedretti, Libro A, p. 189. It is chapter 181 in the Du Fresne edition of 1651. See also lecture 22 in the class notes of Professor Pedretti's course on Quattrocento at UCLA.


95 Cf. Pedretti, Leonardo da Vinci: Studies for a Nativity, cit., p. 43 (no. 3). A set of the Cooper engravings after sheets of the Codex Huygens has been located by Professor Pedretti in the library of the Duke of Devonshire at Chatsworth.

96 This important detail in one of the Anghiari studies at Windsor (no. 12328 recto) was first interpreted by C. Gould, "Leonardo's great Battle-piece. A Conjectural Reconstruction," Art Bulletin, XXXVI, 1954, pp. 117-129, and further commented upon by C. Pedretti, Leonardo Inedito, Florence, 1968, pp. 73-74 and Figs. 53 and 61, who incorporates the motif in his reconstruction of Leonardo's Battle-piece.

97 G. Nicodemi, Daniele Crespi, Busto Arsizio, 1915, reviewed by R. Longhi in L'Arte, XX, 1917, pp. 61-63.


100 These paintings and their bearing on Caravaggio's formative years as detected by Roberto Longhi, are fully

101 The entry reads as follows: "Il Ritratto di S. Carlo, con cornici dorate, alto un braccio, e si ha per la miglier Testa che di lui sia stata iatta in pittura." Description and dimensions correspond to the painting, inv. no. 109, reproduced in Falchetti, Catalogo, p. 178. Another portrait of St. Charles also attributed to Figino shows a standing half figure in profile to the left in the act of looking at an open book. This not described in the 1618 Deed of Gift (contrary to the statement in Falchetti's Catalogo, p. 281), but it is listed in the 1685 inventory. For a full discussion of these portraits see R. P. Ciardi, op. cit., pp. 54, 69 (note 13), 115, 223.


103 Lomazzo, Trattato, cit., p. 438: "... con parte de l'ombre lumi, e d'accuratezze di Leonardo, con le maesta armonice di Raffaello, con i vaghi colori del Coregio, e co'l disegno d'intorno di Michel'Angelo." The painting is in the church of S. Antonio Abate, Milan. Cf. Ciardi, op. cit., pp. 93-94, and Fig. 4 (with full bibliography).


107 See also the lively observations on "Athletic figures" in *De Pictura Sacra*, I, xii: "... Artists occasionally produce bodies so robust and truculent as if they almost intended to paint not Saints, but athletes, with faces so frowning and severe that they inspire anything but sentiments of piety. Still not a few stress the individual parts of the body, of articulations, of flexions, of masses, as if they intended to produce anatomical illustrations for the dressing of wounds rather than incitements to religion. And to the movement and expression of those bodies they impart a tension and a violence that would not even be suited to a soldier."

109For the correspondence of Cardinal Borromeo with Guido Reni and Rubens see *Indice delle lettere etc.* (as quoted in note 51 above). The material pertaining to the relationship between Cardinal Borromeo and Guido Reni is fully discussed in a forthcoming article by the author of the present dissertation.

PART TWO

FEDERICO BORROMEO'S MVSAEVM
EDITORIAL NOTE

The Musaeum of Cardinal Federico Borromeo is translated into English from the Italian translation by Sac. Luigi Grasselli as given in the Beltrami edition of 1909, checking it against the Latin text of the original edition of 1625. References to the pagination of the original edition are given as accurately as possible between ( ), usually taking the end of a phrase or a comma as a suitable breaking point. The text is annotated with 46 consecutive notes as given in the Beltrami edition. These are reproduced without alterations or additions as reference material, and as such each of them is also designated with the reference to the page on which it is found and the number it has in that edition. The Introduction serves the purpose of a full commentary to the Musaeum, and any revisions or expansion of Beltrami's notes would have been repetitive.

No copy of the original edition of the Musaeum is found in American libraries. A facsimile of it is given by Beltrami and is reproduced here from the copy of the Beltrami edition in the Belt Library.
FEDERICI CARDINALIS
BORROMÆI
ARCHIEPISC MEDIOLANI

MVSÆVM.

MEDIOLANI.
Anno salutis M. DC. XXV.
VM nuper ego Tabulas, typisque, et signa contemplaverim, quae in Bibliotheca Ambrosiana Edibus ad id ipsum extrastris nuper collocari inserebamus, præterea accessisse ex familiaribus nostris studiosi hominibus duobus, et veluti insusurrantes, nonne pulchrum, elegantissime fores opus, inquirunt, si hac omnia existimaret artis monumenta, quae congrega in hanc sedem videmus, expressa, et delineata stylo extarent; Statim id, quod dicere volebant, intelligi, adeoque placuit res, ut hilaris vultu, et consilium eorum.
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eorum laudarem, et primo quoque tempore, ipsorum desiderio me satisfacturum esse pollice-
ver. Post aliquot inde dies, subeunte animum meum recordatione sermonis, consiliumque eius, quotidian magis res ea placebat, tacitusque probam id, quod homines mei fortè suaderent voluisse. Memineram enim, siisse apud veteres banc curam, ut præstantissima quaque Pictura, vel Stauaria, vel Architeætonicae opera styli etiam ope conservetur, duplicemque ita vivere vitam, et eam scilicet, quam Articium ingenia dedissent, et eam, que beneficio litterarum venirens. Euentusque postea monstravit ipse, posteriorem banc præore illa vita siisse dururniorem. Cum enim Urbes tota, non Palatia tantum, et Musæa consagrata, incendium, clademque vitaeque latentia in obscures, ignobilibusque locis monumenta litterarum, et receptaculis abdet avibus memoria triumphantur arcus, pyramidesque ex-
celsas, et portentosa alia ludibria opum humanarum. Collabuntur in ruinas alta adijum mo-
les, disolubque substructiones pontium vestus-
tas, et humi sternit, comminuitque Obelisco, cum interim infelicium etiam litteratorum non illustrium tantummodo, et inclytorum scripta vitant cladem, et in media serum hu-
manarum
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torum ille obuerfatur, velut si Sanctis fimorum hominum exempla specieus, atque intueantur quis longissime a tanta perfectione absunt. Exempla enim eiusmodi ruinerant, confunduntque animos, exprobrans vitia, et culpas.
culpas, et totius vita censuram agunt. Quod si nonnunquam ad illius unici Scriptoris similitudinem in alia operis parte adspire vi-
sus fuero, nequaquam id asequendum se fieret, sed ut perfectissima quaeque conscendi, minus vi-
tij contraerim, quae omnium excellentissimae-
rum rerum nota conditio est. Ita enim etiam
in omni Republica oportet probos admiti, ut
similes optimis sint, ne pejus, deterrimique
reperiantur. Asque imitatio tamen ista, simi-
le quiddam erit, veluti cum naturam ars lon-
go interium asequi conatur. Ordo Libri non
erit alius, quam quem ipsa disposition Tabula-
rum dederis; neque Tabula ipsa ordine sunt a-
tio collocata, quam quem opportunitas, neces-
stitas loci, causae alicuius tuli. Neque vero
susciptimus hoc, ut cura, qua vel Pictures, ve t
Statuaria Artis illustria opera in Museo nostr
stro afferuantur, litteris bisce representemus, sed
practicum tantummodo quodam amplectemur,
memores etiam Virgilium in tradendo agrorum
culta, nequaquam omnes agricolarum laboris,
solertiaque exequitum fuisset, sed ea delegisse
tantum, unde maiorem laudis, et gloria fructum
speculat. In Museo hoc nostro sunt Tabula,
sunt typa, et typae ex nobilissimis antiquorum
operebus expressae sunt illustrium virorum ima-
gines.
gines, præsens Tabulas eas, quæ historiam ali₀-
 quam, argumentumque singularis complectu-
tur. A Tabulis incipiemus, quorum prima
se seoffert illustriore petis locos: Magi Sal-
vatorem infantem adorantes. Celebrè Titia-
ni opus, cui Artifex ille præciuo studio ad-
laboratae, ut Cardinali Esteensi seniori gra-
tificaretur, qui Regi Gallia Francisco Pri-
mo munus hoc parabat, ac de ea re fortasse à
nobilis alibi dictum est. Mortuo postea Este-
tense illo, Tabula ad Sanctum Carolum Bor-
romæum pretio coempta devinit, sicuti ma-
gnorum domorum ornamenta fere distribu-

tur argento, dissipanturque nibilo meliore con-
ditione, quàm Principes ipsi, quorum cadave-

ra vermes absumunt. Sed Tabulam, hanc
satis attenta custodia comitata est, donec post
Sancti Caroli excessum, in suo nostro emeretur.
Satis ampla magnitudine rerum, quà iœfex cernuntur,
Pictorum judicis admodum utile opus, ex quo
samquam Amalthea cornu pleraque baurire,
ac petere leges possint. Amplectitur enim va-
rios hominum vultus, et multiformes anima-
lium figuræ, prospectusque terrarum, et non-

nibil etiam ex Architectorum subtilitate, et
arte. In terrarum tractu Titianus eximio,

B qua
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qua pollebat arte est usus, Artificemque saltem, quals vis eri suit, vel inde agnoscas. Nam qua finium, et Cali extrema, ultimaque montium, et camporum ora confunduntur, atque miscentur, dedita opera obisam tantum, nullo super inducito colore, telam reliquit, ut illa inceboati operis lacuna oculorum allucinationem representaverit, cum nimis longiumqua intuentes oculi falluntur, atque aberrant. Ita Ar- tifex ille confusionem rerum expressit non ar- te, qua pictores nostri circa eam laboriosè, et anxiè utuntur, sed res ipsas confundendo, ac misendo, campum nempe, et liniitionem, et lin- teum; et rudes quaemquecolores, ut ea omnia magna artis loco essent, insigni sanc documen- tum, excellentiam in omni genere nec obsidenti si de det, nec tegi posset si adsit. Hac porro numero- rosa Tabula discentibus multis Tabularum esse inflar potest, unde proefciat. Federicum Zuccarum, qui nostri temporibus, graphidis tantummodo gloriam esse affectus, aiebat, egregiam laudem esse pictoris, si ad omnia, quae pingit posset, faciendi promptus faret. Nam quaemque oiebat, reperiri adeo seius, ut pingendis tantummodo hominibus affecto, si spatia mon- sis, terraque aliqua rehnsendis sint, vel al anienam opera confugiant, vel tam absurdè de-
AMBROSIANAE.

defungantur, ut partem eam corrumpant, si quam tota Tabula laudem meruisset. Repti
sanè Zuccarus, in qualibet unius artis parte, mediocrem saltem oportere esse artificem; ip-
saque partes volebat conuenire cum toto, ne alibi decus, et elegantia, alibi deformitas, et
surpitudo spectaretur, sed partium omnium, excellentiam intra angustos etiam euislibet
artis fines sana mentis homo nullus sperauerit, eum aestui non detur. Ac sube hoc loco ve-
serum Pictorum, modestia, qui, sicuti apud Plinimum est, de partibus us sibi invicem cede-
bant, in quibus quisque, excelleret, neque minui eo sancam sibi existimabant. Sub nos-
tram hanc sanc atem, Titianus colorandi, et imitandi gloria ceteris antelatus, ad gra-
phidis officia minor habitus est; quodque magis mirere, Michaelum Angelum in pingen-
dis pedibus, Raphaellem circa capita, ex summum humani sorooris culmen adeo eximium
suasse contendunt, ut antiquitatem in certamen vocare ipsam possit. Raphaeli vero etiam in
oculum, obtutusque vivacitate palma tributa est. Monentque impartos ab obtrem-
tandum homines, us same in hoc, quam in omn alia arte se se aquiores praebere velint,
visuperentque ea tantummodo, quorum lau-
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dari nihil potest. Ceterum, inter animalium
figuras, quas Artifex Tabula ista dispersit, in-
signis pulchritudo est equus albi, qui dieceo ad
crura capite, velicantem ibi muscam abigat,
mira imitatione naturae, cuius exprimere motus
optime omnium Titianus potuit; ac Magis-
trum fortae genera eius eum merito quis ap-
pellauerit. Nam estiam natura effusè suauerat
ei, cùmque multum industria suae debuerit,
longè plurimum tamen debuisse natura credi-
tus est, adeo quidem, ut Michael Angelus
hanc eius dotem admiratus, et alii omnibus
uvirum, et ibi fortae, praferret, agnosceret,
que vel hoc nativo munere superiorem, amu-
lum. Cuius sanè munere magna in vitam
que partem momenta babentur, veluti cum in
pulvis aquitas, iniquitatis loci victoriae, fi-
ue cladem dedis. Teftatur haec Tabula id ip-
sum, quod antea dicebamus, neminem unum
omnibus posse rebus excellere. Nam Deipa-
ra Virgo, et Salvator infans nequaquam ibi
consumatissima artis sunt, totamque Artificis
curam in obscuriore illa lixarum, et seruorum
turba occupatam suisse apparet, qui Mago-
rum comitatum sequebantur. In ea turba
puer abips cernitur atricolor, cuius negriti\em
obscuritas circumfusa absorbet, ita ut figura
ea.
ea modo fugiat oculos, modo se offerat rursus per dubia lucis interna lla. Namque a pascis
sint egressa ans, in tantum progressa est, ut
defingantur etiam ea, qua pingi non possunt
mutatio nempe, et motus veniens in, discorden-
tisque. In eadem aula cernitur alius Titiani
opus. Tumulus nempe Salvatoris, sue depositus
et Cricce Salvator. Consumata artis cerni-
utur Chri sti peltus emortua carne provocante
naturam ipsam. Magdalena adec summum
exprimens animi dolorem, & amore consum-
psta, viuacissimo interim spiritu; qua omnia
ut exprimeret Artifex, integra iunenta foren-
tem fecit. Evangelica Historia veritatem in-
terea formafte transgresfas. In ea Tabula Ni-
codemas laudatur negligentia, qua senem den-
ceat. Sanctus Ioannes cum Magdalena cer-
tare videtur affectu; Ha duae figurae cum om-
nem munificentiam imaginem consumpserant, difficile
opus restabat, ut Sanctissima Virginis dolor
adigit ostendetur. Ideo Titianus vetorem il-
lem, excellentissimum; Pi torem dissimili in-
uenta imitatus; Deiparam fecit inter mortuis
Filij brachia osculo barentem, tenebrisque cir-
cumfugum. Ita plus ostendis, quam pinxit,
proslitisque, etiam ea, qua occultavit. Con-
tra Titiani Tabulam hanc, pendet in aduer-
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so pariete Tabula altera Artificis aedifici, qua licet eiusmodi sit, ut eadem officina prodijisse videatur, documento tamen sive posset, perinde penicilem, aitquestylum fatigatis quodammodo, et infringe, rem traetando sapitus unam, posterioresque conatus cedere, prioribus curis. Apparet, satum gloria, fel sumue labore Artificem ea pinxisse. Facilitas tamen operis, et quadem in graphide securitas laudem habent. Cetera sunt facta tamen oscitantes, ut Titianum etiam ipsum, negligentia sua conscium suisse dicas, cum ea sanctet. Ea ipsa incursa autoritatem operi addere potest, magisque rudes artis, quam periti Tabulam banc improbabunt. Dispar incidet Tabulam in vicino alias commendat, cum manus, quam eam fevere, ignorentur. Si graphidis excellentiam intacate, dicas Georgi nis esse, non Titiani opus; si vivam in colorando mirificam spectes, non Georgioni, sed Titianone adiudicabis. Ita antecip inter duos gloriam, benigne inter utrumque communicatur. Continet Virginem Deiparam cum Infante suo, Angelumque, qui puerulum Tobiam tenet manus; atque in linearum argumentum pravit Angelus pleno gradu, quern aequant curse puero conatur. In ea autem properi incessus imagine, duo
duo quadam mirificè Artifex expressè. Nam
et Angelum fecis in corporis agilitate, plus-
quam humana, passus aslempantem suos ad
pueri imbecillitatem, et puern Tobianus,
anxio, laboriosoque grctu minime aequantem-
cursum, ideoque velut supplici vultu exposcen-
sem opem ab Duce suo. Titiani item est Vir-
go cum Infante, Catharinaque ad leuam Vir-
ginali habitu, tenerrimèque expressè membri-

Eiusdem argumenti Tabula alia est Titiani
manu, in qua Salvator infantis pulchri-
tudinis operis minimè respondet, sicuti paruulus
Ioannes artificij magnitudine cum cuncta ibi exu-
perat. Veneto Titiano propè conterminus pa-
tria Senior Bassanus etiam bac Tabularum,
serie, finitimus se se offert solennis ille pecudum.
Pictor simul genus illud suum exercebens, simul
calumniam propulsans, quod animalia tantum
pingere didicit. In Tabula namè bac illustri
maximè loco, præcipueque lumine Pastorum
secis summe arse elaboratum, eaque figura
superasse se ipsum est viisus. Sed acrius ille ex-
pressè calumniam grandiore alia Tabula, in
qua Deipara vnris Infantem tenet. Retrò var-
ri generis animalia sunt. Iuxta Virginem ad
levam Sponsus Joseph sedens bumi, tamquam-
annis, et iiineris labore succumbat. Reclinato
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in manum alteram capite, Infantes adspicit, 
landanturque in ea figura paternus affectus, 
e tessa astas cum simplicitate quadam ad vis-
sum express. Simul videre est familiarem u-
sum, et senis cum Infante, et Infantis cum,
sene. Has, de quibus adduc dixi, Tabulas 
Artifices pinnere, quos nominavi. Sed quid 
video saepidiosos quosdam, et superbos, caque 
superbia, et saepidio acerrimi iudiciis, famam 
quarentes, si sim ubi Tabulas aliquam ad-
spectare ex buiusmodi exemplaribus, quamuis 
exquisiti exprimam, contemnere sim, et ab-
dicare id opus; hos alloqui parumper opera 
sum puto. Alloquar autem, itaut dicam, ni-
mis fluxas esse res omnes humanas, et breui-
se momento corrupta cuncta, et dilabi. Adeo 
ostabile suisse bominum generis, ut quemad-
modum ad atatem nostram pervenere transcri-
pita veterum librorum exempla, ita etiam 
exempla illustrium Tabularum pervenire po-
sissent, eamque operam priorum industria na-
usat atari seque. Quanti pretios foret bo-
die Apollis, sive Zeuxis pictura aliqua expres-
sa, et cuspida coloribus alienis? Quanta 
momenta ad excolendam artem exempla ea af-
serrrent? Quanta cum iucunditate utilitas fo-
ret? Quanta etiam incis ad difficillimum lo-
corum.
AMBROSIANUM.

corum, ac Pliniij preseritum interpretatione in-
de peteretur, si subieéta essent oculis ea, qua
 nudis ille verbis describis? Laudable igitur
 est inuentum hoc exemplum desumendi, si qui-
dem tria preseritum ista custodiantur, qua no-
 bis in nostra exemplorum copia cordi suere,
 vt nimium et exemplaria perfectissima sint,
et summa diligentia exprimantur, nec promis-
cuē omnia, fēd ea tantum, qua vel iam cor-
rupit atas, vel ob infestum aliquem eam in-
tercidere, ac perire posse videantur. Illus-
trium Tabularum exempla, quae sunt in Mu-
seo nostro, dedimus operam, ut ad hanc nor-
man, legemque exigerentur, poteruntque ip-
sa exemplarium olim esse instar, quam diu qui-
dem vetustatis resistent. Est in eo numero
Isaias Prophetas incubitus ille, Raphaelis, qui
 quoniam in pariete depictus est, magis obno-
xius iniuria temporis erit. Adest Colosea, sio
Gigantea propē figura sanae graphidis a-
te, ut omnes bac spectare Pictores debeant.
Adest Aeneas sublatum in humeros patrem in
nocturno illo memorabilis tumulu eripiens cap-
tiuitati, vel neci, membraque vieta et effeta
senis cernuntur,unicatque sub pondere gene-
rosa indoles filij parentem ferentis. Adsum Si-
bylla, propter quas Tempulum Pacis Romae vi-
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manu cernitur hic irati Maris atrocissima
sempesnas, cuius aspectu quilbet inborrescat,
etemque biemis facies, in qua niuium etiam,
et emortua natura rigor places. Fecis is quo-
que Danielem in Leonum septo circumluen-
tibus beñiarum linguis, quarum artificio Bas-
fanum superauit, ab ea quoque parte miri-
sus, quod multitudinem hominum is a confu-
derit, ut in confusione ipsa ordinem agnoscas.
Juxta est Salvator, quem pleique tribuunt
Andrea, qui Sutoris est dictus. Egregium
utique opus, et sine fine laudatum. Sed ad
Brugelum citò redire, non cogit multitudo
operum ipsius. Occurrunt namque quattuor
Tabula, quas efflagitatu meo fecit tanto suc-
cessu, ut laudandi finem facere nequeat qui
minus hoc sucepterit, et earum unaqueque,
suum commendationem habeb, cum simul om-
nes admirationi esse possint. In descriptione
Maris, & aquarem ita varij generis pisa-
tus expressis, ut non minor piscandi, quam
pingendi Artifex saisse videatur, conobisque
natura ludam, et etsi tama Maris summa
sea laude veluri collegit, et ope taurit, Fini-
tima Tabula Terra elementum amplexus, re-
prasentauit squalida loca, solitudinesque vaf-
tas, et frequentes arboribus filias, prospectus.
MUSAEUM BIBLIOTH.

que longinquos. Et animalia, qua tellus alit, cum faeta Leonem, cum pennaram pompa Pauonem, cum fautilia Leopardum, et Lupum. In ignis elemento, quia ferilis voracias natura illius nullam artifici copiam dabat, cum Etta cyclopom ingenia, seruentesq; officinas exhibuit, adiectis etiam Vulfani, Saturnique fabulis, quas faxi unius baita monstravit, quod plus dignitatis inuentio habet. Aera cecum campum lucis omni incedidate circumsudis; ac si comparationis causa dicendum est etiam aliquid, extrema bac Tabula omnem Artificis consumpsisse solertiam videtur, sicust laboris etiam ordine ed consumebat opus. Nullus iibi prospectum fecit, ne tantopere diusa miracula minus valerent, idque fortasse unum defuit ad absolutionem artis. Planè-nibil in Museo erat, quod cum opusculis bisce compararemus, nisi nubem multis, multiformam famam varietatem amplexa corona, quam posius arcum triumphalem dicas, partis lare gradu. Insident floribus alicula, floretque ipsi peregrina cernuntur facie, cum nostrazibus baud quamque Artifex contentus fuerit. De Imagine, qua ferto includitur, dixitque nihil attinet, quia minorem lucem tot circumfusa lumina extingunt. His Brugnelis Tabulis finitima sunt tres miniati operis Tabula.
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Hieronymi Marchesini miniati op-era.

Augusti Dc. ciu.

Crystallini operis.

Brugveli Mut.
AMBRUSIANA

bac signari iussimus, cum graphidis exercenda causa Academiam institueremus. Sunt enim ibi notata pleraque, que propter Artificium excellentiam, et nomen, non parui aistimantur, neque nos cuncta nunc persequi necesse erat;

Non, inquam Titiani Monachum, non Tempesta nobile opus, quod calamo ille delineuit, non pleraq; alia id genus minuta simul, et praclara. Sed sicuti pratermississe bac decuit, ita cetera, qua Musaeum implent, eiusmodi sunt, ut spectari oculis, et consignari chartis ea operis pretium sit. Aula, qua proxime initur, Luini senioris mirificam artem exhibet statim, atque offerit. Tabula sat is ample magnitudinis est, quam nos satis magno pondere aurum emimus, exstitantque Piacores, nil ab Artifici illo factum sui esse perfectius. Non tamen tota gloria Tabula huius ad Luinum spectat, sed cum Artificio alio sanno communicatur. Leonardo is suis, qui, cum exquisitisimè delineavit opus, Luinus deinde consiluit ei, quod pulcherrimum, præstantisimumque dare poterat, suavitatem nempe quandam, et tenevros, postumque motus, ac vultus. Fra nimium praclaris Artificis facultatem invicem suam sibi commodabant, agnoscente altam Leonardi graphidem Luino, et vicissim Leonardo col.
laturo in festatoreum suum gloriam summam, si nautam +ibi ab eo operam vidiisset; eaque
manu iacta morum in summis ingenii fermexistit, taliqve veterum Artesic artem exempla
Plinius eisam referret. Cum enim agnoscerent
immensos Artium fines, et angustos humani
ingenii terminos, et quum artem uinuscuisque
facultas, et excellentia circumscriberetur, alien
alium comiter, hilaritate adepuabatur. Preci-
puum huius Tabula lumen, est Infans Iesu,
eiusque facies, et mirifica praesertim in cor-
pusculo Divini Infantis tractabilitas, et tene-
ritudo ventris inter Artifices laudatur, ex-
tasque typus, quem Leonardus impressa argi-
labecit, ut excellantiam operis vulgando, la-
bores suos testaretur. Deipara Virginis pul-
euiritudo tantd admirabilior est, quantd magis
eximium illud, et venerabile os laetitiam om-
nem excludit, ut mirari possis, quamwv arte
Pictor res duas inter se natura ferè connexas,
penicillo discreuerit, et alteram ab altera lon-
gissime alegarit. Anus Elisabetae vimida
seneeta robusta pretter, puerque Ioannes admi-
rabilis suavitate Salvatoris adsecat. Hae,
que admirable, et superlatè dici videntur,
magnopere nobis optandum effet, ut in cetera
Musaei nostri perinde consenirent; sed infes-
tendum
tendum esse, styllum video, quia non eadem
autoritas ys, qua res tant. Inclam bane,
de quae dixi, Tabulam interlocut, atque in-
gunt duo argumento quodem inter se simili,
penae codem, sed non eadem manu. Altera
continet nemora, et lucos, et confusa in unum
pleraque natura; arbores nempe, et rupe, et
campos, sylva,que virentes, et lucis, et tene-
brarum, locorumque prospectus, quam sibi va-
riarum rerum syluam Titianus fecit non in
aliun ullam, sicuti fama est, usum, quam,
vte ex hoc veluti promptuario petet exempla
rerum eiusmodi, quandoque operibus ad-
fergere suis talis quipiam velles inter ea,
quae Pictores parerga appellat. Alioqui con-
silium operis, et ratio non constabat, nisi quod,
vte dixi, ab exemplari petebat isto exempla pin-
gendis eiusmodi rebus, atque ita se ipsum imi-
tabatur. Altera est Tabula Pauli hominis
Belg., qui non mediocrem etate nostra famam
assecutus, consulisse bae videtur quidquid ar-
tis, ingenijque babebat. Mare cernitur ibi
tam molli, et placido, longique prospectu, ut
quisquis intendat illuc oculos, acie simul, et
gressu maritima illa spacia pererrare se se pu-
tet. Cetera non carent laude, sed ea ipsa sit
minor, quia nihil ab nota Pictoris huius con-
suetudin.
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simul hœnestatem conservare. Insumus ordo
aula buias pleraque habet Pauli Belga, illus-
triumque aliorum Artificum, quorum unus
florum vasa magnopere celebraretur, nisi vicini
operis gloria obscuraret, quam posse inspicimus.
Sunt æ regione opuscula Brugeli ad duodecim
marginalis linea inclusæ, cornucopia nimium,
et tartarus, et procella, et silua. In contraria
parte Brugeli eiusmod incendium est, quo pic-
tura generis claruit in inventa Brugelii.
Rathnleri sunt parauli Alitiæ in biemis ri-
gore spargentis florum copiam, quos Brugelii
fecit. Subeb. Mysterium tamquam florum
amœnitæ, et niue adstrictæ gelæ, sunt extre-
ma naturæ, et tamquam biemis facie tellus.
Veris imagine Celum representatur. Sed nihil
ego symbola, mysteriorque ista repiciens, remu-
sic depingi ipsam iussi. In eadem aula, siue
Sacello, parauloque Templo, duas ingentes pug-
na spectantur, altera quidem inter duas Mag-
dalenas, altera vero, quam Brugelii flores
ex vasculo amittunt. De priore Magdalena,
quam Titianus fecit, iam dictum est. Alteram
hanc fecit Luiinus senior, sed Leonardi penicil-
tum præsert, a quo fortasse Luiinus lineamenta,
descriptionemque sumptis, existimantque periti,
nihil in tota arte ferè bodie reperiri pulchrior.
quoad scilicet capite uno consumi ars potest.
Tantum vita, spiritusque inest capiti buic, ut
Titiani Magdalena apposita buic, exanguem quiddam, nec femina, sed femina effigie videsatur. Minime actuosa facies est, sed cuncta tamen peragit, intuentem, adspectans, aperiensque vasculum aptissimum ungendo Salvatoris corporis. Et Magdalena quidem ita inter se pugnans. Ait florum pugna non minor spectatur, quorum pretium Artifex ipse Bruguelus lepidissimo commento indicavit. Pinxit enim in imo vase adamantem, quo inspecto intelleleximus id, quod etiam alio qui statuissemus; gemmarum scilicet astantiionem indicatum par esse operis buiss pretium; quod Artifex est a nobis ita persoleatum. Circumvolitant Papiliones, herbarum viriditas adest, sparsaque iacent bium Concha, ob quas Tabula qualibet alia impenso pretio veniret. Flores bosce ex vase sicassurmunt, multum anteponimus Artifex eiusdem Corona, quam in prima Musae aula collocaiam ante monstraui. Leonardi Cenaculum, sue Triclinium, quod in aula buiss summa parte prostrat, cogis tranire plerisque alia, qua eauslibet tener, oculos possint, in primisque exempla Luini operum, quod cum iam vetustate
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state dilabenter tur, exciderentque tertorys, expressa curauimus, atque hisc inde collegium. Reliquie Canaculi cernuntur adhe in Ubris huius Monasterio, quod Sancta Maria Gratiarum dicitur. Ibi cum ego olim insidum santo operi parietem, excidientisque crutias in- spexissem, desiderio exarari conservandi operis, si qua humana ope id assequi possem; ac super ea re probatum mihi Pietorem appellavi. Is pleno desparationis sermone corruptas, et euan- nidas, dilapsaeque figuras arguedo, solum pri- mam meam omneem infregis; deinde monitus, ut capia saltem nonnulla Apostolorum, quae aheb et exerent, exprimere ne cunfairetur, post- quam id fecerat, duque, vel tria capita com- paruere, sic desperatione damnata sua, sper vltra creuere. Ita lentè, et laboriosè, ex magno omnium tadii per temporum etiam, interualla opus est abolesum, quale iam esset; argumentumque difficultatum istarum esse pos- sed hoc ipsum, quod non linteii unius continua- to tenore, sed separatis, interpolatisque linteis bec Triclinij exempla continentur. De Arti- sificis sive dubious non poest, quia et Leo- nardi ipsius exemplaria in membranis reperta sunt ad hanc eandem formam, et Artifex ipse erasticula, ES dilucidatione singula capita ex- plia.
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ploravit. De operis autem precio cùm multis
adhib dixerint, nos tantùm id dicimus, quod
fortasse alios fagiti; Affectus nimium, sine
motus animi varius, et diversos praecipuam esse
gloriam Operis buius; quam Plinius eiam in
extollendo Dearum iudicio laudem spectauit,
cùm tres ibi diversos affectus in Paride mi-
raretur. Nèque vero Artifex dolorem san-
summodo, et lacrymas protulis, quod quilibet
fortasse alius faceret, sed in membrorum motu
descriptos animi sensus ostendit, itaut Tabu-
lam banc collufranti oculus personent aures
Apostolorum vocibus, quas inter se consulere,
postquam Salvator tremendum illud enuntia-
uit; Qui intingit mecum manum in Parop-
side, ipse me traditurus est. Venerabile Sal-
vatoris os altum animi meorenum indicat, qui
grauiffima moderatione occultatus, atque sup-
pressus intelligitur. Sermones Apostolorum, et
colloquia tum inter ipfos, tum vero cum Sal-
vatore pro atrocitate rei quadammodo audi-
untur. Minuat proditori alius, alius opem,
auxiliumque Domino pollicetur: Fixus ali-
quis in silentium magnitudine sceleris obstupe-
scit: nonnemo angitur, seque Christo socium-
doloris prabet: Est qui tanti fragilitatis suspiro-
nem ab se auersiere constur: Est qui percus-
tando,
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... et inquiringo seriem, ordinem; parati
scelris cognoscere velit... Sunt attoniti, sunt
indignabundi, sunt taciti, et aliorum dila sub-
auscultantes. Sed ante omnes Apostoli Petri
vultus ira, et vindicta cupidine surgit, cer-
niturque impatiens mora animus caritate.

Magisri; spectaculo est robust eius, vigor-
que, et fortitudo. Vides tacite voluentes iras,
malumque proditori minitantem, quod nemi-
ne conscio paret intus ipse, et coquit. Ea dis-
simulatione, et ira obversus in Sanctum Ioan-
nem, rogat, ut prodicionis arcanaibi patefa-
ciat, senum quod divini sermonis interpretetur.

Iuxta sic affectum Apostolorum Principem,
localuit Arisfex proditorem Iudam magna illa-
ratione, ut contraria studia clarius, apertius-
que spectarentur. Nec minus diversus vultus,
facieque contra. Torua, et hispidae, et vi-
lis proditori deformitas; Os Apostolo vividum,
et boseum, plenumque dignitatis. Preterea,
anxius Judae odio simul, et metu ne inditum
emans, intendit aures, ut Petri cum Ioanne
colloquiam excipiat, aucupaturque verba ve-
cors simul, aitonitisque ob facinus scelusia men-
ta conceptum. Explicavit autem Leonardus
in Júde vultu mysteria magna physognomicas,
etque ostendit quem peritus esses eius artis.

H. Feci.
Facit enim atrim, bisfutam, additis introfusum oculis, inhorrescente capillo, torrida macie, squalidum, simo naso; qua cum et pessimos animi mores indicant apud eos, qui ex facie hominum animos addiuvare possunt. Ad easdem metoposcopia leges optimae congruit ex diverso, flamma Apostoli pallore labiorum, timidisque naribus artificiosè declaratas, oblongus, incurvusque nasus, ex viriles oculi nobilis pectus depingunt. Quae nature signa sed at.tigi, ut Pictores nostri admonerentur, non esse cognitiones istas extra artis fines, quam facitiant, et nibil erraveros eos, si studium tutum in hoc etiam generis sibi esse consumendum putabunt. Cenaculum igitur hoc inter praeipua Musaei nostri, earum nobis est, cariusque porro quotidie crisi iam dilapso, et in suis amisso Leonardi opere, quod sibi aliquis loco semper habitum est. Ipsumque Leonardum inter Francisci Gallia Regis manus expirasse ferunt. Tantus honor artifici. In aula eiusdem esserupta supra limen vistur Magdalena ex profano Deo vultu, quam Raphael Rome pinxit, in sanctoorem habitum transfigurata nostri Pictoris arte, qui monitus est, ut prsesimas imagines ita mutaret, expressit hanc gentem manum vasculum, atque sublimè elasm.
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tam; quod ei non semel in die accidisse memorarunt, cùm in solitudine ageret. Vellem saepe ego plus esse bonestatis in vultu, sed pristini oris lineamenta mutari non posse. In exita Magdalenam, bane Raphaelis. Hercules est absolutissima roboris, atque fortitudinis imagine, quem Artifex ille in Gisorum adibus fecit. Pictor verò no. Angelum adiecit cum libro, ita vel Sanctum Malhabum ex parte Hercules representat: Angelum verò ipsum alicubi fecerat Raphael. Latum plane mihi est, quod pleraq; Romanorum operum ex profano usu in pios sic assimulata vultus, Musæo buic nostro inferre potuerim, utimurque ad hoc studij genus. Patria hujus hominis; cui nomen Antonius, ut boc diligentia, artificioque eius detur. Tanta enim hujus non diligentia solum sed etiam patientia est, ut putem intelligenter ipsum etiam rerum iis, dum exemplaria ipsa curias in teceantur, laudatorum esse boc ipsum, quod facies eadem diversis locis expressa reaparitor. Par diligentia Tabulae. | Ex Pueri dicempe poteo Tabulae.

Continent Virginès, Episcopo, sacra plera.
pleraque simul, et profana tanta copia, ut vel
bec sola exempla sufficere Pictoribus ad imi-
tationem possint. Aliquanto minor Tabula,
qua subjiciat bisce tertitur, Titiani est, quern
credunt, Patrem suum in thoracatum pingere
voluisse, ut faceto argumento addaret no-
bilitatem, quam tali prole ille asecutus esset.
Id ipsum tamen ambiguum adhuc est; Aucto-
ris operis minimè ambiguus. Marginate Ta-
bus, qua quattuor longis ordinibus in eadem
aula excurrunt, varias hominum facies con-
tinent Mutiani ferè manu, qui Silli Quinti
temporibus, Roma claruit, cum arti bonos es-
ser. Poteunt studiosis visui esse, nec minus
visui erunt alia, quas Antonius nofler ex Ra-
phaelis exemplaribus expressit; ac si discentes fe-
duò imitari hoc volent, perinde erit, ac si
Raphaelis iphus opera ante oculos haberent.
Sin autem in studio, imitationeque hoc tardio-
res erunt, banc isbi sibi culpam tribuant.
Mutianus porro idem, cuius manu expressa
sunt ista, expressit item banc postam in aula
fronte Sancti Antonij, Sane Sancti Benedicti
effigiem, Fratris Sebastiani opus, superaunique
Artificem illum, scusi quidem et mibi, et
alius videtur. Nec abest gloria proxima buie
fiscella, ex qua flores micant. Fecit eam Mi-
ceael
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Artifexque ipse desperavit, cum a nobis ap­pellaretur, ut pari magnitudine tabulam ali­am consiceret arte eadem sua. Cetera, siue ditxi, omitto, quia alienum fulcare equor vi­demur, vocesque etiam audire nonnullorum, qui exprobabunt fortasse, quod in aliena ni­mium arte occupari esse voicerimus; quam Cicerò quoque exprobationem timuisse vide­tur, ne Pictor, et Orasor simul apud Iudices habetetur, cum Verris rapinas, et huius ge­neris sulta enumeraret. Verum, sicum nimi­um insumpsius studii arti buic alienum fuerit a gravioribus studiis, ita extrema talium re­rum imperitia Ecclesiastico homini indecora­re est. Postulat argumenti huius occasio, ut lepidississam ego historia narrarem. Cun­cius Pij Quarti temporibus, ex transmarinis terris Romam nobis viri venissent, ciscque propter splendorem et nobilitatem ostenderentur numism­ata, quae Cardinalis Bembi fuerant, quoties aureum aliquid numisma prolatum fuerat, siebant, autem esse purissimum, nec aliud praterea, quod dicere possent, babebant. Alter verò fuit, qui signa, et numismata putabant exquisitissima esse ea, quae in scriniij parte intra­ima collocata viderest, eaque summooperè ad­mirabatur. Sed iam ad marmor, et types tranfire
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transire tempus est, ut Romana, Graecaque antiquitatis reliquias, quascunque colligere possumus, cura etiam ipsa scribendi custodiamus. Si Congress in hanc sedem cumita esset quascunque in hoc artificij genere praecipae, et admiranda extant, iniuria non parua fore Italiam totius, qua sic orbata talibus ornamento haud immittero conqueretur; neque tamen vel nostra, vel cuiusquam opes ad conquerenda, & conservanda cuncta suffecissent. Quo modo autem haec ipsa notitia fuerimus, memorabo eam rem fortune nostra longè maiorem, nisi casis quodam, vel potius divino munere, ac nutu consigisset. Leo Aretinus fuit ex Valle Solida; qui tractus ad Mediolanensis Ecclesia iurisdictionem spectat. Cui es statuarum artis, et pictura fama satis nosceretur, mandavit ei Rex Franciscus, quo tempore Galli Provinciam hanc tenebant, ut illiusrum omnium statuarum eipomata concerret, ac pararet, ex quibus possea aea simulacra conflarentur. Deblatum namque Regi erat excelsere Gallicanam eam Provinciam, barum etiam artium studij, quarum deus gentes ea penes Italiam aude relinguant. Ita Aretinus Regio sumptu, sed multo magis auctoritate exprimere potuit cum fa, utus s quam

Leo Aretinus.

Rex Franciscus Galliae.
quam praeterea, et mirifica extarent. Mag-

nanimine suis Regis consilio opposita morte est.

qua, scuti norunt omnes, optimarum etiam de-

liberationum filia plerumque obtruncat. Rex

sigitur Franciscus inter ea moritur, superstite

Areino cum suis typis, qua gypso, et argilla

fecerat. Hi posse typi morte Artificis, et

mutatione dominorum, in manus nostras per-

senerent, representantes, ut dixi, pleraque ve-

neranda antiquitatis, et operum etiam corum,

quibus Michael Angelus Urbem Florentii-

am exornavit. Tanta hae praclarissimarum

rerum copia potestis esse adolescentibus

ad huius artis studio ingredientibus, non mi-

nus profecto, quam si statuae ipsas ante oculos

haberent. Notum nunc est ad precipienda

arcana artis perinde valere effipiantibus, quam

statuae ipsas, si quem diligentia, et fide ex-

pressa sint, quam ab Artifici boc suisse adhi-

bitat confiat. Inde ergo plurimum utilis

capiens studios Adolescentes, dum in una sede

habent pulcherrima Artis, qua variis locis

dispera cernuntur. Ac si pictura ista, ha-

beret bolidie Michaelis Angeli membranam, dicli

non potest quanta ea res utilitati foret. Ve-

rum mandaux eas igni Artifex insinuavit la-

picida unus, quo ministro artis, et famulo

vile-

Michaelis Angeli membrana.
AMBROSIANÆ. 37

videbatur. Id ab eo baud temere factum fuisse
se credere nos oportet, nam et Raphaelis mem-
brane, quæ superstites existire, necuquam,
sagrata fuerunt Autori. Quamvis autem
fama sit, Michaelis Angelum neque in pic-
itura tantum, sed etiam in statuaria, mem-
branis, et graphide usum fuisse; in eaque
tamen non potuisse alius, quod de se ipse pradis-
cauit, nisi illis usus fuisse, numquam sic ille
in tanta operum varietate plus excedisse est sa-
xo, ac se cuiisse, quam quantum initio desinere
vet. Artifex ille Michaelis Angelus, sicut
alibi esse dicitum putus, discipulum habere nul-
tum volebas; cùmque ob eam rem invidia, et
liuros incuaretur, aliebat, expertum se ingra-
tatos multorum animos, nolle amplius pati ac-
cerba, et odiosa. At in Museo hoc nostrorum
huiusmodi adversus ingratos querela, vel
suspicio proficiatimum utilitatem tardabit.
Scilicet et Michaelis Angelus, et Artifices
alii obua liberalitate erudiri quemlibet dis-
cere volentem. Altiora quaedam spectantur: quid
ingrati discipuli, vel facere, vel dicere
possint, nihil pensi est. Ceterùm, inter, simu-
lacra ea, qua dicebamus, emicat maxime cœs
lumen, et solis plane instar, Apollo Vatic-
anus, quam ego statuam censui, amplexam est.
lumina cumfa artis, quotquot statuae capere una possit. Quod alii censeant, necicio: venustias certè, et magnitudo, vigorque mihi vis a sunt extra comparationis alicam esse.

Mox se se offer Antinus teneritudine insignis ea, quam in marmore, vel arque ase-qui summum artis opus esse Michael Angellus aebat. Hinc agmine uno statue insignes uisuntur, Paquinus et Hercules, et Gladi-ator robuste celebris, et Narcisus mollicie, et fragmenta pleaque, sue hermatbene, quibus summa artis inest, eaque copia quotidie adden-don sit maior. Michaelis Angeli Crepesculum, et Aurora simul adjunt unà cum grandibus duabus Raphaelis Membranis, quas studiosi artis tantò cariones habere debent, quantò minus de Audere habitatur, cum Tabula qui-dem Artificis eius suspicione nonnulla possint insufcari, propereaquod multis in pingendo adiatores ille babuit, qui manum apposisse posuerunt, ut verò constat non alia, quam ipsius esse manu. Statue porro tam insignes, et earum fragmenta, sue reliquia sunt eiusmodi, ut propter excellentiam suas, non minus ad terrenda, quam ad simulanda hominum ingenia valere possint. Inter nostra atasis Statuarii, primas ego facile tribuam Marco Antonio Praetor.
Præclarior, qui dum vivisset, in familiarium nostrorum numero fuit. Magnus utique Artifex, et preter illustria opera, quæ reliquit, omnes mihi superare visus est mirificis de arte sua sermonibus; quæ nimirum eruditionis et peritia manabat ex eo, quia grandium ferè animum veterum Artificum contemplatione habebat. At nescio an rem ipse quoque nimiam seministra, cum Statuam immense magnitudinis Sanctorum facietam curarem, de cujus operis exitu diu consultatum est, uniusque sermones hominum exitere. Volueram initio minutum, et marmoream facere, sed longitudi temporis, quam illius absolutio requirebat, difficultatibus; cumque subiret animum Rhodiani Colossi memoria, ex eum illud opus non constaret, sed ductile fuisse negotium meminisset, exemplum sequi id animus fuit. Iam Statua inibis est, ut oculus judicari facilius, quam oratione nostra monstrari posset. Improbabant nonnulli consilium nostrum, et opus quodammodo ipsum sternebant humi, propere quaod dicere, peritum esse calamitate ca, quæ Romanas antiquitates absumpset. Vera si hec omnia essent, præclari nihil iam haberet Orbis, nec grande quidquam opus humana industria tentares. Nos vero seiebamus, Romanas anti-
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siquitates esse absumpatas, sed memoriam tertiam maneret ipsarum, locaque monstrari, in quibus sedissent. Verum sit icta cura eorum, quos humana gloria cupiditas sollicitat, atque angit. Colossus nostre sempiternus erit, si munus exiguum accipias Deus in honorem Sancti, cui ponitur, ac dicatur; Tunc sempiternus, inquam, erit saltem propter merisum, quod iplius Auctori constabit; idque homini Christiano satis esse debet. Lam postular easstus, ut tertie parti Musaei huius nostri numerum admoueamus, qua tertia parte sice absolutur. Imposimus enim curam hanc familiaris nostro. Si nomenclaturam conficius illustrium virorum, quorum imagines ad vivum exprimendas curauimus, sunt autem clares litteris homines, vel arte aliqua ex iis, qua liberates dicuntur. Nam militari, reliquae gloria claros conquirere, ab instituto Bibliotheca alienum erat, insumusque honorem haberi eundem subinde alios, quorum fama memoriam hanc imaginum requirere, siue exteris, siue nostrates, siue etiam ex Collegio Ambrosiano, Alumnus ete Collegij fuerint.
While, not long ago, I was contemplating the pictures, the models, and the statues, which I have recently placed in suitable rooms of the Ambrosian Library, two of my following, men of learning, approached me and whispered into my ear: "What a beautiful thing it would be, if someone thought to take notes and describe all the works of art of great worth here." I immediately understood what they meant, and their idea so pleased me that I smilingly praised the suggestion and gave them my word that I would satisfy them as soon as possible. A few days passed and each time that conversation and that advice returned to my mind, it pleased me always more and I approved always more of that of which my faithful friends wanted perhaps to persuade me. I knew full well that the ancients resorted to the pen in order to conserve the most excellent works of painting, sculpture and architecture and to make them live, so to speak, a double life: that with which the genius of their creators had endowed them and that given to them by the writings. Experience later demonstrated that this second life is longer than the first. In fact, while whole cities, including palaces and museums have been destroyed by fire, writings hidden away in obscure and vile places escaped fire and ruin, winning for endurance over the arches, pyramids and other monuments on which human riches were lavished. With the passing of time, grandiose edifices
go into ruin, solid bridges decompose, obelisks fall and shatter into bits, while even the writings of the most obscure literati survive this universal destruction, and enjoy, so to speak, the privilege of immortality. (3) Praxiteles and Phidias won great triumphs in the arts and they reached perfection, each in his own field. How could we today have an idea of their glory if the books which speak of them had not been left to us? Time has consumed nearly all their works, and of the works of such great artists there remain but a few relics. However, this loss is compensated for by the diligence of writers on account of whom these masterpieces dead many years still live and can still be contemplated by us. In fact, the writers, by putting in competition the pen against the brush and the chisel were able to reproduce the work of the latter so well that a doubt remains as to which of the two sides the victory should be attributed.

In beginning this work, my thought runs to Pliny more than to others, not for a desire to emulate him, which would be excessive foolishness and audacity, but almost in spite of myself, for the excellence of the example given by him. Precisely the examples of the holiest men turn the thoughts of those who are farthest from their perfection. Such examples fill the soul with compunction and produce therein a beneficial confusion. They are a reprimand to vice and a censure for the whole life. (4)
Because if in some part of the present work there appears the tendency to imitate this writer, who is unique in his field, I declare from this moment that my intention is not to be like him but rather to prove myself less defective, having the example of his perfection nearby. And precisely this, as everyone knows, is the fruit which one draws from the study of the most excellent things. Thus in every society one must admit the good ones, on condition that they imitate the best, so that they do not become the worst. My imitation shall be similar to the effort that art makes to equal nature, from which it still remains much behind.

The arrangement of the book shall be the same as that of the works with which it deals; and this further was determined by the timeliness of the necessity of the place, or by chance. We do not intend however to describe all the important works of painting and sculpture conserved in our museum, but only the principal ones, recalling that Virgil too in the Georgics did not speak of all the toils and industry of the farmers, but selected those which he hoped would give him the opportunity of excelling.

In this our Museum, there are paintings, drawings and copies obtained from the most famous works of the ancients; there are portraits of illustrious men, (5) as well as others that present a particular deed or subject. And beginning with the paintings, the first one to appear
to us, being in a distinct place, is that of the Adoration of the Magi. It is the celebrated work of Titian, who worked on it with special diligence in order to please Cardinal d’Este the Elder, who destined it as a gift to Francis I, king of France, as we have perhaps said elsewhere. Upon the death of that member of the Este family, the painting came through a monetary transaction, into the hands of S. Charles Borromeo. This is the usual fate of objects, which are the decoration of great houses, of being put up for sale and of being lost and destroyed, just as the corpses of their owners which are consumed by worms. This painting however was kept with sufficient care until, after the death of S. Charles, it was purchased upon our order. It is very large and because of the multitude of things which it contains, it is a veritable school for painters, because from it they can draw, as from the horn of Amalthea, many teachings and in it they can study the laws of their art. In fact it presents diverse faces of men and varied figures of animals and landscapes and even some refinements of architecture. Titian in drawing the village (6) made use of all his skill and even from this alone you can recognize in him the great artist that he was. In fact, where the boundaries, for example the foot of the mountains and the extremities of the plains, merge, he on purpose left the canvas as it is prepared, without spreading on any color,
in order to express by means of that void, the dazzle which causes eyes that are looking at objects too far in the distance to be deceived. Thus that great master expressed the merging of objects, not as painters of today, who work painfully around it, but confused the objects themselves, namely the field, the brushstrokes, the canvas and certain rough colors in a highly artistic mixture. So much so that excellence in every field cannot be demonstrated, if it is lacking, nor be concealed if it's there. An then this painting, rich as it is in details, for those who wish to draw teachings from it, is worth many. Federico Zuccaro, a painter who in our times acquired some glory for drawing used to say that he who is capable of drawing all that can be drawn, deserves the highest praise. Because, he added, there are some whose abilities are so limited that, they being so accustomed to painting the human figure if they must represent a landscape or other things, have others help them, or carry it out so badly, (7) that because of that unsuccessful part, the painting, commendable in all else, remains spoiled. Zuccaro rightly affirmed that the artist ought to be at least mediocre in any given part of his art, and that the different parts must agree with the whole, so that the work does not in one part appear beautiful and proper and in another ugly and improper; let no one however, who has the better part of wisdom, so
flatter himself as to think that he has excellence in every part even within the narrow confines of a single art, this being impossible. And here the modesty of ancient painters comes to mind who, as Pliny says, acknowledged each other's superiority in certain parts of their art, nor did they believe this to wrong their own renown. It is a fact that around our times Titian, who surpassed everyone in coloring and in the imitation of nature was considered less skillful in drawing. That which is said with regard to Michelangelo and Raphael arouses even more wonder namely that they compete with the ancients the first in the painting of feet the second the head and the upper extremities of the human body. To Raphael then is attributed pre-eminence in drawing eyes and the vivacity of looks. Let this serve as a warning to those who easily find fault so that they may be more just in the judging of this as of any other art and so that they revile only that of which nothing good can be said.

(8) But let us return to our purpose. Among the figures of animals which Titian scattered in this painting of his, most beautiful is that of a white horse which is lowering its head to rid itself of a fly which is tickling its leg. A wonderful imitation of nature whose movements Titian knew how to express better than any other; so that in this respect one could rightly give him the
title of master. Nature had also been lavish in her favors towards him and it is generally held that, though he owed much to his studies he was mainly indebted to nature for his successes. Michelangelo admired him for this gift, and particularly because of it he placed him before all the others and perhaps even himself. It is certain that this gift can be both beneficial and detrimental in art just as in battles the nature of the place is usually the cause of victory or defeat, depending on whether it is favorable or unfavorable.

This painting proves precisely what we were just saying, that no one can be excellent in everything. In fact in it the Virgin and Child are anything but perfect and one can see that the artist applied all of his diligence to that ignoble crowd of sutlers and servants which followed the retinue of the Magi. One may distinguish among them a young negro whose blackness is absorbed by the surrounding obscurity, so that the figure (9) is at one moment withdrawn from view and at another reappears through the intervals of uncertain light. Since art, beginning from very little, has developed so much that one now paints even that which is impossible to paint such as the changing position and going backwards and forwards.

In the same room is seen another work by Titian: the Deposition from the Cross. Here the perfection of art is such that Christ's breast with its dead flesh defies
nature herself. Here is the Magdalen, who is consumed with grief and love and nevertheless full of life. In order to express all this the painter represents her in the flower of youth, going perhaps against the evangelical story. Nicodemus is praised for the natural carelessness in an old person. St. John seems to compete with the Magdalen in suffering. Having exhausted the expression of sadness in these two figures the artist would have with difficulty been able to show in a convenient way that of the Holy Virgin. So imitating from that celebrated ancient painter but with different creativity, he painted the Mother of God in the arms of her dead Son in the act of kissing him and cloaked in darkness. In this way he expressed more than what he painted and showed also what he kept hidden.

Facing this one, hanging on the opposite wall (10) is another painting by Titian, which, although it shows that it comes from the same workshop, can still serve to prove that the brush no less than the pen, when treating too frequently the same subject becomes tired, so to speak, and breaks, and that the efforts which are made towards the end of one's career do not equal in success the cares taken in its beginning. One sees that it was painted by an artist who was sated with glory and weakened by work. Nevertheless it merits praise for the ease and a certain sureness of drawing. The rest is done with so much
carelessness, that one would think that even Titian himself noticed it when he was doing it. That same carelessness may give value to the work and, it will be blamed more by the ignorant in art than by the intelligent.

For a different sort of negligence one should praise another picture by an unknown painter, which is near this one. If one looks at the excellence of the design one would think it a work by Giorgione, not of Titian; if at the power of the color, of Titian, not by Giorgione. When in doubt the glory may be benignly communicated to the one and the other. The painting represents the Virgin with Child and the Angel who holds by the hand Tobias as a child. In order to indicate that they are on a journey, the Angel goes before taking long steps and the youth running strains to keep behind. Two things are marvelously expressed in that hurried walking: (1) the effort that the Angel makes despite his more than human agility, to adjust his steps to the feebleness of the small Tobias, and the latter's turning to him with an imploring countenance as if to ask for help, not being able to keep up with the Angel running in haste, although he is breathless and straining his step.⁴

Also by Titian is a Madonna with Child in her arms and S. Catherine at her left. The latter is distinguished by her virginal comportment and the extreme delicacy of her limbs.⁵
There is another painting of the same subject by the same author, in which the divine Infant does not correspond in beauty to the rest of the work while the youthful John surpasses all the other figures. ⁶

Near Titian, in homeland as in this series of paintings, is Bassano senior. Here we see the great painter of animals and both practicing his own art and belying the calumny according to which he knew how to paint only beasts. In fact in this painting, which is placed in a distinct place and in excellent light, he painted with supreme artfullness a shepherd and with that figure he seemed to surpass himself. But he belied the false charge more in another greater painting, in which the Virgin is seen with the Child in her arms and behind them animals of different species. Near the Virgin to her left sits her husband Joseph as if overwhelmed by his years and by the fatigue of the journey (12) and leaning his head in his hand he looks at the Child. One praises in this figure the deep and sincere expression of paternal affection and old age as well as the intimacy which passes between the Child and the Old Man. ⁷

The paintings of which I have spoken up to now are originals. Before speaking of the copies I believe it is suitable to address those who, as arrogant and fastidious, in order to have one think of them as perspicacious critics as soon as they see a painting drawn from such masterpieces,
they immediately scorn and reject it, despite the exquisite
workmanship. I then say to these people that all human
things are fleeting and in a short time, they are spoiled
and perish; therefore it is desirable for the good of
humanity, that, just as copies of ancient books came down
to us so would those of the most famous ancient paintings,
with which past eras would have rendered a great service
to posterity. How precious would the copy of any ancient
painting by Appeles or Zeusis be today! How useful to
the progress of art! and at the same time, how much
pleasure we would draw from it! Moreover how much light
we would glean from it to interpret the passages of
writers, (13) principally Pliny, if we had in sight
those things which he told only with words. Therefore
it is a praiseworthy thing to procure copies provided
that they are worked with extreme diligence and taken from
the most excellent models, preferring those which are most
in danger of being destroyed, or either because they are
already damaged or for other reasons. According to their
standards we have had made the copies which are found in
the Museum. They will perhaps one day be in the place
of the celebrated originals, for so long at least as
they too will be destroyed by time. There is among
them the famous prophet Isiah by Raphael, which
being a fresco is more exposed to decay. There is an
almost colossal and gigantic figure drawn so artfully,
that every painter ought to use it as a model. There is Aeneas who in turmoil on that memorable night saved his father from slavery and from death by carrying him on his shoulders. The decrepit limbs exhausted of all the strength of the old man make a deep impression, as does the generous spirit which shines in he who carries him. There are the Sibyls thanks to whom one visits the temple of the Peace in Rome. (14) It was important to art that one should draw copies from it before the figures should fade. And they already disappear with the falling of the plaster and in a short while, of so great a work, there will be left only miserable ruins. While one day I observed it and thought of its approaching disappearance, I thought I heard the voice of the artist who beseached me to save it, and I was so moved that I ordered that it should be copied. The height of artfulness demonstrated by Raphael in making those Sibyls is in giving to those figures, which for clothes and features seem women, a masculine quality. You could really say that they are on the extreme limit of their sex, there where the weaker ends and the stronger begins.

Near to these there are two other Sibyls, for whom it is harmful to have been placed where they are, because the comparison obscures their glory. They are by Luini the Elder⁹ and considered in themselves appear as excellent work. Their highest value lies perhaps in the fact that
the elegance of the forms in no way moves one to lasciviousness: resulting from an art which I doubt is known to our painters, who are ignorant of the difference between divine and human beauty.

(15) As the work of Correggio, was a Virgin, who being crowned by the stars, fixes her gaze to the sky and there ascends. I said "was" because, having painted it on a wall at Parma, now it is almost vanished and will be in a short while lost if we do not say it is preserved by our copy. We consider it at least as good as the original, from which it was drawn by one of the Carracci brothers, painters of great worth.

Also by one of the Carracci's is the copy after another painting by Correggio\textsuperscript{11} which I saw at Parma in a state so deplorable as to foresee its imminent destruction. It is called La Zingarella (the Gypsy), because the painter, violating the laws of decorum, hence removing from the work itself a great part of glory, represented the Virgin in the figure of a little Egyptian thief. The aforementioned Luini acted very differently, when in painting the Savior in the first flowering of youth, between seventeen and eighteen years of age, was still able to preserve completely his majesty.

There are also six small works of great quality closed in a casket and enframed by chiseled silver, as one does with the most precious gems. They are: the head of the
Savior, a beautiful miniature of Giulio Clovio,\textsuperscript{12} that of the Mother of God, (16) in which Luini put all the care of which he was capable,\textsuperscript{13} some works of Jan Brueghel tiny in size which embrace, so to speak, as much grandiosity and renown as there is in art, so that you can at the same time admire the grandeur and the subtlety.\textsuperscript{14} They represent the Passion of Christ and are executed with the utmost effort of care, a quality wholly proper to this famous European artist and already our intimate friend, whose work we frequently used and whom we shall continue to mention from now on. He was wonderful in his field and knew how to give to those tiny figures so much nobility and so much life that they leave the onlooker uncertain as to the dimensions of the things which are painted. It also appears that he even wished with his brush to travel over all of nature, because he painted, as we shall later demonstrate, seas, mountains, grottos, subterranean caves, and all these things, which are separated by immense distances, he confined to a small space, imitating nature itself not only in color, but also in talent, which is the highest quality of nature and of art. And if to someone this praise seems exaggerated, let him know that one day the fame of this man will be so great that this praise which I gave to him will seem meager.

\textsuperscript{236} Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
From the hand of the same is a storm, the sight of which would horrify anyone; as also a winter landscape, that makes even the squallor of the snow and of the death of nature seem beautiful.

He also did a Daniel in the Lions' den. One can see the wild beasts' tongues, this even for the rest surpasses those of Bassano. It is also admirable in the fact that he has placed in it a confusing multitude of persons, but in such fashion as to show the order within the confusion itself.

There is nearby a Savior, that most people attribute to Andrea del Sarto, a work truly excellent and endlessly praised.¹⁵

But the quality of Brueghel's work forces us to return to him. In fact four paintings follow, representing the four elements¹⁶ executed by him at our request and so well done that they will never be praised enough. Although they are all of marvelous beauty, each of them stands out for some particular quality. Thus in the representation of the element of water, he has introduced so many and such varied kinds of fish as to make one believe him no less skilled at fishing than at painting, and he there collected and disposed in beautiful display every sort of those freaks of nature and refuse of the sea, that are the seal-shells. In the nearby painting, in treating the element of earth, he represented squalid

²³⁷
and deserted places, woods populated by trees, and the backgrounds, (18) not to mention animals nurtured by the earth, as the proud lion, the peacock with his pompous feathers, the leopard and the cruel wolf. As the barren and greedy fire, then, did not offer of itself a suitable subject matter to the artist, he thought of painting the fiery forges and all ingenious works of the Cyclops, adding to these the stories of Vulcan and Saturn whom he showed through the cleft in a rock in order to render the composition more beautiful. In the air, which is the reign of light, he scattered every sort of pleasant things. If one then compares this with the other paintings, one is induced to believe that, being this the last, its author wished to use in it all his art and care. He has not included the background, so that such wonderfully beautiful things, seen as in the distance, would not make a lesser impression; which perhaps has prevented the work from reaching perfection.

There would have been absolutely nothing in the Museum comparable to these small works if there were not another painting by the same author, that is their equal. It is a garland of so many flowers and so various that one can well call it an arch of triumph. On the flowers perch some small birds and the flowers themselves have an uncommon peculiar aspect, since the artist was not content to use our local flowers. We shall not speak of the
figure enclosed within the garland, because as a minor
light, it is overwhelmed by the surrounding splendor.18

These paintings by Brueghel stand near three other
miniatures of great value, (19) both because they were
executed with all possible diligence and also because it
is rare that one should ennoble paintings of such
dimensions with miniature. A Tobias in chiarscuro follows,
that served as a model for Luini19 in making his and re­
presenting its greatness. The said miniatures are the
work of Gerolamo Marchesino, who had been for some time
in our house. Another miniaturist, Agusto Decio, made
the small picture that comes next.20

With regard to the work on crystal, which comes imme­
diately after, I wish I could indicate its author and at the
same time show the nature and the origin of this sort of
painting. But I have not been able to discover either
the executor of this work or how one began to paint on
crystal. Certainly this is a new discovery and such that
in considering it, one remains uncertain as to whether
the artist had used the chisel or the brush. The glass
doesn't seem to be damaged in any place and it is painted
in a single color and with such delicate finesse as to
exceed every artifice.

But so that one could also see the mutual contrast of
minute things, Brueghel21 executed on parchment a mouse,
some rosebuds and several tiny little animals. I wanted
to mention in particular this parchment, so that one might deduce its worth even only from the fact that in it even mice are pleasing.

And now from the bases and most vile among the animals, (20) we go on to contemplate the eternal splendors of Heaven. In fact, the nearby small picture (called "la Cestella") presents a joyous subject. Paradise is the work of Rottenhammer the Belgian. Brueghel has added to it the flowers. The Madonna is a miniature by Gerolamo who copied his from one by Correggio and in the opinion of many, including myself, surpassed its model.

The third part contains the Savior as an infant who plays with a lamb and is so tender that nothing better, I believe, has ever been done by Luini the Elder. Next to it is a head by Michelangelo that is believed to have been prepared by him together with the other models, when he was painting the Last Judgment in Rome. On account of a fortunate accident near it is another head, the portrait of one of our princesses, which is by Leonardo and seems to vie with the other for the excellence of drawing. We would praise here another small garland by Brueghel if we had not already praised the first and greater one. The celebrated miniaturist Decio on the model of Sanzio made the Adoration of the Magi, that is seen nearby. There is in it a temple, a distinguished work of perspective. By whose hand it was done
may be obtained from the catalogue, (21) in which, when we established the Academy for the study of drawing, we ordered to have all these works listed. In it are recorded the greater part of those which for all the artists' excellence and renown are considered of not little value. It is not therefore necessary that we record everything here and that we mention for example the Monk by Titian or the famous Tempest or other similar minute although excellent works. But if it was not worth the trouble to speak of these, the Museum has many others and such that will deserve to be admired and written about.

The room that comes immediately after displays an example of the wonderful art of Luini Senior. The painting which was purchased for a great sum, is fairly large and is valued by painters as one of the most perfect of that artist. However not all the glory for this work belongs to Luini, but is shared by him with another great master, with Leonardo. His is the exquisite drawing: Luini added the best he could give, that is to say a certain delicacy, the movements and the affectionate and devout look of the faces. This is a clear proof that these most renowned artists lent each other their own skills, and that Luini recognized Leonardo's excellence in drawing, and Leonardo in turn (22) would have attributed to his disciple all the merit for the painting if he had seen how much more beautiful Luini had
rendered his work. And such qualities of goodness of soul in the highest minds are common: Pliny too tells of them in the ancient artists. They knew only too well how vast are the boundaries of art and how narrow are those of the mind and of the ability of man; therefore they very willingly helped one another. The most beautiful figure in the painting is that of the Baby Jesus whose face the artists praise, and more than anything else, the little body and the soft belly. There exists a model, that Leonardo made in potter's clay for the purpose of propagating the knowledge of such a distinguished work. The Virgin Mother of God is so much more admirable in that her singular charm inspires a sacred respect and sweeps out of every mind every unchaste thought: this is a result that one can call superior to nature. In Elizabeth one may perceive the vigor of a strong old age and in the infant John the lively pleasure with which he watches the Savior.

We wish that the other works of our Museum should also merit such a praise; but those which we have yet to describe are not of the same value. The famous painting of which I have just spoken lies between two other ones similar and almost the identical subject matter, but by different authors. One contains a mixture of rocks, fields, and verdent forests with the background both luminous and dark and with landscapes. It is said that
Titian ammassed there all these different things only because he used them, so to speak, as a depository to which he could resort when he might need to place in his works that which the painter calls accessories, therefore imitating himself. And that is how it must be, because one cannot see another purpose or reason for it. The other painting is by Paolo the Belgian who in our times acquired not little fame. It appears that here he wished to use as much art and talent as he had. There is seen a frontal seascape so peaceful and expansive, that whomever looks at it believes that he is covering it on no less with his foot than with his sight. His other works of which the same room is full, are not without merit, but it is diminished by the great resemblance that they have to one another. (24) One may distinguish among them deserts, the dreadful rocks, and rocky ravines which he painted wonderfully in watercolors. Also in watercolors is a Magdalen at the feet of the Savior disguised under the figure of an ortolan. It is the work of the old Luini. Someone else then added to it an oil tint or some other liquid perhaps in order to make the color last longer. One praises in it the feminine movement of the kneeling Magdalen. In the same series of paintings one may observe another which is somewhat older, by the hand of a German artist done at that time in which all the glory of art was placed in diligence. There follows a Madonna with Child similar to the work
of Leonardo, that one would say it is by his hand. Instead it is the work of one of his students who was such a perfect imitator of the master, that most people were deceived by it. The other paintings that are seen leave no doubt as to the author. They are by Titian and among them stands out the Magdalen with her hair flowing down the length of her person, of which there exist many copies. In this painting one must admire exceedingly the fact that the artist knew how to maintain an honest appearance in a nude.

(25) The row, which stands lower, is composed for the most part of the works of Paolo the Belgian and of those of other illustrious artists, one of whom would be praised to the heavens for a vase of flowers if the glory of a nearby work which we will observe later, did not prevent it. Facing it there are about twelve small works by Brueghel; namely some horns of plenty, the Tarter, a storm and some woods. In another part there is a fire by the same Brughel, who in his youth distinguished himself by treating such subject matter. There are some flying putti painted by Rottenhammer, which in the rigors of winter spread a great number of flowers, painted by Brueghel. Here beneath a mystery is hidden. The flowers and the frost represent Spring and Winter, extreme opposites of nature symbolizing the joy of the Heavens and the sadness of the terrestrial story. But, to tell
the truth, when I ordered the painting, I did not think at all either of symbols or of mysteries.

In the same room, which is a true sanctuary of art, are to be witnessed two great battles: the one is being fought by two Magdalens, the other is presented by Brueghel's flowers jutting out of a small vase. Of the first Magdalen, a work by Titian, we have already spoken. This other is by Luini Senior, but it appears to be by Leonardo, from whom perhaps Luini took the drawing.35 Experts think that almost nothing more beautiful is to be found today in all art, (26) in so far as his art can be exhausted on a single head. There is so much life in this head that the Magdalen by Titan in comparison seems dead, and not a woman, but the shadow of a woman. But if the face lacks action, it fulfills for the rest all its other functions, she turns to whomever looks at her and opens the small vase suited to oil the body of the Savior. Thus the two Magdalens contend among each other. But not lesser is the battle of the flowers, whose merit Brueghel himself, who made them, indicated with a most graceful invention. He painted at the bottom of the vase a diamond, whose view makes us understand that which we would have thought just the same, namely, the work is as valuable as a gem, and we paid for it as such. Around the flowers there were flitting butterflies, green grass and shells scattered on
the ground, for which any other painting would be sold at an expensive price. These flowers issuing out thus from the vase we place far above the garland by the same artist, which as we said is to be found in the first room of the Museum.

The Last Supper or the Triclinium by Leonardo, which is seen in the highest part of this room, compels us to pass over most of the other works that could also attract anyone's attention, particularly the copies we had made in different places from Luini's frescos, which were damaged and about to be destroyed. The remains of the Last Supper can still be seen in the Monastery of this city, which is called S. Maria delle Grazie.

Having observed at one time that the wall no longer sustained so great a work and that pieces of plaster were falling from it, I was taken by a burning longing to save that masterpiece as much as it was humanly possible. To such an end I called a painter in whom I had confidence and I proposed that he copy it. He said at first that it was impossible, because the figures were no longer recognizable, and with his despair, he took away from me the hope which yet had entered into my heart. Nevertheless, I ordered him to copy without delay at least a few heads of the Apostles which were still visible. He having done this and two or three of those heads having appeared, he ceased to despair and I resumed an increased
hope. So slowly and with effort and with great trouble
to all and also with interruptions the work as it may now
be seen was brought to completion. One proof of the
difficulties encountered in doing it, can be this very
fact itself, that the different parts were not copied
on only one canvas, but on different canvases later
joined together. As to the faithfulness of the copy,
it cannot be doubted, because it agrees with the models
found among Leonardo's papers and the artist himself
studied each head, subdividing it into squares and tracing
it. (28) As to the value of the work, many having already
discussed it, we shall say only that which perhaps es­
caped the others, namely, its main merit rests in the
expression and the variety of affections. It is this praise
that Pliny too gives to the Judgment of the goddesses,
in which he admired the three different sentiments of
Paris. However the artist did not express only the pain
and the tears, which any other would have been able to do,
but he represented the emotions of the soul along with
those of the body so that he who looks attentively at this
painting, seems to hear the words that the Apostles ex­
changed among each other, when the Savior had said that
dreadful "Whoever extends his hand to me on the dish, will
betray me." The venerable aspect of the Savior shows a
profound distress, concealed however and repressed by an
absolute self-control. The attitudes of the Apostles
are such that they make us guess and almost hear the words which the awesomeness of the scene suggests to them. There are those who threaten the traitor and those who promise the Master help and defense. Someone remains silent and amazed meditating on the horrible crime; several striken with anguish offer themselves to Christ as companions in grief. There is the one who tries to avert suspicion from himself of such a foul misdeed, and he who with questions (29) and inquiry wishes to find out about the plot. One is overcome by astonishment, another by indignation, another is silent trying to collect the speeches of his fellow disciples. But among all, the Apostle Peter stands out, in whose face one can read the wrath and longing to avenge without delay his dear Master. His every gesture shows a singular strength of character. You see him consumed within with anger and preparing something terrible at the traitor's expense, which however, he still does not wish to have known. With such ideas in mind, he turns toward St. John and begs him to reveal the secret of the betrayal and to explain the meaning of the words spoken by the Man-God. Near the Prince of Apostles the artist has placed Judas the traitor for the great reason that the contrast makes the sentiments stand out more. Nor are the faces and features less different. The face of the traitor is ugly, surly, ignoble: that of the Apostle is full of life and of dignity.
Judas then is troubled by hatred and also by the fear that the secret will come to be known, listens carefully to catch the words of Peter and John, with the look of one who is beside himself for the foul crime that he harbors in his heart. Moreover Leonardo in making Judas has brought into play the great mysteries of physiognomy and has shown his deep knowledge of it. (30) For he has made him black, hairy, with sunken eyes, with his hair standing straight on his head, with pug nose and extremely emaciated; all signs of evil traits according to those who from men's faces can see into their souls. To the same laws of metoposcopia conforms extremely well on the other side the inflamed face of the Apostle, artfully made to stand out in contrast to the paleness of the lips and of the flared nostrils. The rather long and aquiline nose, the eyes with their virile look reveal a generous heart. I have touched upon these signs of nature in order to inform our painters that their knowledge can serve their art much and that they cannot certainly go wrong, if they were to study them with care. Nevertheless this Last Supper is among the precious things of our Museum and will increase more in value every day, because the work of Leonardo is now spoiled and already almost entirely lost, though it was always considered a treasure. They say that the great artist died in the arms of Francis king of France. He truly deserved such great
Coming out of that very room from the threshold is seen a Magdalen, whose head was taken from a goddess painted in Rome by Raphael. It is a work by a painter of ours, to whom I suggested to thus change the famous profane images into sacred ones. He represented the saint, who holds in her hand a small vase, in the act of rising into the air (31) as she made according to what they say, several times a day, while living in the desert. Actually I would have wished a little more modesty in the face, but it was not possible to change the features of the original. Near to Raphael's Magdalen (for it thus can be called) there is a Hercules, the perfect model of strength, painted by the same artist in the Chigi palace. Our painter has added there an angel with a book, so that Hercules can in some way represent St. Matthew. The angel was also painted by Raphael, I do not know where. I am very much pleased at having been able to get into the Museum most of the Roman works, thus adapting them to pious custom. For this work we still avail ourselves of a fellow citizen of ours by the name of Antonio, who deserves to be remembered for his diligence and skill. Such gifts, along with a great deal of patience, put those who best understand such works in a position where, after having accurately compared them with their models, they must, to my belief, praise them; all the more for the
fact that the same faces were repeated in different places.

We caused that eight paintings by Gaudenzio of Novara, to be seen in Milan in the church of S. Raffaele, should be copied with equal diligence because they were cracked on account of great age and were near to being destroyed if the situation were not immediately remedied. They include Virgins, Bishops, sacred and profane things (32) in such great number, that even by themselves they could provide painters with all the necessary models. The somewhat smaller painting, which is seen below this, is by Titian and it is believed that he wished to paint his father thus clad in armour in order to indicate in a facetious way the nobility which such a son had acquired for him. That this should have been his intention is still uncertain; the author of the work is not however uncertain. The framed paintings, which lie in four long rows in the same room, contain different portraits of men's heads and are almost all by Muziano, who brought, while in Rome at the time of Sixtus V, great fame to himself and honor to his art. They can be useful to students, as also those others which our Antonio copied from Raphael. If those who are learning art will use all their care in imitating them, they shall be useful to them not less than the originals themselves. If they will be somewhat neglectful in their study and in imitation,
few will profit little from them, for this they will have
to blame themselves. The same Muziano who made this
copy, also copied the St. Anthony or St. Benedict by
Fra Sebastiano, which stands opposite the entrance into
the room, and as far as myself and others are concerned,
he surpassed that artist. Of not little value is a
basket, that stands near it, with flowers in lively tints.
It was made by (33) Michelangelo da Caravaggio who acquired
a great name in Rome. I would have liked to place another
similar basket nearby, but no other having attained the
beauty and the incomparable excellence of this, it re­
mained alone.

There are in this our Museum other glories of painting
that deserve to be spoken of but the marbles will not permit
it, for they, although silent and lifeless, demand my
voice. And we willingly proceed to them, also because we
would weary of enumerating so many works. Nevertheless
we again note in passing: a Christ by Titian dressed in
his royal cloak and crowned with thorns; a painting by
Giambellino, that contains a head with the upper portion
of the chest elegantly painted; another figure of similar
size, the work of Parmigianino; the risen Savior of
Giulio Romano with inventions by Raphael; a Madonna by
Leonardo and a rather large painting by Perugino who was
the teacher of Raphael. And although I nearly fail to
mention the names of so many illustrious artists, I
should at least describe a little more carefully a miniature
by that Gerolamo, of whom I have already spoken. It is
a human head of normal size, which is so finely done that
I do not believe that a finer thing of that kind could be
done. (34) The artist himself, when asked by us to do
another painting of the same size with the same artfulness,
stated that he could not do it. I omit the other paint-
ings, as I already said, because I feel as if I were invading
someone else's field and as if I could already hear my-
self being reproved for engaging in an art that is not
mine. It would seem that, even Cicero feared being thus
reproached and of being taken by the judges as both a
painter, and an orator, when he enumerated the plundering
and the thefts of Verre. But on the one hand, to have em-
ployed too much study in this art would have been to the
discredit of more important studies, and on the other,
further an absolute ignorance would be dishonorable for
an ecclesiastic. In connection with this, a very funny
incident comes to mind. In the time of Pius IV some noble-
men from abroad came to Rome, and in order to honor their
rank they were permitted to see Cardinal Bembo's num-
insmatics collection. Every time a piece of gold was pre-
sented to them they said "It is the purest gold" and
they were not able to say anything else. Then there was
another, who believed the medallions and coins, which
were placed in the middle part of the jewel case to be
more precious and it was those which he greatly admired.

(35) But now it is time to proceed to the marbles and the models, because in mentioning them in this work, it will be possible to preserve all the remains of Roman and Greek antiquity, which we happened to collect. If we had accumulated in the Museum everything excellent and wonderful of this kind in existence, we would have wronged the whole of Italy more than a little, for in being deprived of such ornaments, not without reason would she complain; and on the other hand, to acquire and preserve them all, neither our riches nor those of anyone else would be sufficient. Now I shall relate the way in which I succeeded in purchasing what the Museum possesses. Even for this alone our faculties would not have been enough to last a great while, but fortune or rather divine Providence favored us. There was a certain Leone Aretino a native of Val Solda, a territory belonging to the Church of Milan. He being fairly well known as a skillful sculptor and painter, at the time that the French held the duchy, king Francis commissioned him to prepare the models of all the celebrated statues, from which he would later make copies in bronze. For it was the intention of that sovereign to civilize with the study of these arts also his nation, which has hitherto left the glory of them to Italy. Thus Aretino with the money and much more so with the authority of the king
was able to copy all the excellent and wonderful works found everywhere. The magnanimous intention of the prince was thwarted by death, which, as everyone knows, all too often renders vain even the most generous resolutions. King Francis dies and Aretino outlives him with the models which he had made in gesso and clay. Also after the artist having died, the models passing through various other hands, finally reached ours. They represent, as I have already said, most of the relics of vulnerable antiquity and also of the works, with which Michelangelo embellished the city of Florence. Such a great quantity of excellent things will be useful to the young, who are beginning to study this art, certainly no less than if they had the statues themselves near at hand. Since it is known that to learn the secrets of the art, models are worth as much as the statues themselves, only if these however have been accurately and faithfully copied, as our artist has done. It will also be exceedingly useful to young students to have collected in one place the most beautiful things, that are seen dispersed in various places. And even if the art of painting still possessed the drawings of Michelangelo, that is not to say how much benefit would be derived from them. But the artist flung them into the fire on the instigation of a stone-cutter, who was serving him as a helper in art and as a servant.
(37) One must believe that he did not do it for no reason, for even Raphael's drawings were not unpleasant to the author. And then, even though word has it that Michelangelo made use of drawings not only in painting but also in sculpture, even if he had not made use of them, he would not have been able to boast, as he did, that, in all the different works that he made, he never had to cut more stone than what he had established at the beginning.

This artist, as I believe I said elsewhere, did not want to have students, and being accused because of this envy, he said that, having experienced the ingratitude of many, he did not wish to have other troubles. But in this our Museum, no such complaint or suspicion of ingratitude will prevent the students from profiting; since both Michelangelo and other artists, without having to be begged, are generous in their teachings to whomever wishes to learn. Here one aims higher; one does not mind what ungrateful students may do or say. Besides among the above mentioned exemplaries the Vatican Apollo shines as the sun; and it, I believe gathers in itself (38) all the virtues of art, which can possibly be in a single statue. What others may think of it, I do not know; as for myself, I am convinced that nothing can compare with it for beauty, grandeur and vigor. Immediately after it comes the Antinous, distinguished for its softness, which,
according to Michelangelo, cannot be obtained either in marble or in bronze if not by a supreme artist.

Then one sees arranged in a single line the famous statues of Pasquin, Hercules, the Gladiators and Narcissus, the one renowned for its robustness, the other for its delicacy; and many fragments or armatures of exquisite make, whose number increase each day for the additions made to it. There are Michelangelo's Dusk and Dawn together with two cartoons by Raphael, which students ought to hold the dearer, the less one can doubt the author. One could rather have some suspicion regarding the paintings by this artist, because many of those who helped him when he painted could have taken a hand to them; but it is certain that these are not by other hands. Thus renowned statues and fragments or remnants of them are such, that, because of their excellence they cannot less frighten than stimulate the mind.

Among the sculptors of our time I am inclined to give supremacy to Marc' Antonio Prestinari, (39) who, while he lived, was of our household. He was certainly a great artist both for the famous works that he left and because he surpassed in my opinion all others for admirable discourses about his art. His doctrine and skill derived from the fact that he fecundated, so to speak, his soul through contemplation of ancient artists.

But I suspect that I too have undertaken a work too
grandiose, when I had a statue of St. Charles made of huge size. There was much consultation aiming at its success, and different opinions came to be offered. I at first wished to have a smaller one of marble, but the long time, that it should have required in order to bring it to completion deterred me from it. Having the Colossus of Rhodes then come to mind and that, that was not of cast bronze but of beaten medal, I proposed to take it as a model. Now the statue is almost finished, so that one may judge more easily with one's eyes, than from what we could say about it. Some reproached our plan and threw discredit on the work itself, saying that it ought to perish in the same way in which Roman antiquities perished. But if one were to think of this, nothing beautiful would any longer be made in this world, and human industry would not undertake anything great. We knew full well that even if Roman antiquities are now destroyed, memory however remains and one still points out the places where they rose. But let those who are tormented by the craving for worldly goods trouble themselves with this. Our Colossus shall be eternal if God will accept the small gift which I offer to him in honor of the Saint, to whom it is submitted and dedicated. Then, I say, it shall be eternal at least for the merit which will be derived from it for he to whom it was erected and this must be enought for a Christian.
It is time by now to lay hand to the third part of this our Museum. It will soon be finished; because we entrusted it to one of our family. He will record the names of the illustrious men, whom we ordered would be portrayed as faithfully as possible. They are all famous personages in the field of letters or in one of the arts which we call liberal, because to admit those who acquired glory in the army or in else, would not have been permissible according to the purpose, for which was established the Library. We then ordered that the same honor be given to others, whose renown requires that their memory be preserved with portraits, be they foreigners or Italians or even members of the Collegio Ambrosiano or students of the Collegio itself.
In the Deed of Gift of April 28, 1618, Cardinal Borromeo had in fact alluded to the vicissitudes of the painting, with the following words: "it was made on the order of the Cardinal of Ferrara to be given to King Francis. Having belonged of late to Saint Charles, it was bought by me, Federico Cardinale Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, from the Ospedale Maggiore which was his heir." We are in the presence of a singular example of munificence, since it is a Cardinal who acquires the valuable painting, already destined to a king, bequeathing it to the benefice of a hospital, and it is another cardinal who redeems it, in order to secure it for public enjoyment. The Cardinal of Ferrara was Ippolito d'Este who intended the Titian painting as a present to Henry II of France: a circumstance also attested by the carved wooden frame, which shows the bow and the quiver, attributes of Diana, and the monograms interlaced with the letters H and D. A version of the same subject, with some variation, is in the Royal Gallery at Madrid, with an attribution to Titian.

Federico Zuccaro, who died in 1609, is the author of the book Idea dei pittori, scultori, architetti, from which Cardinal Borromeo drew the observations reported
in his Museum.

3 (p. 48,1) The Deed of Gift mentions this painting as follows: "The Deposition of Our Lord Christ from the Cross with seven figures, done by Titian himself, with gilded frame, three and half braccia in length and three in height. Another similar one is seen in the Escorial."

4 (p. 49,1) The Deed of Gift describes the painting as follows: "A Madonna with St. Joseph, the former holding Our Lord in his arms, and nearby St. John, and the Angel with Tobias, who has a fish in his hand, with the frame outlined in gold, of two braccia and half in width and two in height, and it is by Giorgione Teacher of Titian." This attribution becomes less decided in the Museum, leaving the former designation uncertain between Giorgione and Titian, who were contemporaries and collaborated in Venice in the Fondaco dei Turchi. Today the author of the painting is recognized as Bonifacio Veronese.

5 (p. 49,2) It is thus mentioned in the Deed of Gift: "A Madonna with St. Catherine, the Christ Child, and St. John, the work of Titian."

6 (p. 49,3) It must be the painting described in the Deed of Gift as "a Blessed Virgin, with nude Child in her
lap, St. John the Baptist, and S. Cecilia, likewise by Titian."

7 (p. 50,1) They are the paintings thus mentioned in the 1618 Deed of Gift: "A painting by the hand of the said Bassano, where the Angel announced to the Shepherds the Nativity of the Lord" and "A Blessed Virgin with Child, who offers a veil to St. Joseph, with three shepherds and some animals: and it is by Bassano the Elder."

8 (p. 51,1) Of particular interest is the passage which mentions the copies after Raphael's frescoes, not yet mentioned in the Deed of Gift. The figure of the prophet Isiah was painted by Raphael around 1512 on one of the pillars of the church of St. Agostino in Rome, in whose figure the painter betrayed the transitory influence exerted on him by Michelangelo with the frescoes of the vault of the Sistine Chapel, which had in part been freed from the scaffolding in the Spring of 1511; Raphael's fresco was badly cleaned in 1555, and Daniele da Volterra was commissioned to restore it under the pontificate of Paul IV. In the figure of Aeneas, carrying his father, one cannot fail to recognize the famous group in the Fire in the Borgo, in the Vatican Stanze; as for the Sibyls, Cardinal Borromeo himself indicated their whereabouts, in S. Maria della Pace, near the home of
Agostino Chigi, upon whose order, in the same year 1514 Raphael frescoed both the Triumph of Galatea in the Villa, and the Sibyls in that church, at the entrance of the Chigi family chapel. Raphael's Sibyls, painted after the ones which Michelangelo with biblical inspiration frescoed in the Sistine Chapel, afford on the contrary all the grace of Pagan inspiration, enlivened by a Christian sentiment, which was lacking in the same subjects painted by Vanucci in Perugia, in the Sala del Cambio, and by Pintoricchio in S. Maria del Popolo, in S. Onofrio, and in S. Pietro in Montorio, with their predominately decorative character. Cardinal Borromeo's selection reveals therefore a firm discernment of art, coupled with the practical sense which induced him to have those copies made: it was as if Raphael's own voice entreated him to take such a measure, called for the breaking of the plaster and by the fading of the painting. And that the damage was serious at the time of Borromeo, is evidenced by the work of restoration, which Pope Alexander VII wanted, a few decades later, to have carried out under the direction of Cavaliere Fontana; at the beginning of the last century the damages reoccurred at S. Maria della Pace, and in the other frescoes in Rome, so much so that P. L. Courier, in 1809, would express the wish that copies should be made of these...
frescoes (see the letter to Mad. Dionigi, in Raccolta Vinciana, volume V); the painter Palmaroli was in fact commissioned at that time to restore the Sibyls, as C. Fea reported in 1816.

9(p. 52,1) Even these Sibyls, copied by Luini, are not mentioned in the Deed of Gift, nor with regard to the same, is it easy for us to infer the location of the originals.

10(p. 52,2) The Deed of Gift says: "A Madonna with her hands crossed in the act of being crowned, from the waist up, larger than life, copied by Caracciolo the Bolognese from the one by Correggio, which used to be seen in a gallery at Parma."

11(p. 53,1) The Deed of Gift attributed to Schedone the "Madonna dressed in gypsy style with the sleeping Child, copied from that of Correggio in Parma."

12(p. 53,2) The Deed of Gift says instead: "Small head of a Savior, which comes from Giulio Clovio, rendered in miniature by Girolamo Marchesini the miniaturist."

13(p. 53,3) "A Madonna with the nude Lord in her arms, who points with one hand to his Mother. Miniature by Girolamo Marchesini, the model for which is by Luini the Elder", as described in the 1618 Deed of Gift.
For the works of this painter, for the greater part still in the Pinacoteca Ambrosiana, it is necessary to consult the numerous letters of the artist to Cardinal Borromeo; letters that were published and diligently annotated forty years ago by Giovanni Crivelli, Doctor of the Ambrosiana. Borromeo had a particular preference for Brueghel, whom he met in Rome, entertained in Milan for some time, and whom he recommended warmly in 1596 to the Bishop of Anversa, when the painter wanted to repatriate; from that time, for some thirty years, the cordial relations between the Cardinal and Brueghel or more precisely between the patron and the artist, since the correspondence almost always regards works of painting destined for the Cardinal continued. It is worth mentioning that, while the letters written by Brueghel himself up to the year 1612 demonstrate a confusing style and the worst orthography, starting from that time the correspondence generally assumes a fairly correct form. Crivelli explained this circumstance with the recognition of Brueghel's secretary as none other than the painter Peter Paul Rubens.

It is the fourth of the works mentioned in the Deed of Gift: "A youthful Savior with a ball in his hand. It is believed to be by Andrea del Sarto."
The four paintings of the Elements, of which only two were returned to the Ambrosiana, at Napoleon's fall are repeatedly mentioned in Brueghel's letters from 1608 to 1622, alternating with references to another series of Elements, painted by Brueghel at the same time.

The painter mentions the **Element of Fire** in the letter of February 1, 1608: "and if it had not been for this extreme cold I would have begun with some creation of the element of fire, in the hope that it should please Your Most Illustrious Lordship." And in September of the same year he writes: "in a few days I will send the painting of the **Element of Fire** in which one can see every sort of armoury, metals, gold, silver, and fire, even alchemy and distillations."

The year after, in August, he promises to do two other Elements: "returning home I will only work on the paintings for Your Lordship and in time I will begin the others, two of Water and Earth." The promise was caused by the fact that Brueghel had to go to Brussels "in order to serve our Archduke and to serve our serene Enfanta."

In May of 1610 he sent the **Element of Fire**, and around March 11, 1611, he wrote: "I am from day to day waiting for a week of beautiful weather in order to retouch the three small paintings Water, Earth, and Air. May Your
Lordship believe me that in the aforementioned I employed as much care as possible." And a few days later, having received notice of the good reception given to the painting of Fire, he writes: "with pleasure I hear of the satisfaction that Your Lordship has the painting the Element of Fire." In the following year 1612 Brueghel was to send the painting of the Element of Earth, since in the letter of April 19, 1613, Brueghel thanked the Cardinal "that he is pleased to order another painting in his service, that namely, the Elements of Water and of Fire, as companions to the others which V. S. Ill. ma has by my hand:" the artist soon set about executing the Element of Water, which he sent to Milan the Spring of the following year, as it is shown by the letter of December 24. 1614: "I was much gladdened when Your Illustrious Lordship deigned to command of me that painting of the Element of Water, and I conducted the work to that perfection that the little talent and feeble hand permitted. On the other hand I am not little grieved that, after having given it to signor Ercole Bianchi nine months ago, I have never heard whether it arrived safely and whether Your Lordship was pleased with it." The Cardinal justified the delay by referring to his letter of response, which had been lost.

The execution of the last painting of the Elements
was much delayed, and in fact, in 1616 Cardinal Borroméo wrote: "I await the last Element left, in which I desire and also anticipate greater diligence than is to be found in the others." But it is only in October of 1621 that Brueghel writes: "the fourth Element of Air made according to orders" and in February 1622 announces: "I sent a painting made by your order, the Element of Air;" in the same letter Brueghel states: "my secretary Rubens is in France."

It is truly to be regretted that the ensemble of the Four Elements is to be found scattered between the Ambrosiana and the Louvre; and it is still more to be regretted that for many years the two Elements remaining there, have not been exhibited to the public; which contributes to render even more rightful their much delayed restitution.

17 (p. 57,1) This corresponds, on the other hand, to the recommendation that Cardinal Borroméo addressed to the painter in 1616, requesting the completion of the fourth element The Air: "I would like that in what remains to be done you would try to surpass even yourself, both for your greater praise and for my satisfaction." See Guida all' Ambrosiana, Milan 1907, p. 57.

18 (p. 57,2) "A Madonna with young boy in her arms in a.
oval with a crown around of various flowers, by the hand of the same Brueghel," as recorded in the 1618 Deed of Gift.

19 (p. 57, 3) It is to be found in the category "Disegni" (drawings), in the gift of 1618, thus described: "A drawing that contains the old Tobias and the youth with an angel and other figures made by Luini the Elder, in chiaroscuro."

20 (p. 58, 1) It must be the "Madonna with son and S. Catherine in miniature; of "Agosto Desio Milanese" as mentioned in the 1618 Deed of Gift.

21 (p. 58, 2) It is the first work which Brueghel sent to the Cardinal in 1596, after his return to his native country: "this trifle which I send you is not to give you the occasion of thanking me, but as a sign of the immortal obligation which I owe you."

22 (p. 58, 3) In the 1618 Deed of Gift it is thus described: "The Glory of Paradise symbolized with very many figures and with a flowered meadow: the figures are by Rathnamer, and the landscape by Gio. Brueghel."

23 (p. 58, 4) "A large head of the Madonna in profile by the hand of Girolamo Marchesini miniaturist, after Raphael," as recorded in the 1618 Deed of Gift.
24 (p. 59,1) The particular predilection that Cardinal Borromeo showed for Luini found satisfaction in this small painting, mentioned in the 1618 Deed of Gift as "A Christ embracing a Lamb made by the same Luini," which is in fact a summation of all the painter's qualities of grace.

25 (p. 59,2) It is the first painting "by the major artists" mentioned in the 1618 Deed of Gift: "a head of an old man done by Michelangelo which he perhaps used in his works in Rome."

26 (p. 59,3) This is the painting which by now is considered the most precious gem of the Pinacoteca Ambrosiana. Modern criticism which deems it necessary, contrary to that of the past century, to make its judgments conform to more rigorous criteria, because it tries to sanction as much as possible its conclusions with the prestige of patiently traced documents, and when these are lacking with the relationship between the various works of art, wanted not only to take away from Leonardo the paternity of the painting, but also to substitute for his another name, that of Ambrogio de Predis. Yet, the authority that such an attribution can claim results somewhat limited, not deriving from any positive fact, but only from a peculiarity of technique that, for the
simple fact that it was found in a portrait in profile, painted by Ambrogio de Predis, one wanted to consider as an exclusive characteristic of that painter, without taking into account that precisely because of the same simplicity and effectiveness of such a technique it seems natural to think that Leonardo deserves the merit of having conceived and adopted it, and that the pupil must have found convenient and easy to take advantage of it: this is that light which is seen at the side of the eye, and which gives it a singular liveliness of expression. Can this detail carry enough weight to destroy the two circumstances on which the attribution to Leonardo is founded, that is to say the statement made by Cardinal Borromeo a century after the painter's death, and the intrinsic value of the painting compared to what results from the works of Ambrogio with which we are acquainted?

The critics wanted to invalidate the authority of Cardinal Borromeo too abruptly, observing that his attribution ought to be received with diffidence, both because he was not himself an artist, and because he might have found himself exposed to the temptation of glorifying the work of art, which he owned and gave away, and also because of the general lack of rigor in the art criticism of his time; but the pages of the Musaeum suffice to disprove such objections, since they show
the sobriety of his judgment in matters of art, without any temptation to artificially because the merit of his munificent act. The modifications themselves made between the Deed of Gift and the *Musaeum*, to which he conforms, as we already saw, are proof of his unbiased and objective judgment; and although he could not help but be subject to the particular conditions of the environment in which he lived, this cannot authorize the convenient conclusion that the attribution of the *Portrait of a Lady* to Leonardo is due to the deficiency of an aesthetic sense coupled with a vain desire of making a display of his possession. In every period, on the other hand, judgments of art had some weak point of transitory effect: the very attribution to de Predis constitutes a new proof of this, as it passes over the singular intrinsic value of the painting, which is due to a hand considerably superior to that of the works ascertained to have been by Ambrogio de Predis.

27 (p. 60,1) "An *Adoration of the Magi* whose drawing is by Raphael and painting by Agosto Deiso Milanese," as recorded in the 1618 Deed of Gift.

28 (p. 60,2) "*Portrait which represents a friar*, done by Titian," thus the 1618 Deed of Gift. The panel is today exhibited as no. 40 in Room C, with the inscription
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29 (p. 61,1) This is one of the paintings from whose possession Cardinal Borromeo derived the greatest pleasure, so much so as to exceptionally mention to have acquired "magno ponderi auri"; while in the Deed of Gift, after having described it as "A Madonna with St. Anne, Our Lord, and St. John as small children with St. Joseph, by the hand of Bernardo Luini," he added: "major painting."

30 (p. 61,2) There is no doubt that Luini demonstrates with this painting that he was inspired in an almost exceptional way, by the work of Leonardo, and precisely by the St. Anne cartoon; but from such a simple correlation one cannot deduce a collaboration between Leonardo and Bernardino Luini, two artists unknown to have been in personal relation, while the characteristics of both remain very distinct, even though they both worked in the same environment, and with the same models.

31 (p. 62,1) Even this indication regarding Leonardo is subject to the reservation put forth in the preceding footnote. Truly, the existence of a Leonardo bozzetto in clay is mentioned by Cardinal Borromeo as being only a current rumor, but one cannot in this way admit a collaboration between Leonardo and Luini in the same
painting, thus by the same token it does not seem admissible that, in order to make known the composition of the St. Anne, Leonardo should have turned it into a model. The opinion expressed by Cardinal Borromeo can be explained by various circumstances: we must remember that in the seventeenth century the opinion that Luini had been among the pupils, or more precisely among the imitators and reproducers of the works of Leonardo had taken hold, an opinion which has not completely disappeared, not even in the face of the greater possibility, reached today, of comparing the work of these two artists in order to distinguish their personal characteristics, and therefore the differences of technique and inclination. Add to this fact that the same subject of Luini's "principal painting" had been treated by Leonardo, with the panel which together went with the painter to France, and is now in the Louvre: which may justify the hypothesis that there was a collaboration of sorts, in the sense that Leonardo's preliminary drawing for his St. Anne, could have inspired Luini in executing the painting of the Ambrosiana, a hypothesis which derived some grounds from the fact that the cartoon of St. Anne, which later when to England, had contributed to make one believe that it was the question of a work left by Leonardo in the state of a mere study. We should note finally how
the very strength of the relief and the plasticity of the masses in the cartoon of St. Anne and in the other smaller Leonardo drawings, which are preliminary sketches for that cartoon, could have concurred in engendering the opinion that Leonardo had planned with those sketches to translate his composition into a sculpture by means of a model.

32 (p. 63,1) Of this strange painting, attributed to Titian, we have no trace.

33 (p. 63,2) The 1618 Deed of Gift singles out for praise this painting in particular: "A view of the Sea, by the hand of Paul Brill, which is one of the most beautiful things that he has done."

34 (p. 63,3) The 1618 Deed of Gift in fact refers to other ten works by Paul Brill.

35 (p. 64,1) "A bust of the Magdalen, with an alabaster vase in her hand, which is by the hand of Luini." Deed of Gift 1618. [The subject can be identified with the Luini Magdalen in the Knoedler House, New York, reproduced by Ottino della Chiesa, Fig. 150.]

36 (p. 65,1) The four pages in the Museum dedicated to the Last supper, have a singular interest for the story of painting. Cardinal Borromeo stresses from the outset
the exceptional importance he attributes to the copy which he had entrusted to Andrea Bianchi, called il Vespino. It seems that Borromeo, despite the painter's hesitation, ordered the latter "to copy without delay at least some heads of the Apostles which were still visible." And the indication that once this was done two or three of the Apostle's heads could be detected, leads to believe that already at the time of Cardinal Borromeo the impression that the damage was worse than it was in fact was facilitated by the development of mold, whose removal permitted a better view of the painting, to the point that Vespino could succeed in copying all of the heads; such results encouraged Borromeo to consider the copy which he had commissioned from Vespino among the most precious things of his Museum, whose value, he foresaw, would increase with the progressive deterioration of the original.

37 (p. 68,1) The tradition of the episode of Leonardo dying in the arms of Francis I, lasted until the nineteenth century, and was even to furnish the subject for a painting. From the memoirs of the time however such a tradition appears unfounded.

38 (p. 68,2) This painter, whom the Cardinal remembers for his diligence and ability, mentioning only his name,
can fortunately be identified as the same Antonio Mariano as recorded in the two letters of 2 and 24 September 1628, cited in the preface, concerning precisely the various copies that Borromeo continued to commission from Mariano even after the publication of the Musaeum.

39 (p. 69, 1) Of these paintings by Guadenzio Ferrari in the church of S. Raffaele, which attracted the attention of Cardinal Borromeo, no trace remains. The Santagostimi brothers in their Catalogo delle pitture insigni eposte al pubblico in Milano made mention such works as follows: "around in the above-mentioned church there are many standing saints by Gaurenzio Ferrari," and Torre in his Ritratto di Milano records these paintings as still existing. But, beginning with the eighteenth century, there is no information regarding them; neither Latuada, nor Sormani, speaking of the church of S. Raffaele and of the paintings which were there, cite such works of Gaudenzio Ferrari, which Cardinal Borromeo, in the preceding century, faced with their deterioration, deemed worthy of being copied, in order to preserve at least their memory.

40 (p. 69, 2) "The bust of Titian's father, dressed as a soldier," as recorded in the 1618 Deed of Gift. We
do not know which given fact is the basis for this designation, which Borromeo in his *Musaeum* deemed to enhance with a mere hypothesis.

41 (p. 69,3) Girolamo Muziano from Brescia died in 1590, at the age of 60, in Rome, where Cardinal Borromeo was able to meet him personally. Muziano, who had won Michelangelo's praise with his painting *The Resurrection of Lazarus*, founded the Academy of St. Luke. This would confirm the possibility of a personal rapport with the man who later founded the Milanese Academy of Fine Arts.

42 (p. 71,1) A contemporary hand erased the term *intima* which is in the text and replaced it with *media*, written on the margin. We felt that the latter should be given preference in the translation ("in the middle part" instead of "inside").

43 (p. 72,1) In the Louvre are in fact preserved some copies after the best examples of ancient statuary, and cast in bronze by the order of Francis I.

44 (p. 73,1) Marc' Antonio Prestinari was one of the three sculptor brothers who worked on the Cathedral of Milan at the end of the seventeenth century, and the beginning of the following one: Marc' Antonio, who left traces of his talent in the decorations of the choir,
died in 1618.

45 (p. 74,1) This is the colossal statue, modeled by Cerano, and erected between Arona and Meina.

46 (p. 75,1) Nothing else is known of this third part of the Musaeum Cardinal Borromeo had planned to write
A. INDEX OF WORKS MENTIONED IN THE MVSAEVM AND LIST OF MARGINALIA

The Musaeum as published in 1625 and 1909 has no index, but the original text carries marginal notations in Latin which serve the purpose of a subject matter index. These notations are shown in the facsimile above and are translated into English in the list appended to the Index which follows.

References to the present location of the works of art and to the documents and publications which record or discuss them are designated according to the following abbreviations:

- G = On view in the Gallery
- S = In storage
- L = Lost
- DG = Deed of Gift of 1610. See Appendix B below
- DB = Charles de Brosses' Account of 1739. See Appendix C below
- FR = French Requisition of 1796. See Appendix D below
- RL = Ratti's List, inventory in A. Ratti's Guida Sommaria of 1907

Full bibliographies for each of the works exhibited are given in the Falchetti Catalogue of 1969. (See Bibliography below.)
ANONYMOUS. See UNKNOWN ARTIST. UNKNOWN GERMAN ARTIST

BASSANO, Jacopo (Jacopo da Ponte, called), 1510-1592.

Annunciation to the Shepherds, p. 11.
G, DG, DB, RL

Rest on Flight into Egypt, p. 11-12
G, DG, RL

BELLINI, Giovanni, 1430-1516.

Unknown portrait, p. 33.
L

BRILL, Paul, 1544-1626.

S, DG, DB, RL

Works of Unspecified Subjects, p. 25
S, DG, DB, RL

BRUEGHEL, Jan ("Of the Velvets", called), 1568-1625.

Acquasantiera, pp. 15-16.
(see also Clovio, Luini, and Marchesini)
G, DG, DB, RL

Allegory of Winter (Winter Landscape with Glory of Angels, part of Sei pezzi di Paesini, with Rottenhammer), p. 25.
G, DG, DB, RL

Daniel in the Lions Den, p. 17.
G, DG, DB, FR, RL

Four Elements, pp. 17-18.

1. Allegory of Air, p. 18.
DB, FR (now in the Louvre)

DG, DB, FR (now in the Louvre)
3. Allegory of Fire, p. 18.
   G, DG, DB, FR, RL

   G, DG, DB, FR, RL

Glory of Paradise (La Cestella, with Rottenhammer), p. 20.
   G, DG, RL

   L

   G, DG, RL

Mouse and Rosebuds with Little Animals, p. 19.
   G, DG, RL

Sei pezzi di Paesini, p. 25.
   G, DG, DB, RL

Sei altri di Paesini, p. 25.
   G, DG, DB, RL

Storm, p. 17.
   L

Winter Landscape, p. 17.
   L

   G, DG, DB, RL

CARAVAGGIO (Michelangelo Merisi, called), 1557-1610.

Basket of Fruit, p. 33.
   G, DG, DB, RL

CARRACCI, Lodovico, 1555-1619.

Copy after Correggio's Ascension of the Virgin, p. 15.
   (attributed to the Bolognese School or Schedone)
   S, DG, RL
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Copy after Correggio's *La Zingarella* (*Gypsy*), p. 15.
S, DG

CERANO (Giovanni Battista Crespi, called), 1576-1633.
*Colossus of St. Charles* at Arona, pp. 39-40.

CLOVIO, Giulio, 1498-1578

*Acquasantiera*, pp. 15-16.
(See also Brueghel, Luini, and Marchesini)
G, DG, DB, RL

CORREGGIO (Antonio Allegri, called), c. 1494-1534.
See CARRACCI, Lodovico; MARCHESINI, Gerolamo.

DECIC, Agosto, active fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

*Adoration of the Magi*, p. 20.
(Miniature after Raphael)
S, DG, DB, RL

S, DG

FERRARI, Gaudenzio (Gaudenzio of Novarra, called),
c. 1470/80-1546.

Eight copies after paintings in S. Raffaele:
"Virgins, Bishops, Sacred and Profane Things,"
pp. 31-32.
S, RL

GIAMPETRINO, c. 1490-1540.

( Probably Leonardo's composition)
G, DG, RL
GIORGIONE CASTELFRANCO (Giorgione Barbarelli, called), 1477/80-1510.

Sacred Family with Tobias and the Angel, pp. 10-11. (now attributed to Bonifacio Veronese; see also Titian)
G, DG, RL

Salvator Mundi, p. 17. (formerly attributed to Andrea del Sarto)
G, DG, DB, RL

GIULIO ROMANO (Giulio Pippi, called), c. 1499-1546.

Risen Savior, p. 33. ("with inventions of Raphael")
L, DG

LEONARDO DA VINCI, 1452-1519.

Clay Model of Christ Child for the Burlington House Cartoon, p. 22.
L

S, DG

Madonna (unspecified subject), p. 33.
L

Portrait of a Young Lady (so-called portrait of Beatrice d'Este), p. 20. (now attributed to Giovanni Ambrogio De Predis)
G, DG, DB, RL

Virgin and Child (Madonna del Latte). See GIAMPETRINO

LEONI, Leone (Leone Aretino, called), 1509-1590.

Antinous, p. 38.
L

Hercules, p. 38. (now at the Scoula Beato Angelico, Milan)

Gladiator, p. 38.
L
Narcissus, p. 38.  L

Pasquin, p. 38.  L

Vatican Apollo, pp. 37-38.  L

LUINI, Bernardo, 1481/2-1532.

Acquasantiera, pp. 15-16.
(see also Brueghel, Clovio, and Marchesini)
G, DG, DB, RL

Christ Child with the Lamb, p. 20.
G, FR, RL

Holy Family, pp. 21-22.
G, DG, DB, FR, RL

Magdalen at the Feet of the Savior disguised as an Ortolan, p. 24.
S, DG

L, DG, DB, RL

Old Tobias and Youth with Angel and other Figures, p. 19.
S, DG, RL

L

Youthful Savior, p. 15.
G, DG, DB, RL

MARCHESINI, Gerolamo, 1481-c. 1550.

Acquasantiera, pp. 15-16.
(see also Brueghel, Clovio, and Luini)
G, DG, DB, RL

L, DG
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Head of a Large Madonna in Profile, p. 34.
L, DG

Madonna with Nude Lord in Her Arms Who Points with One Hand to His Mother, p. 16.
L, DG

Old Tobias, p. 19
L

Two Unknown Subjects, p. 19.

MARIANO, Antonio, active fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Copy after Raphael's Hercules, p. 31.
L

Magdalen, pp. 30-31.
(After Raphael's Pagan Subject)
L

MICHELANGELO, 1475-1564.

Head of an Old Man for the Last Judgment, p. 20.
S, DG, DB, RL

Model of Dusk and Dawn, p. 38.
L

MUZIANO, Gerolamo, 1528-1592.

Copy after Sebastiano del Piombo's St. Anthony or St. Benedict, p. 32.
S, DG, DB

Various Men's Heads, p. 20.
S, DG

PARMIGIANINO (Francesco Mazzola, called), 1503-1540.

Portrait of Unknown Subject, p. 33.
L
PERUGINO (Pietro Vannucci, called), 1445-1523.

Large Painting of Unknown Subject, p. 33.
L (possibly DB as "Portrait de Pascalino, par le Pérugin")

PREDIS, Giovanni Ambrogio De, 1455-1508

Portrait of a Young Lady (so-called portrait of Beatrice d'Este), p. 20.
(formerly attributed to Leonardo da Vinci)
G, DG, DB, RL

PRESTINARI, Marc' Antonic, active sixteenth century.

Many Works, p. 39.
(all lost except a Madonna in the Scalone Rosso in the Ambrosiana)

RAPHAEL, 1483-1520.

Adoration of the Magi, p. 20.
(Decio's miniature)
S, DG, DB, RL

Aeneas, p. 13.
(copy after the group in the Fire in the Borgo)
L

Cartoon of the School of Athens, p. 38.
G, DB, FR, RL

Hercules, p. 31.
(copy by Mariano as a St. Matthew)
L

Isiah, p. 13.
(copy after the Fresco in S. Agostino, Rome).
L

Pagan Subject, pp. 30-31.
(copy by Mariano as a Magdalen)
L

Risen Savior. See GIULIO ROMANO
Sybils, pp. 13-14.
(copy after the fresco in S. Maria della Pace)

ROTTENHAMMER, Johann, 1564-1625.
Allegory of Winter (Winter Landscape with Glory of
Angels, part of Sei pezzi di Paesini, with Brueghel),
p. 25.
G, DG, DB, RL

Glory of Paradise (La Cestella, with Brueghel), p. 20.
G, DG, RL

SARTO, Andrea del, 1486-1531.
Salvator Mundi, p. 17.
G, DG, DB, RL

SEBASTIANO DEL PIOMBO (Sebastiano Luciani, called),
1485-1547. See MUZIANO, Gerolamo.

TITIAN, 1488/90-1576.

Adoration of the Magi, pp. 5-9.
G, DG, DB, RL

Deposition into the Sepulchre, p. 9.
G, DG, DB, RL

Ecce Homo (Christ Crowned with Thorns), p. 33.
G, DG, DB, RL

Holy Family, p. 23.
L

Madonna and Child with St. Catherine, and St. John the
Baptist, p. 11
(now attributed to workshop)
S, DG, DB, RL

Madonna and Child with St. Cecilia, and St. John the
Baptist, p. 11.
G, DG, DB, RL
(now attributed to workshop)
G, DG, DB, RL

Monk, p. 21.
(now attributed to workshop)
S, DG

Old Man in Armour, p. 32.
G, DG, RL

Sacred Family with Tobias and the Angel, pp. 10-11.
(now attributed to Bonifacio Veronese; see also Giorgione)
G, DG, RL

Tempest, p. 21.
L, DG, DB

Unknown Subject, p. 10.

VERONESE, Bonifacio, 1487-1553.

Sacred Family with Tobias and the Angel, p. 10-11.
(formerly attributed to Giorgione and Titian)
G, DG, RL

VESPINO (Andrea Bianchi, called), active fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

S, DG

UNKNOWN ARTIST.

Work on Crystal, p. 19.
L

UNKNOWN GERMAN ARTIST.

Unknown Subject, p. 24.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Occasion of the Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Id., after Correggio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Works by Brueghel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Four Elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Brueghel's Mouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Miniatures by Gerolamo Marchesino and by Augusto Decio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Painting of the Paradise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The Monk by Titian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Damages produced by fire and time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Luini's Savior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Head of the Savior by G. Clovio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Order of the book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Painting by Titian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dictum by Zuccaro the painter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Excellence of Michelangelo and Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pliny's example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other paintings by Titian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other work by Titian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Two other paintings by Titian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Two works by Bassano the Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Usefulness of the copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Michelangelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Leonardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Other Garland by Brueghel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Reputations of the copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Michelangelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Leonardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Other Garland by Brueghel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Painting by Titian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Painting by Paolo Belga (Paul Brill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Painting by a German artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Titian's Magdalene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Other work by Paolo Belga (Paul Brill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little work by Brueghel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birds by Rottenhammer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luini's Magdalen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Brueghel's Flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leonardo's Last Supper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pliny, Nat. Hist. XXXIV, viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Leonardo's studies of physiognomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Leonardo's death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raphael's Goddess changed into a Magdalen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Hercules, after Raphael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eight paintings after Gaudenzio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Titian's painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muziano's paintings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muziano's painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work by Fra Sebastino (del Piombo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Basket by Michelangelo (da Caravaggio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Works by other illustrious painters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miniature by Gerolamo Marchesino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Marbles and models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Michelangelo's drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Michelangelo's pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Apollo in the Vatican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Francis I, king of France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Michelangelo's Dusk and Dawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marc'Antonio Prestinari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colossus of St. Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third part of the work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. DEED OF GIFT, 28 APRIL 1618

a. Gli Originali degli Artefici Maggiori che Contengono Historie e Ritratti

Una testa d'un vecchio fatta da Michel Angelo di cui forse egli si servi nelle sue opere in Roma, con cornici dorate, alta otto once, e larga cinque.

Un Ritrarro d'una Duchessa di Milano dal mezzo in su, di mano di Leonardo, alto nove once, e largo mezzo braccio con cornici nere.


Un Salvatore giovinetto con una palla in mano. Si crede, che sia di Andrea del Sarto, alto cinque once, e largo quattro, con cornice intagliata, e toccata d'oro.

L'Adorazione dei Magi di Titiano, nella quale si veggono dodeci figure humane e quattro cavalli in circa, lunga braccia tre e mezzo, et alta due, con cornicioni dorati. Questo quadro fu fatto fare dal cardinale Ferrante per donarlo al Re Francesco. Ultimamente essendo stato di S. Carlo, fu comprato da me Federico Cardinale Borromeo Arcivescovo di Milano dall'Hospitale Maggiore che fu di lui herede.

La Deposizione di Cristo N. S. dalla Croce, con sette figure, fatte dall'istesso Titiano, con cornici dorate, di braccia tre e mezzo in larghezza, e di tre in altezza. Un'altra simile si vede nell'Escuriale.

Una S. Maria Maddalena dal mezzo in su, dell'istesso Titiano, larga un braccio, et un quarto, alta uno, e tre quarti, con cornice dorata.

Una Madonna con S. Catherina, Christo Bambino, e S. Giovanni, con le cornici di noce, alta un braccio e due once, e larga un braccio e mezzo, opera di Titiano.

Una Beata Vergine, con Bambino nudo in grembo, S. Gio. Batta, e S. Cecilia, parimente di Titiano, con cornici nere, e toccate con fogliami, e fili e'oro, lunga un braccio e tre quarti, et alto un braccio e sette once.
Un Ecce Homo di Titiano, alto un braccio, e largo tre quarti, con cornici nere.

Un Ritratto di Titiano, fatto da lui medesimo dal mezzo, in su di larghezza di due palmi, ed altezza di tre, con cornici di noce.

Il Ritratto del padre di Titiano dal mezzo in su vestito da soldato, di mano pure di Titiano, alto e largo un braccio, con cornici di noce.

Un Ritratto che rappresenta un frate fatto da Titiano alto mezzo braccio e largo 4 once con cornici nere profilate d'oro.

Una notte con un paese, fatta da Titiano, alta un braccio et once otto, e larga braccia due, e tre quarti, senza cornici.

Una Madonna con S. Giosefo, il quale tiene N. S. in braccio, e S. Giovanni appreso, e l'Angelo con Tobia, che hà un pesce in mano, con le cornici con profili d'oro, di due braccia e mezzo di larghezza, e due di altezza, et hà di Giorgione Maestro di Titiano.

Una B. Vergine col Bambino, che porge un velo a S. Giosefo, con tre pastori, et alcuni animali, con le cornici dorate, larga braccia due e mezzo, et alta due. Et hà del Bassano Vecchio.

Un quadro di mano del detto Bassano, dove l'Angelo annunta ai Pastori la Natività del Signore con cornici di noce, largo un braccio e mezzo, et alto due.

Un'Adorazione dei Magi, alta braccia tre, larga quattro, di Andrea Schiavone Disciepolo di Titiano.

Una Madonna con S. Anna, N. S. e S. Giovanni piccoli con S. Giosefo di mano di Bernardino Luino, alta due braccia, e larga un'e mezzo, con cornice dorata, quadro principale.

Il Signore con la Maddalena in habito d'Ortolano, con due altre figure del Luino, per ogni lato d'un braccio e mezzo, con cornici dorate.

Una Maddalena dal mezzo in su, con un vaso d'alabastro in mano alta un braccio, e larga tre quarti, con cornici dorate, et hà di mano del detto Luino.
Un Christo, che abbraccia un'Angellino, fatto dal medesimo Luino, alto mezzo braccio, e largo cinque once, con cornici d'ebano.

Un Salvatore in età giovenile in atto di dar la benedizione, di mano del Luino, alto once otto e mezza e largo sett'e mezza con cornice pro filata d'oro.

Una Testa di S. Girolamo con un Crocifisso piccolo, di mano del Luino Vecchio alta cinque once, e larga quattro, con cornice di noce profilata d'oro.

Un Iddio Padre in tavola di legno, di mano del Francia Bolognese, alto mezzo braccio, e largo sette once senza cornice.

Un'Herodiade, che tiene la testa di S. Giovanni Battista, con un'altra donna appresso, di mano del Parmigiano alta mezzo braccio, larga cinque once con cornice profilata d'oro.

Il lavamento dei piedi fatto dal Signore agli Apostoli, con cornice dorata a fogliami, largo braccia due e mezzo et alto uno e mezzo. E si crede che questo quadro sia di mano di Perino del Vago.


Una Madonna, che porge le mammelle al Bambino, la quale è di Marco d'Oggion Discépolo di Leonardo, alta un braccio, con cornice profilata d'oro.

Una Madonna col Bambino in seno, a cui ella porge delle ciriege con cornici dorate, alta un braccio, e larga once nove. Et è di Domenico Boltraffio discepolo di Leonardo.

Teste ventidue, alcune delle quali sono del Mutiano, et alcune del Pellegrino, e d'altri, le quali mostrano d'esser state fatte da loro o per ritratti, o per valersene poi nelle opere, alte mezzo un braccio l'una e larghe meno.
Una testa di S. Gio. Batta in un piatto, di mano d'un Antico Pittore, alta nove once, larga sette, senza cornici.

Un S. Francesco che si guarda le stimate nelle mani, fatto da Federico Zuccari, di altezza di due braccia, e quattro once, e di uno e mezzo di larghezza, senza cornici.

Una Testa della Madonna, con un velo trasparente di mano di Scipione Gaitano, larga tre quarti, et alta un braccio, con le cornici d'ebano.

Un S. Pietro dalla cintura in su, il quale piange per haver negato Christo, di mano del Carracciolo Bolognese, alto due braccia, e largo uno e mezzo, con cornici dorata.


La Disputa di Christo fra Dottori fatta dal Morazzone, larga un braccio, et once cinque, et alta alquanto meno, senza cornice.

Un S. Francesco che sta contemplando un crocefisso e il compagno una morte, fatto dall'Aretino, con le cornici di noce, alto braccia tre, e largo due e mezzo.

Un Christo, che era nell'Horto, con cornici di noce con profili d'oro, largo un braccio e mezzo, alto due. Questo quadro non per la finezza del lavoro, ma perché in esso tenendo gli occhi fissi S. Carlo, rende l'anima a Dio, si è conservato, e si è consegnato con gli altrri.

Una Resurrettione di N. S. con diversi atti dei Giudei, d'Autore Antico, alta un braccio, e larga dieci once, senza cornice.

Una Madonna antica, con alcune sante, fatta con maniera Tedesca, ma non si sa da chi, alta braccia due e mezzo, e lunga un'e mezzo, con le cornici nere di pero.

Una Testa di Christo, et un'altra della Madonna appassionati di mano del Sordo d'altezza di nove once l'una e larghe sei, senza cornici.
c. Gli Originali dei Paesi.

Un Paese, dove vi è un Angelo, che appare ad un Romito, di mano di Paolo Brillo, lungo quattro braccia e mezzo, et alto tre, con cornici con un profilo d'oro.

Un altro Paese dell'istessa grandezza e dell'istesso Autore, con un altro Romito, che con una mano tiene un bastone, e l'altra mano tiene innanzi agli occhi.

Un Paese largo tre braccia e mezzo, et alto due, dove si vede un ponte, et una chiesa in cima d'una montagna con un'huomo et una donna in habito di Pellegrino, et con un Pastore, dipinto a quazzo da Paolo Brillo, con cornice piccola con un profilo d'oro.

Un altro Paese con due Capuccini, et con un Pastore in una strada, fatto da Paolo Brillo, con l'istessa maniera e dell'istessa misura.

Una Prospettiva di Mare di mano di Paolo Brillo, la quale è delle più belle cose, ch'egli habbia fatto, larga braccia due e mezzo et alta un'e mezzo, senza cornici.

Un Paese dove è dipinto S. Gio. Battista in piccola forma, che scherza con un'Agnello, dell'istesso Paolo Brillo, dell'istessa misura con le cornici nere, con un profilo d'oro.

La Conversione di S. Paolo rappresentata in un Paese da Paolo Brillo, alta un braccio e mezzo, e larga due, con cornice d'un profilo d'oro.

Un'altro Paese dell'istessa mano, e grandezza, con varie figure, con gente armata, e con un cane in mezzo.

Un Paese, che contiene Tobia con l'Angelo, e due huomini con un Asinello, largo braccia due, et alto un'e mezzo, opera di Paolo Brillo.

Una Madonna, che riposa nel viaggio d'Egitto, con S. Giosefo, che purge un'uccello al Signore, fatto da Paolo Brillo, in un Paese lungo un braccio e mezzo, et alto uno, e tre once con cornice, con un profilo d'oro.

Un Paese con Romito, dove anche si vede un piccolo Castello sopra un Monte di mano d'un Pittore Fiamengo, largo un braccio, et once due, et alto tre quarti, con
cornice di pero profilata d'oro.

Un altro Paese dell'istesso Fiamengo, con un Montagna in mezzo un Romito da una parte, et un cervo sopra un sasso.

L'elemento del fuoco, dove si vede la fucina di Vulcano, e molti altri artifici, che si fanno col fuoco di lunghezza circa un braccio, e due once, et alto once ottio di Giovanni Brueghel, con cornice d'ebano miniata d'oro.

L'Elemento della terra rappresentato in un Paese, con le figure d'un Leone, d'un Pavone, d'un Toro, d'un Cavallo, e di molti altri animali, con cornice d'ebano toccata d'oro, alto tre quarti in circa, e largo un braccia dell'istesso Brueghel.

L'Elemento dell'Acqua di Gio. Brueghel, alto un braccio, e largo cinque quarti. Et a tergo vi sono i nomi dei pesci e degli altri animali ch'egli con somma diligenza ha ricavato dal naturale, con le cornici d'ebano coi profili d'oro.

Daniele nel lago de'leoni, e d'altri animali, con molta turba che lo rimira, di Gio. Brueghel, alto mezzo braccio, e largo un poco più, con cornici parte d'ebano, e parte di pero toccata d'oro.

Sei pezzi di Paesini dipinti sopra il rame, tutti di mano di Giovanni Brueghel, con cornici dorate, lunghi in tutto braccia due, et alti uno.
   Nel primo pezzo vi è un Eremita, che legge un libro, con alcune ruine antiche.
   Nel secondo è rappresentato l'Inverno con alcuni Angeli e fiori.
   Nel terzo si vede una Cisterna d'acqua, et alcune capanne di Romiti.
   Nel quarto vi è l'incendio delle cinque Città.
   Nel quinto è dipinto un bosco, et un'acqua senza figure humane.
   Nel sesto si vede un Eremita, che siede con le mani giunte, con una lontanza di mare.

Sei altri pezzi di Paesini sopra il rame dell'istessa gradezza e misura.
   Il primo rappresenta l'Inferno con assai diverse figure.
   Nel secondo vi è una figura rappresentante l'abbon- danza, e la varietà delle cose, con quattro fanciulli, che significano gli Elementi.
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Il terzo contiene un'Eremita che fa oratione avanti a una immagine, con una lontananza, et una rupe, e nel fondo alcuni fiori. 
Nel quarto si vede un'Eremita in piedi con un bastone in mano, che legge, e dietro di lui una capanna. 
Il quinto è di una Nave, che rappresenta il Misterio "salva nos perimus" et un gran Mare. 
Nel sesto è dipinto un bosco, con dell'acqua. E questo solo è di mano di Paolo Brillo, essendo gli altri cinque di Giovanni Brueghel.

La Gloria del Paradiso significata con moltissime figure, e con un prato fiorito di sotto, alto cinque once e largo sette e le figure sono di Rahtnamer et il Paese di Gio. Brueghel, con cornici di pero proffilate di oro.

Un'ovato di larghezza meno di quattro dita dov'è un Inverno, con una processione del S. Sacramento, legato in argento di mano del Brughel.

Un altro ovato della medesima grandezza, e della medesima mano, di una Tempesta di mare, con la Sma. Vergine Maria circondata da splendori, ornato parimenti d'argento.

Nostro Signore, che porta la croce con molte altre figure, fatto da Giovanni Brueghel, in un'ovato d'avorio, lungo quattro dita.

Un Crocifisso con molte altre figure dell'istesso Gio. Brueghel in un'ovato di avorio dell'istessa misura.

Una Madonna col fanciullino in braccio in un'ovato, con una corona d'intorno di vari fiori di mano del medesimo Brueghel, di larghezza di quattro once, e cinque e mezzo d'altezza, con cornice e con coperta miniata d'oro.

Un Vaso grande, dove sono dipinti con somma vaghezza fiori di varie sorti, con un gioiello nel fondo, alcuni dannari antichi, et alcune conchiglie marine di mano di Giovanni Brueghel, con cornici dorate, alto un braccio e due once, e largo dieci.

Un' altro Vaso di fiori dell'istessa mano, largo mezzo braccio, et alto nove once, con cornice ornata d'oro.
Un sorcio et una Rosa in un piccolo quadretto di mano del detto Giovanni Brueghel.

Una cesta di frutti di Michel Angelo di Caravaggio, sopra la tela larga un braccio, et alta tre quarti, senza cornice.

La Prospettiva del Tempio d'Anversa fatta da un pittore eccellente Fiamengo, con alcune figure di mano di Giovanni Brueghel, larga once otto e mezza, et alta sei, con cornici parte di pero, et parte d'ebano.

d. Le Copie fatte con Diligenza.

L'Effige di S. Maria Maggiore con cornice di noce profilata d'oro, alta due braccia, e larga un'e mezzo, copiata assai bene da Antonio Fiamengo.

Il Cenacolo di Leonardo, copiato da quello, che si vede nel Monastero delle Gratie da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino; lungo braccia tredici, et alto un braccio e mezzo.

Una Madonna grande di Leonardo copiata da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, sopra una tavola alta braccia tre, et once due, e larga due braccia, senza cornice.

Una Madonna con S. Anna e Christo Bambino, che scherza con l'Agnello, dipinta da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, non copiandola da altro quadro simile dipinto, ma solo imitandola dal Cartone di Leonardo. È senza cornice, et alta braccia due e mezzo e larga due.

Due Teste d'Apostoli, copiate da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, dalle opere di Leonardo, in un sol pezzo alto un braccio e largo un e mezzo, senza cornice.

Una Madonna col Bambino in braccio, al quale S. Giovanni stando in ginocchio porge un ficre, copia del Luino, alta braccia due, e larga un e mezzo, con cornici di noce.

Una Madonna, et una S. Elisbetta, con Christo, e S. Giovanni bambini che abbracciano un agnello, larga braccia tre e tre once, et alta braccia due e mezzo.
cavata da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, da quella che fu dipinta sopra il muro del Luino Vecchio senza cornici.

Una Madonna col figliuolo nudo in braccio, e S. Giosefo, e con un ritratto al naturale, cavati dalle opere del Luino Vecchio a Lugano da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, alta braccia un e once otto, e larga un e mezzo, senza cornice.

Le Tre Marie con un bambino copiate dagli originali del Luino in Lugano da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, alte un braccio, et once nove, larghe un braccio e tre once, senza cornici.

Tre teste che rappresentano tre sacerdoti Giudei, cavati dagli originali del Luino, da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, alte un braccio, larghe uno, e due once, senza cornici.

Tre altre teste cavate dall'opera grande della Passione dipinta dal Luino in Lugano da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, alte un braccio, larghe uno e due once, senza cornici.

Due Apostoli dal mezzo in su, alti poco piú d'un braccio, e poco piú lunghi, dal detto Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, copiati dal Cenacolo del Luino a Lugano.

Due altri Apostoli dal mezzo in su, quasi dell'istessa grandezza copiati dal suddetto Vespino dall'istesso luogo.

Un Crocifisso senza bracci e senza gambe, copiato da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, e l'originale del Luino, alto un braccio et otto once, e largo once nove.

Una testa di S. Catherina, grande un palmo, copia fatta da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino da un'altra del Luino alta sette once, e larga sei.

Un Giovane rappresentato nell'oscuro vestito di pelle, senza cornice, il quale è copia del Parmigiano fatta da Ms. Andrea Bianchi detto il Vespino, alto un braccio e largo tre quarti.
Un S. Benedetto con un gran libro avanti, e che fisso riguarda il Cielo, con una cornice di noce, e con profili di oro, alto due braccia, e largo un' e mezzo. Et è copia del Mutiano cavata diligentemente dall'originale di Fra Sebastino del Piombo.

Una Madonna con le mani in croce in atto di esser incoronata, dal mezzo in su più grande del naturale copiata dal Caracciolo Bolognese, da quella del Correggio, che già si vedeva in Parma in una Tribuna, alta tre braccia, e larga due e mezzo, senza cornici.

Una Madonna vestita alla cingaresca col Bambino che dorme, copiata da quella del Correggio dallo Schedone, che dipinse in Parma, alta nove once, e larga otto, senza cornici.

Una Madona col Bambino, ambidue, che siedono in terra, e S. Giosefo il quale porge un ramo di marene al Bambino, con cornici di noce, alta braccia tre, e larga due, et è copia che viene dal Barocci.

Un'Annontiata di Fiorenza, di mano del Bronzino in due pezzi, d'un braccio l'uno in altezza, e di tre quarti in larghezza, senza cornice.

e. I Ritratti fatti da Pittori men Celebri.


S. Basilio dell'istessa grandezza vestito alla greca in habito Pontificale, tolto dagli originali Greci, e conforme alla descrizione dei Monologi greci senza cornice.

S. Gregorio Nazianzeno vestito pur alla greca in habito Pontificale dell'istessa misura, tolto dagli originali...
Greci e conforme ai Monologi suddetti.

S. Atanasio, cavato dagli originali Greci, della medesima grandezza, e simile alla descrizione dei Monologi.

S. Gregorio Magno in mezzo del Padre e della Madre, largo braccia uno, et once otto, et alto un braccio, e tre once, senza cornici.

S. Tomaso d'Acquino con un libro in mano, tolto dalla vera effigie antica, che si vede nel Regno di Napoli, alto un braccio, et un quarto, senza cornice.

S. Benedetto in età giovanile. Copia dell'antico in Roma, alto braccia due e mezzo, largo uno e dieci once, senza cornici.

S. Benedetto in età matura sentato con innanzi Desiderio Abbate copiato dall'antico in Roma, alto braccia due e tre once, e largo uno, et otto once, senza cornici.

Il Ritratto di S. Francesco in piedi di statura quasi naturale, cavato da quello che si stima che forse la più vera effigie del Santo.

Gelasio Secondo e Bernardo Abbate. Copia dell'antiche figure di Roma, alta braccia due e due once, larga un braccio, et once otto, senza cornici.

Il Ritratto di S. Ubaldo, alto un poco più di un palmo, con cornici nere.

Ottone Secondo Imperatore tirato da due Cavalli, preso dall'antico in Roma, alto due braccia, e once due, e largo un braccio, e once otto, senza cornici.

Anrichis Benventano Principe dei Longobardi, alto braccio uno, e nove once, e largo uno e tre once, senza cornice, tolto dall'antico.

Il Ritratto di S. Leopoldo Marchese d'Austria, alto braccio uno, et once nove, e largo uno e quattro once, senza cornici.

Il B. Amadeo Duca di Savoia, alto un braccio, e dieci once, largo un'e mezzo, senza cornici.

Il Ritratto di S. Carlo, con cornici dorate, alto un braccio, e si ha per la miglior Testa che di lui sia stata fatta in pittura.
Il Ritratto di tutta la persona di S. Carlo di mano di Giuliano, alto braccia tre e mezzo, largo uno, e due once, senza cornice.

S. Giustina Vitaliana Vergine e Martire, copiata dall'antico, alta braccia due, larga uno, con cornice che ha un profilo d'oro.

S. Agnese copiata dai Mosaici di Roma, alta braccia due, e larga un'è mezzo senza cornici.

S. Costanzia copiata dai detti Mosaici di Roma dell'istessa grandezza.

S. Scolastica copiata dall'antica di Roma, alta braccia due e cinque once, e larga un braccio, et once otto, senza cornici.

Il Ritratto della B. Catherina Ricca, largo un braccio e mezzo et alto due, senza cornice.

Il Ritratto della B. Maddalena Pacci (Pazzi) Fiorentina, con le cornici di noce, alto un braccio e tre once, e largo un braccio.

Il Ritratto di Suor Catherina Monaca convertita, alto due palmi, largo due e mezzo, senza cornice, di mano del Vanni Sanese.

Il Ritratto di Pio Quarto, che sta sedendo, alto braccia due e quattro once, e largo un braccio e dieci once, senza cornici.

Il Ritratto di Papa Sisto Quinto in sedia, con cornici di noce, alto braccia tre e largo due.

Il Ritratto del conte Vitaliano Borromeo Vecchio, alto braccia due, et once quattro, e largo uno, et once dieci, senza cornici.

Il Ritratto del Conte Giovanni Borromeo Vecchio dell'istessa misura.

Il Ritratto del Conte Federico Borromeo Vecchio, fratello di S. Carlo dell'istessa grandezza.

Il Ritratto della Signora Anna Borromeo Colonna, sorella di S. Carlo, alto braccia due e once quattro, e largo uno e once dieci.
Il Ritratto di Claudio da Correggio di buona mano, alto due once, con cornici che hanno inserite alcune pietre.


Ritratti di diversi al numero di novant'otto, di larghezza di un braccio l'uno, e di altezza di un braccio, et once tre, quali sono posti nel circuito della Libreria (M) e nella Sala (K).

f. Le Opere di Miniatura.

Una Madonna col figliuolo, e con S. Catherina di miniatura di Agosto Desio Milanese, alta quattro once, e larga tre con cornici d'ebano.

Un'Adoratione dei Magi di cui il designo è di Raffaello, e la pittura di Agosto Desio Milanese, alta sette once, e larga cinque, con cornice di pero ornata d'oro.

Una Madonna col Bambino in braccio, con S. Giosefo, che lavora di Girolamo Marchesini Miniatore, essendo del Correggio l'inventione, con cornice d'ebano, guernita d'oro, alta cinque once, e larga quattro.

Una Madonna la quale mostra di voler mettere in dosso una veste a Christo N. S.re con S. Giovanni Battista appresso in ginocchio, di mano di Girolamo Marchesini Miniatore, larga quattro once, et alta cinque e mezzo, con la cornice d'ebano proffilata d'argento.

Una Testa della Madonna grande in proffilo di mano di Girolamo Marchesini Miniatore, alta sette once, e larga cinque con cornici d'ebano proffilate d'argento, copia di Raffaello.

Una Madonna col Signor nudo in braccio, il quale accenna con una mano la Madre. Miniatura di Girolamo Marchesini, si come l'inventione è del Luino Vecchio, con le cornici d'ebano, alta poco meno di mezzo braccio, e larga cinque once.
Un'Annuntiata dove si vede la Madonna che sta sedendo e l'Angelo che da lei si parte con un vaso di dori di mano di Girolamo Marchesini Miniaturista, di larghezza di sette once, et di altezza cinque, con le cornici di ebano proffilate d'argento.

Una Testa di Maria Vergine miniata dal detto Girolamo Marchesini in un avato di larghezza meno di quattro dita legato in argento.

Una Testa d'un Salvatore piccola, la quale viene da Giulio Clovio, miniata da Girolamo Marchesini Miniaturista.

g. I Disegni.

Diversi Disegni, i quali sono inserti in un libro di carta imperiale, che è nella Liberia Ambrosiana.

Sei pezzi di disegni fatti dal Pellegrino sopra la carta con acquarella, alti braccia tre e larghi uno per ogni pezzo.

Due Angeli nudi disegnati da Bernardino Lanino sopra la carta nera, larghi, un braccio e quattro once, ed alti due et once due l'uno.

Un disegno d'una battaglia di chiaro e scuro, di Giulio Romano lungo braccia quattro.

Un disegno d'un combattimento d'animali, fatto a penna di mano d'Antonio Tempesta, alto sette once, e largo dieci con cornice di pero proffilata d'oro.

Un disegno che contiene il vecchio Tobia, et il giovane con un'Angelo, et altre figure fatte dal Luino Vecchio a chiaro e scuro, largo nove once, et alto otto, con cornici di noce proffilate d'oro.

Un disegno fatto di lapis rosso dove si vede un S. Sebastiano, un S. Rocco, et una Santa Catherina, largo due palmi, et alto tre.
C. THE DE BROSSES ACCOUNT OF 1739


Tableaux de la Galerie Ambrosiane

Une Tête de vieux, de Michel-Ange Buonarotti.
Une Decollation de saint Jean, d'Albert Dürer, très belle.
Un Christ, du Corrège.
Une Sainte-Vierge, du Vieux Palme.
Six Paysages, du Brueghel, d'une grandissime beauté.
Plusieurs grands paysages, de Paul Bril.
Une Madeleine, de Luini, sur les dessins de Léonard de Vinci.
Un Chanoine, par André del Sarto, admirable portrait.
Une Sainte Famille, du Vieux Palme et une autre de Luini.
Un Saint Jérôme, du Titien.

Une Tête ronde, du Guide.

Quatre tableaux des Quatre éléments, du Brueghel, d'une beauté et d'un travail achevé; ce sont les plus beaux morceaux de la galerie.

Jacques de Médicis, par le Titien.

Le portrait du Titien par Lui-même.

Une Adoration, par le Titien.

Un Christ mis au tombeau, par le même.

Une Madeleine, par le même.

Une Mater Dolorosa, du Corrège.

Un Ecce Homo, du Titien.

Une Nativité, du Bassan.

Six paysages du Breughel, tout à fait charmants.

Une tête, du Titien.

Un beau dessin de clair-obscur, par Tempeste.

Une Hérodiade, du Parmesan.

Un Saint Jean, de Luini.

Une Sainte Cécile avec Jésus-Christ, du Titien.

Deux Capucins, au pastel, par le Guide.

Trois dessins d'Albert Dürer, de Paul Véronèse et de Jules Romain.

Une Adoration, par André Mantegna, très singulier et très curieux.

L'Enfant prodigue, de Cairo.

Un Pot de fleurs, par le Breughel, admirable et sans prix.
Deux portraits, de Luini.

Un Portement de croix, de Lucas.

Une Vierge et son fils, du même.

Une Translation du corps de Jésus-Christ, par Baroni, parfaitement beau.

Un Concert, du Giorgione, beau.

Un Jeune homme, d'André del Sarto.

Daniel dans la Fosse aux lions, du Breughel, médiocre.

Un Ermite et une paysanne, du Guide.

Une Estampe d'un pape, tableaux tres beau, d'Alexandre Ricci.

Un Mariage de sainte Catherine, du Guide.

La Cathédrale d'Anvers, du Breughel, fort bon.

Une Adoration, sur les dessins de Raphaël.

Un Mariage de sainte Catherine, du Titien.

Un Panier de fruits, par Michel-Ange des fleurs, très bon.

Saint Benoît, de Sébastien del Piombo, copié à ce que je crois.

Portrait de la duchesse de Milan, Léonard de Vinci.

Le portrait de Pascalino, par le Péruin, de sa dernière manière.

Un autre portrait, par la comtesse Borromée.

Deux têtes, un Saint Jean et un Enée, sur les dessins de Raphael.

Un vase d'argent avec six tableaux, tres petits, ouvragés, d'un travail inconcevable, par le Breughel.

Saint Eustache, par Albert Dürer, curieux.
Le Serpent d'airain, dessin de Michel-Ange.
Un Docteur, par Léonard de Vinci.
Un Sauveur, du Vieux Palme.
Une belle Vierge, du Gaétan Scipion.
Saint Charles, très ressemblant, par le Figin.
Une Nuit, du Titien.
Le Triomphe de David, excellent dessin de clairobscur,
par Lucas de Hollande.
Une Transfiguration, par Lomazzo, assez bon.

Remarquer le fameux dessin de l'Ecole d'Athènes, de
la main de Raphaël, les Lévites, de Léonard de Vinci, le
recueil de ses dessins, autres recueils de dessins des
meilleurs maîtres.
D. FRENCH REQUISITION OF 1796

The document which lists the material requisitioned by the French on March 9, and June 10 to 25, 1796, is known in a copy signed by G. Bugati, acting librarian of the Ambrosiana. It entered the Ambrosian Library as a gift of Cav. Francesco Gnocchi in 1904. The items marked 'R' are those which were returned in 1815.

a. Pitture Originali


Un S. Giov. Battista coll'Agnello, dipinto in legno dal suddetto 5 x 5 1/2 R.

Una S. Maria Maddalena col vaso dell'unguento, dipinta in legno da Bernardino Luino. 12 x 8 1/2 R.


I quattro famosissimi elementi dipinti su metallo rosso, ed uno in legno dal suddetto Brughel, cadauno di 13 1/2 x 9. R. Acqua e Fuoco.

Daniele nel lago dei Leoni con moltissime figure in metallo rosso, suddetto Bruguel. 7 1/2 x 5 1/2. R.

Un concerto di musica con varie figure, dipinto in tela dal Giorgione. 35 x 30 1/2.

Una B. Vergine con varie figure, dipinta in legno di Luca d'Olanda. 16 1/2 x 12 1/2. R.
Un figliuolo prodigo in atto di congedarsi dal padre, dipinto in legno dal cav. Del Cairo. 12 x 8 1/2.

b. Disegni Originali.


Un quadretto con disegni di Raffaele d'Urbino e di Andrea del Sarto.

Un Christo di Semino Genovese.

Un S. Gerolamo di Giulio Romano.


Una testa con barba, di Leonardo da Vinci, che credesi il proprio ritratto grande al naturale. R.

Un disegno della scuola di Michel Angiolo.

Una B. Vergine col Bambino, S. Batta e due Santi.

Un disegno di cinque figure.

N. 8 disegni di Pellegrino Tibaldi, B. 3, p. Br. I cad. circa. R.

c. Manoscritti.

Un volume coperto di pelle di 13 per 9 1/2 di fogli 398 che contiene vari disegni e figure Meccanica, Idraulica, Idrostatica, Geometria, Architettura Civile e Militare, di Tattica e di diverse Macchine, ed Arme da guerra,
di taglio e di fuoco ecc. di Leonardo Vinci con varie annotazioni scritte a mano mancia dallo stesso, raccolti da Pompeo Leone, e donati dal Cittadino milanese Galeazzo Arconati alla Biblioteca Ambrosiana, come da inscrizione in marmo. R.

Altri 12 volumi Leonardo tra grandi e piccoli del medesimo, dei quali uno in foglio coperto di pelle, che tratta della luce delle ombre, gli altri contengono varie figure geometriche e diversi pensieri dell'Autore.


Le opere di Vergilio coi commenti di Servio scritte in pergamena in foglio grande, che fu ad uso di F. Petrarca e da lui sparso da varie annotazioni sopra Virgilio, e di varie altre memorie spettanti a se stesso ed a Madonna Laura tra cui quella che comunica Laura etc. Nel frontispizio vi sono delle figure di Simon da Siena in miniatura coll'effige di Virgilio etc. col distico sotto:

Mantua Virgilium, qui talia carmine finxit.
Senna tuit Simnonem digito qui talia pinxit. R.

Una cronaca dei Papi scritta da Martino Polono dell'Ord. di S. Domenico in pergamena in foglio dove trovasi...
inserita la favola della Papessa Giovanna tra Leone IV e Benedetto III. R.

La Divina Commedia di Dante con lettere iniziali dorate in pergamena del sec. XV. R.

Galileo Galilei - Del Flusso e Riflusso del Mare, piccolo volume in carta. R.

Suddetto - Trattato delle fortificazioni, piccolo vol. in carta. R.

d. Libri di edizione milanesi del secolo XV.

1471. Pomponii Mela - Cosmografia.
1473. Aeneae Silvii Epistolae.
1474. S. Ambrosii de Offciis, et Opuscula cum ejusd; vita.
1475. Missale Ambrosianum.
1475. Arnoldi de Villanova Libellus de arte cognoscendi venena.
1476. Fab. Quintiliani, De Institutione. Orat.
1480. Statuta Mediolani.
1490. Breviarium Ambros. in membrana impressum.
1493. Isocratis Opera Graece in membrana impressa.

Sin. an. Panegyrici veteres XII in membrana impress. con altre opere incerte.

C. Julii Solini - De mirabilibus Mundi.

Hesiodi Ascreaei Giorgi.

e. Antichita.

Un vaso Etrusco che si giudica di circa XX secoli, stimato 200 Armette con varie figure ed ornamenti bellissimi alto circa 0.18.

Un pezzo di cristallo di rocca in natura lungo poll. 18.

Altro con entro fili d'erba ed altri accidenti cristallizzanti di pollici 9 di lunghezza.

Una tavoletta di marmo di Fiorenza di lungh, pollici 22, larga pollici 10 con macchie rappresentanti naturalmente un prospetto di paese con Torrazzo nel mezzo.

Un cannoncino di bronzo di lunghessa Br. 1 1/2 circa ben travagliato, mandato al Lazzaretto fuori di P. O. nel tempo della requisizione militare di tutte le armi da guerra.

Una bomba di grossezza straordinaria, mandata come sopra.

Dall'Ambrosiana li 7 di nevoso anno VI. A. Bugati prefetto.
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