IAN VERSTEGEN

Barocci's Immacolata within 'Franciscan' Umbria

Abstract

This article addresses the iconography of Federico Barocci's Immaculate Conception by investigating local customs. Seeing Urbino and greater Umbria as a region of semiofficial Franciscan belief makes it is possible to understand how Barocci was able to reflect in a precocious way on this venerable subject. Because the belief in Mary's immaculacy was taken for granted, it was possible for an audience to work with a more abbreviated iconography, which became a model for seventeenth century art. The model of sectarian belief is useful for understanding the universality of counterreformation belief and its enforcement in post-Tridentine Italy.

Fig. 1: Federico Barocci, *Immaculate Conception*, c. 1577, Oil on canvas, Galleria Nazionale delle Marche, Urbino

1. Introduction

<1>

Rome and province, center-periphery, Catholic rite and local custom, have been at the center of definitions of Catholic reform.[1] After exchanging the monolithic "counter-reformation" for a more flexible concept of Catholic reform, historians have sought to define how and when canonical teachings and edicts of the pope were actually observed in Italy. One way to discern regularity without demanding the full uniformity of a classic counter-reformation definition of Catholicism is to study the sectarian beliefs that were allowed to be practiced *within those same sects*. For example, the powerful Franciscans held to aggressive beliefs about Mary that were contrary to accepted church doctrine yet were allowed to use their own breviary, even after Pius V's reform of the liturgy.

<2>

This article examines such a case of regional belief that was allowed to seep even into the metropolitan structure of a city – Urbino – where the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was celebrated in the conventual church of San Francesco via Federico Barocci's precocious painting (Fig. 1; c. 1575, Galleria Nazionale delle Marche).[2] Because Urbino – really a part of Umbria in common usage – were in some sense 'Franciscan,' due to the proximity to original preaching of Francis himself, not to mention waves of Observant and Capuchin belief, Franciscanism was the 'state' religion.[3] Dogmas were celebrated and new iconographies were created that anticipated in many ways seventeenth century beliefs and practices, once the Immaculate Conception was more openly accepted, yet still not dogma.[4]

<3>

After discussing this phenomenon, I move on to a discussion of Barocci's painting and the way in which immersion in immaculist doctrines may have aided the simplification of its iconography. More particularly, the iconographical innovation was the use of the apocalyptic woman as the immaculate Virgin. After examining issues surrounding the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in the mid to late sixteenth century, and taking issue with the standard chronologies for the introduction of these iconographies, I move on to discuss the surprising extant of Barocci's influence, particularly among artists like Rubens and Reni. Barocci's importance in establishing this "Baroque" type is emphasized.

2. Franciscan Concessions, Dogma and Iconography

<4>

Barocci created a Franciscan image in a deeply Franciscan context, and this is more true than we might think: Pius had granted the celebration of the feast of the Immaculate Conception orally to the Franciscans in 1569.[5] All his efforts were to clarify a standard position for the canonical church, for instance, the Roman breviary. But he had nothing to say about the breviary of the Franciscans or their practices and beliefs. Thus he knew that the Immaculate Conception was the subject of Franciscan belief and of course Franciscan art. There is nothing contrary to Trent, therefore, in the depiction of such a subject in a Franciscan church. Throughout the seventeenth century the Roman church (Pope, bishops, canons) could not openly indulge the immaculate, which later explains Paul V's evasion of its outward naming in heavily immaculist contexts in the Pauline Chapel in Santa Maria Maggiore and Annunciation chapel in the Quirinal Palace.[6] However, there were even contexts in which territories beholden to the Virgin, like Umbria, felt themselves exempt. This explains the great number of Immaculate Conceptions throughout the region.[7] It also explains the presence of pictures of Immaculate Conceptions in cathedrals – naturally under the nominal control of the local bishops and archbishops – such as Virgilio Nucci's in Gubbio Cathedral, in a city that openly called the Immaculate Virgin its copatron.[8]

<5>

The phenomenon of concession can be illustrated in the pastoral decisions of Pius V, formerly a Dominican friar. As a Dominican, Pius was predisposed against the immaculist claims of the Franciscans and many of his efforts were a part of a larger attempt to stay Franciscan theological interests. Pius suppressed both the Feast of the Name of Mary and of the Presentation of Mary. The former was instituted in 1513 by the Franciscan Julius II and the latter by the Franciscan Sixtus IV. The Franciscan-friendly pope Gregory XIII and the Franciscan pope, Sixtus V, reinstated each, respectively.[9]

<6>

Nevertheless, Pius handled sectarian claims with balance and caution. On 1 October 1567, he condemned Baius' proposition (#73) that "no one but Christ was without original sin, and that therefore the Blessed Virgin had died because of the sin contracted in Adam, and had endured afflictions in this life, like the rest of the just, as punishment of actual and original sin."[10] But he also issued a constitution in which he forbade – as did Sixtus IV before him – all public

discussion of the subject.[11] Sixtus IV and Pius V, then, were inverted figures, each holding opposite theological positions yet denying debate for the greater good of the church. Sixtus, however, was putting forward a bold theological move, whereas Pius almost a century later was resisting what had become an increasingly popular devotion.

<7>

Pius skillfully patronized Franciscan shrines that could fall into the abuse of supporting the Immaculate Conception. He instigated work not only at the Holy House of Loreto but also the Porziuncola shrine outside of Assisi, in the building of Santa Maria degli Angeli.[12] The former, devoted to the Virgin, had long been in Franciscan hands and the latter was a true Franciscan shrine. By putting his stamp on the monuments, he gave approval of the canonical teaching of Franciscanism without yielding to its more extreme doctrines (i.e., the Immaculate Conception). His subtle resistance to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception lay in his reform of the Breviary, Missal and other texts surrounding Mary. Most importantly, on 5 July 1568 with the bull *Quod a nobis* he introduced the new Roman breviary (*Breviarium Pianum*) in which he reformed the office of the Conception of the Virgin.[13] He substituted instead the sanitized *Officium B. Virginis* without the immaculist claims of the former Offices. Thus without overturning Trent and the Marian conundrum it had created, Pius succeeded in distracting attention away from the immaculacy debate.

<8>

Characteristically, when in 1576 new handbooks were printed in Loreto with praises drawn directly from the New Testament, one, written by Bernardino Cirillo, maintained the old litany of call and response.[14] The archdeacon of Loreto, Giulio Candiotti of Senigallia, was even so bold as to send the old litany with music by Costanzo Porta, choir master at Loreto, to Gregory XIII recommending that it be played in St. Peter's itself.[15] The response is especially interesting, because it acknowledges the reforms of Pius V and at the same time indicates the latitude created by privileges. The matter was referred to a theologian who wrote that, "the litany might be sung at Loreto as a devotion proper to that shrine, and if others wanted to adopt it they might do so by way of private devotion."[16] This effectively allowed the celebration of the old Litanies of the Virgin even amidst Pius V's and Gregory XIII's hesitations. The question of the Litany of Loreto was raised again by the Franciscan Pope, Sixtus V, and officially accepted by Clement VIII in 1601.

<9>

What is so interesting about this exchange is that the date, 1575-6, coincides with Barocci's painting of his image. Also, interesting is the biographical fact that Barocci's patron at this time – much more so than the occasional commissions of Duke Guidobaldo II della Rovere – was the Duke's brother, Cardinal Giulio Feltrio della Rovere, who was also Cardinal-Protector of Loreto.[17] In fact, it was Giulio, Cardinal Protector also of the Franciscans who negotiated carefully with the Pope to maintain the proper Marian focus of Loreto against the aims of the reforming pontiff. It was he who directed his archdeacon Cirillo to sustain the old litanies. And it was he, even, who commanded the new litany be set to music by his choirmaster at the Basilica of Loreto, the Franciscan friar Costanzo Porta, and printed in Venice in 1575. The time of the controversy over the validity of these litanies was precisely when the issue of tradition versus doctrine was decided. The Gregorian church finally allowed the full implications of Trent's decision on Mary's exemption from mortal and venial sin to surface, but it was already clear in 'Franciscan' Umbria.

<10>

What Barocci did in this situation is choose a guise of the Virgin, the apocalyptic woman, which had immaculist associations, and present her with absolutely no supporting clues. The verbal litanies of the Virgin on the lips of believers in this venerable Franciscan church were brought to the image rather than the other way around. Thus ritual-based visuality is required to properly understand the image.[18] Subjects of the duchy of Urbino could have been the most precocious to regard the Apocalyptic Woman, formerly used for the Assumption, as sufficient to evoke the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, now its theological equivalent by implication. However, the idea of a rethinking of the symbols of the Immaculate Conception, even if they could not be directly employed anyway, fits well with Barocci's searching after a proper form for his novel image. It also explains the appearance of an unadorned Immaculate Conception in other contexts, for example Girolamo Muziano's work for the Shod Carmelites of Santa Maria in Transpontina in the 1580s (Fig. 2).[19]

Fig. 2: Girolamo Muziano, *Immaculate Conception*, 1580s
Oil on canvas, Istituto Madonna del Carmine, Sassone

3. A New Iconography

<11>

I noted that the remarkable precocity of Barocci's *Immaculate Conception* may be attributed to its creation for a Company of the Conception in the Conventual Franciscan church of Urbino, San Francesco, in the heart of Franciscan country in Umbria-Marche.[20] Urbino and its environs had seen both the birth of Franciscanism in the 13th century, the Franciscan Observancy in the 15th century, and the Capuchin movement in the 16th.[21] Since the adoption of a della Rovere into the ducal line of Urbino, Franciscanism was officially sanctioned as the della Rovere dukes of Urbino carried on the doctrinal policies of their ancestor-Popes Sixtus IV and Julius II.[22] Barocci produced works for Conventual, Observant, and Capuchin Franciscans.[23] Their commitment to the Virgin and her Immaculacy were taken for granted by the Urbinate church and by Barocci and this may have allowed him to meditate on the *Immacolata* in a particularly

advanced way, much as Carlo Crivelli had nearly a century earlier with his *Immaculate Conception* for the Franciscan church of San Francesco, Pergola, near Urbino.[24]

<12>

Barocci's work began life as a traditional *Misericordia* image, as early drawings attests.[25] The artist began with a traditional image of the company members sheltered under the Virgin's mantel, which Stuart Lingo has noted for its *retardataire* quality.[26] Barocci soon moved on to a simpler solution. The members are still present but separated from the Virgin, who is surrounded by seraphim and standing on a crescent moon. Lingo's analysis shows the way in which Barocci was able to import the gravity of earlier iconic images of the Virgin into this devotional image. But it is also possible to see such archaism in a provincial way. Provincial painting in Tuscany, Umbria and the Romagna during Barocci's lifetime typically includes donor figures, family crests and inscriptions on altarpieces. Barocci included donor figures in his *Martyrdom of St. Sebastian* (1557, Urbino, duomo), the *Madonna of St. Simon* (1566, Urbino, Galleria Nazionale delle Marche) and the company figured at the bottom of the *Immaculate Conception* can be considered a concession to this taste. It is useful to recall that never, after the *St. Simon*, does Barocci directly include donor figures.

<13>

When we examine Barocci's work, we see the Virgin without attributes and surrounded by seraphim on a blank background, just as in later Baroque versions. The two differ in the fact that Barocci's Mary does not clasp her hands in prayer (and is thus not technically a representation of Mary "tota pulchra") and look heavenward, but rather looks down in a more encompassing gesture of recognition, appropriate to the original *misericordia* intention.[27] Alessandro Zuccari has tentatively related Barocci's pose to the orant, although it may more simply be a compromise to the lack of sheltering mantel.[28] But there was much variety in the hand gesture of Mary in Italian Immaculate Conceptions, including hands across the breast, out as in Barocci's work, and even carrying the Christ child. The conformity among Spanish examples is really striking and the variety of Italian examples equally so.

<14>

At this moment Barocci was also working for the Compagnia della Misericordia in Arezzo for his famous *Madonna del Popolo* (1579, Uffizi, Florence). For that work too, he struggled with

the limitations of the theme, arriving at an opposite solution of breaking away from an antiquated iconography instead of going toward it. Perhaps in the case of the *Immaculate Conception* this was appropriate because the image was smaller and more meditational and Barocci wanted to partake of the similar fact that the Madonna Misericordia, like the Immacolata, is a boon against plague.[29] Urbino, not far from the coast, was not too distant to areas that had been affected by the great plague outbreak of 1576 and perhaps this made the Misericordia even more appropriate.

<15>

Is this an Immaculate Conception? Later artists certainly understood it as such, for example, its engravers. The work was engraved more than once, first by Philippe Thomassin in 1591 (Fig. 3) and then Raffaelle Schiaminossi in 1613 (Fig. 4).[30] Thomassin added symbols of litanies and a crown, indicating that he at least understood the image as an Immaculate Conception. Since as we noted Barocci repainted the work, probably in the early seventeenth century, it is certain that *he* would have begun to understand it that way (even if he hadn't before). Giovanni Battista Mercati (1591–1645), who copied the main figure for his *Immaculate Conception* in the Museo Civico of Borgo Sansepolcro, also certainly understood the picture in this way.[31]

Fig. 3: Philippe Thomassin, *Immaculate Conception*, 1590

Fig. 4: Raffaello Schiaminossi, *Immaculate Conception*, 1613

3.1 The Apocalyptic Woman as *Immacolata*

<16>

It is my argument that unique conditions in and around Urbino, and especially the ubiquity of Franciscan thought, allowed Barocci to mediate on the mystery of Mary's immaculacy in an unusual way. More particularly, he allowed the apocalyptic woman to stand for the doctrine of immaculacy alone. Walter Friedländer introduced a classic comparison when he showed Giorgio Vasari's Mannerist *Immaculate Conception* (1541, Florence, Santissimi Apostoli) in comparison with Ludovico Carracci's Baroque *Madonna degli Scalzi (The Virgin appearing to Sts. Jerome and Francis* (Bologna, Pinacoteca).[32] Here, while both artists' Virgin's stand on crescent moons in conformity with John's apocalyptic vision in *Revelations*, Vasari's Mannerist vision of the mystery is expressed in complex allegory (with Adam and Eve, representing Original Sin, underfoot), whereas the proto-Baroque Ludovico reduces the image to essentials. The process of the simplification and focusing of the Immaculata culminates in Guido Reni's *Immaculate Conception* in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Fig. 5). The Reni 'Baroque' type is simple, unadorned and direct, no longer needing to win over with its elliptical argumentation.

Fig. 5: Guido Reni, *Immaculate Conception*, 1627, oil on canvas,
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

<17>

When artists like Ludovico Carracci and Guido Reni shed these litanies, they were making the apocalyptic woman stand alone for the doctrine. Because not long beforehand not even the apocalyptic woman was standardized, symbols or snippets of the Song of Songs and other literary fonts serving to justifying Mary's immaculacy, along with disputing saints, were used to guide the viewer to the proper identification of the iconography.[33] The most popular litanies are from the Song of Songs: the lily (*sicut lillium inter spinas*, 2:2), Tower of David (*turris David*, 4:4), Meadow of flowers (*Flos campi*, 2:1), Well of living waters (*putues aquarum viventium*, 4:15), Enclosed garden (*hortus conclusus*, 4: 12), Fountain of the Garden (*Fons hortorum*, 4: 15), the Sun (*electa ut sol*, 6:9), and the Moon (*pulchra et luna*, 6:9). Others are the unblemished Mirror (*speculum sine macula*, Wisdon, 7, 26), Rose Garden in Jericho (*rosa in Jericho*, Ecclesiastes, 24:18), Sealed Fountain (*fons signatus*, ibid.), Temple of God (*templum Dei*, Psalms, 64:5), City of God (*civitas dei*, Psalms, 86:3), *porta clausa* (Ezechial, 44, 1).[34] Saints could appear at the bottom or baldly floating banderoles or stacked symbols of each of the litanies aided the viewer to identify the iconography. There were numerous sources to draw from, but the most famous were the Offices of Leonardo Nogarola and Bernardo de' Busti,

both written at the behest of Sixtus IV. He recognized the feast of the Immaculate Conception in 1476 and issued a bull, *Cum praecelsa*, also in 1476, which promised indulgences to those who recite the office.[35] Later, the Litany of Loreto – the text sung on Saturdays at the Holy House in Loreto – became the definitive source.

<18>

In contrast to the usual loose identification of paintings as an Immaculate Conception, Stratton's rigorous treatment in *The Immaculate Conception in Spanish Art* is refreshingly quite stringent. She shows how even a mid-to-late sixteenth century work with an altar dedicated to the Immaculate Conception and an apocalyptic woman (on a crescent moon, etc.) need not suggest the doctrine. The carved *retablo* by Pedro Arbulo de Marguvete for an altar of the Immaculate Conception of the parish church of Briones (1568), for example, features a sculpted Virgin on a crescent moon. Stratton argues that this central figure represents the Virgin's assumption, while the doctrine of the altar dedication is carried by relief sculpture of the Meeting at the Golden Gate.[36] For decades the litanies (or, as in Vasari's case, allegories) were necessary to accompany the apocalyptic woman, to serve to reshape the image from an Assumption to a new meaning.

<19>

Catholicism was primed for new immaculacy imagery because it virtually allowed its acceptance at Trent. While denying Mary's exemption from Original Sin, Trent allowed that Mary had committed no venial or mortal sin.[37] The authority of the traditions of the church, in holding that her body assumed uncorrupted, could be used as indirect evidence of her immaculacy.[38] According to Stratton, the modern iconography was reached when floating symbols of litanies were placed in the landscape naturalistically and finally disappeared. In Italy, on the other hand, the Disputation or Allegory of the Immaculate Conception was the most popular way of showing the Immaculate Conception through most of the sixteenth century.[39] While Italian artists also began placing symbols of litanies in the landscape, the Allegory with saintly figures never really died out (Fig. 6).[40] Even Barocci produced one image of this sort, his lost Immaculate Conception for the Capuchin church of Macerata (1608).[41] This late work, which was destroyed by Napoleon's troops when the church was burned, featured a kneeling Mary surrounded below by four saints.

<20>

The emphasis placed on the preexistence of Mary in God's mind in these images suggests that it really was a distinct iconography and explains why artists like Fra Valeriano (Chapel of the Madonna della Strada, Gesù, Rome), Francesco Vanni (Pinacoteca, Siena), Guido Reni (Annunciation chapel, Quirinal Palace; St. Petersburg, Hermitage), Pietro da Cortona (Chiesa Nuova, Perugia) and Guercino (Pinacoteca, Ancona) continued to produce them well into the seventeenth century.[42] Perhaps the act of conception of Mary made these more narrative while the apocalyptic woman was more iconic. In the same vein, it is worth pointing out that even mature Baroque examples of the Immaculate Conception do not dispense with symbols of litanies, as examples by Diego Velázquez (National Gallery, London) and Jusepe Ribera (Prado, Madrid) demonstrate.

Fig. 6: Cesare Nebbia, *Immaculate Conception*, 1580s,
oil on canvas, San Francesco, Orvieto (photo: Chris Poprocki)

<21>

In either case, it is useful to see that the standing or disputing saint (Italy) or symbol (Spain) was presented in an unrealistic way. Vasari's solution, then, at least has the advantage of presenting the bald texts in a non-simplistic way. His solution of allegory went toward mannerist

complexity and not spatial realism, but was nevertheless a step forward toward a similar goal. Stratton has noted the placement of Virgin's litanies in a landscape in the Grimani Breviary, and argued that one of the first times it occurs in painting is in El Greco's *Vision of Saint John on Patmos* (Toledo, Museo de Sancta Cruz) from the 1580s.[43] Later works of Cristóbal Gómez (*Virgin of the Immaculate Conception*, 1595, Church of El Salvador, Seville) and Juan Pantoja de la Cruz (*Virgin of the Immaculate Conception with a Donor*, 1602, Museo Nacional de Escultura, Valladolid) also place the litanies in a landscape, and the iconography was spread by Martin de Vos' print of the *Virgo Parens Dilecta*.[44]

<22>

According to Stratton, Spanish artists were the first to depict the Virgin on a crescent moon without allegories or litanies. Pablo de Céspides (*Virgin of the Immaculate Conception*, Seville, private collection) and Hieronomous Wierix (*Pulchra et luna*), in an engraving, had shown the apocalyptic woman without them. She also implies that Diego Velázquez arrived at the mature Baroque formula before Reni already in his *Virgin of the Immaculate Conception* (London, National Gallery) for the Shod Carmelites of Seville in 1619.[45] But we now must come to terms with an overwhelming number of earlier Italian examples, even from provincial centers. In approximately chronological order, early allegorical example in Italy are seen in Cesare Nebbia, *Immaculate Conception* (Fig. 6, 1584, Orvieto, San Francesco); Ascensidonio Spacca's *Immaculate Conception with St. Francis, St. Anthony and the Donor, Clemente Bontadosi* (1584–6, Montefalco, Museo Comunale),[46] Virgilio Nucci, *Immaculate Conception* (c. 1584, Duomo, Gubbio),[47] as well as Giovanni Battista Fiammeri's *Immaculate Conception* in Santa Maria in Aquiro, Rome (1585),[48] Francesco Vanni's *Madonna of the Immaculate Conception* in San Salvatore, Montalcino, 1588 (Fig. 7), and Federico Zuccaro's *Madonna of the Immaculate Conception* from San Francesco, Pesaro (1592).[49] These examples are all earlier than the most frequently discussed Italian example of Cavaliere d'Arpino's *Madonna of the Immaculate Conception* (c. 1600, Real Academia de Bellas Arte de San Fernando, Madrid) that must now because of its late date be relegated to secondary status.[50]

Fig. 7: Francesco Vanni, *Immaculate Conception*,
1588, San Salvatore, Montalcino

<23>

What makes these Italian examples troubling for the theory of Spanish precedence is also that, as Stratton admits, the Italian Grimani Breviary was the first instance of symbols of litanies in a landscape, not to mention Taddeo and Federico Zuccaro's lost apse fresco for SS. Annunziata, Rome.[51] Furthermore, these Italian renditions *never* show the Virgin *tota pulchra* as in the Spanish examples, that is, in the conventional pose of prayer of the young bride of Joseph derived from broad sheets. Therefore, the possibility of an Italian origin must be kept open. Until a micro-chronology of all these varied works can be constructed, the priority issue between Italy and Spain must remain undecided.

<24>

Referring back to Stratton's discussion, we know that the apocalyptic woman at this time in Spain was not yet consolidated as the *Immacolata*. This is even truer of Italy, with the exception that the apocalyptic woman was not so rigidly attached to another iconography (ie, the

Assumption) as in Spain. Although the apocalyptic woman had been used in Italy as a way to represent the Immaculate Conception before Barocci, for instance in block prints issued during Sixtus IV's time and in Parmigianino's *Vision of St. Jerome* (National Gallery, London), this was not an ubiquitous symbol.[52] Instead, the apocalyptic woman had been used for the Madonna of Humility, the Vision of John of Patmos, the Virgin of the Rosary, and the Benediction of the Virginal Limbs. In the previously cited examples, context made it abundantly clear what iconography was attempted (i.e., an indulgence or chapel decoration).[53]

<25>

Thus the degree to which Barocci's work is unambiguously an *Immacolata* is difficult to estimate. The fourteenth century church of San Francesco in Urbino was rebuilt in the eighteenth century, between 1748-90, and we therefore do not know if there was additional fresco decoration in the chapel to carry the dedication, or just the altarpiece itself.[54] Furthermore, the chance to depict the litanies or to add attendant saints is obscured by the need of the confraternity to represent its members. Thus an accidental factor may have been a boon for the creation of a new iconography. For this reason it appears that Barocci has provided in Italy the first apocalyptic woman as unambiguously the Immaculate Virgin.

4. A Model for the Seventeenth Century

<26>

Federico Barocci's remarkable *Immaculate Conception* was destined to serve as a seventeenth century model for many artists, from Rubens to Alonso Cano. Most significant, perhaps, is its importance for Guido Reni. Although not counted among the *Baroccisti* active in Rome while he was there, like Antonio Viviani and Francesco Vanni, Reni perhaps assimilated Barocci at a deeper level, not of imitation but emulation. The direct followers of Barocci imitated his *sfumato* manner and sweet figural types, but Reni learned a deeper lesson from Barocci about the ability of forms to communicate a state of grace to their subject.[55] This is what separates Barocci's *Immaculate Conception* from Wierex. The iconography is identical but the state of grace of Mary for which the iconography was created in the first place must be communicated *formally*. It was the formal conception, as much as the iconography, which appealed to Reni in a way that a fussy Flemish engraving could not.

<27>

How could Reni have known this work? As was noted, the work was engraved by Thomassin (Fig. 3) and then Schiaminossi (Fig. 4). Thomassin removed the seraphims, added a crown, rays of light and replaced a landscape at the bottom for Barocci's onlookers. More interesting is Schiaminossi's image, not so much for its formal qualities but the artist's biography. Schiaminossi was born in Borgo San Sepolcro; he was not only familiar with Barocci's work but may have known the artist.[56] The year before he engraved Barocci's *Rest on the Return from Egypt* then in the Aldobrandini collection in Rome. Crucially, Schiaminossi was at the forefront of reform printmaking, along with Francesco Villamena and Luca Ciamberlano, both also important engravers of Barocci.[57] Schiaminossi was also interested in the Immaculate Conception theme engraving Bernardo Castello's *Immaculate Conception* in 1603, complete with litanies in the background.[58]

<28>

Schiaminossi easily could have emphasized Barocci's invention second hand to Reni through Luca Ciamberlano. Ciamberlano was also a friend and collaborator of Guido Reni. Ciamberlano was from Urbino and almost certainly knew Barocci. Reni and Ciamberlano were brought together by Scipione Borghese and worked together to produce the engravings for the biography of Philip Neri eventually published by Father Giacomo Bacci in 1625.[59] In addition, Ciamberlano engraved certain of Reni's paintings, like the *Blessed Filippo Neri with Madonna and Child* for Neri's private chapel in the Chiesa Nuova.[60] Reni certainly knew Barocci's two altarpieces from Neri's Chiesa Nuova, the *Visitation of the Virgin and St. Elizabeth* (1586) and *Presentation of the Virgin* (1603; both *in situ*) and the artist's high regard. He also would have seen evidence of Barocci's formula for the *Immaculate Conception* in the same church in a fresco decoration by Barocci's follower Andrea Lilio in the chapel of the Annunciation where Domenico Passignano's painting of this subject hangs.[61]

<29>

In addition to this plausible scenario it can be seen that Reni was simply an *alter Baroccius*, linked by topos and temperament. Barocci famously left Rome due to a poisoning; according to Bellori, after Barocci had helped finish the frescoes in the Casina of Pius IV he began frescoes in the Vatican apartments and had just finished a *Moses and the Serpent* (c. 1563, Museo Etrusco Vaticano) when a jealous painter poisoned his salad. This led him to go home to Urbino to recover, where Bellori says he was aided in prayer by the Capuchin friars outside of town.

This was something of a *topos* for Guido Reni, who similarly finished frescoes in Rome in order to secure his reputation, the Quirinal chapel, but then avoided fresco thereafter. It was said during Reni's lifetime that fresco actually made him sick,[62] and it is just as easy to explain Bellori's colorful story about Barocci in terms of a similar temperament. Fresco was demanding physical work and placed one in the hotbed of competitive Roman pursuit of monumental mural decoration. Fresco was said to have made the pupil of Barocci, and no doubt acquaintance of Reni, Antonio Viviani deaf, thereby earning him the nickname "il Sordo." Such a temperament could also feed into the idea of a devout character. The "Vita divota" was a strong topos for many Counter-Reformation artists, including not only Barocci and Reni, but also Girolamo Muziano and Francesco Vanni.[63]

<30>

It was probably Vanni who helped Reni deepen his knowledge of Barocci and his art. And this brings up the greatest affinity. Each artist was known not for great *istorie*, narrative paintings, but rather ravishing devotional pictures. This could have its downside; many authors famously contrasted Reni with Domenichino, often through the fanciful story of the old woman (*vecchiarella*) who is driven to tears by the latter's more narratively logical painting.[64] Malvasia even suggested that Reni's *Massacre of the Innocents* (1610, Bologna, Pinacoteca Communale) was a specific response to this charge of an inability to *istoriare*.[65] Nevertheless, Reni's particular genius for devotional painting was universally praised and made him a very successful man.

<31>

Given the connection between the two men is by no means to say that Barocci is responsible for the entire Baroque iconography. In addition to the images produced by Reni's teachers Denys Calvaert and the Carracci, the most advanced image of an *Immacolata* was that by Ludovico Cigoli in the cupola of the Pauline Chapel of Sta. Maria Maggiore (c. 1612), where Reni himself had worked.[66] As Steven Ostrow has shown, it is an Immaculate Conception in all but name, in order to avoid factionalist politics on the touchy doctrinal issue.[67] Cigoli's formal treatment of the Virgin in turn has been connected to the Rubens's *Sta. Domitilla* in the Chiesa Nuova. However, on closer inspection it is clearly derived also from Barocci's work; the similarity between it and the Schiaminossi engraving (which succeeded it), is striking.[68] There is repeated the large swag flowing across the Virgin's body.

Fig. 8: Peter Paul Rubens, *The Immaculate Conception*,
1628–29, Prado, Madrid

<32>

The interest in Barocci by both Cigoli and Reni should cause us to reconsider further relation-
ships. Not only does the prototype appear further throughout Italy.[69] Around 1620 Guido Reni
gave powerful form to the venerable image of the *Madonna Immacolata* in his image of 1623–
8 for S. Biagio, Forli and culminating in 1627 in the version for the Infanta of Spain, placed
prominently in the Cathedral of Seville, and now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Fig. 5).[70]
Reni codified an iconographic formula with Mary standing isolated, before time, surrounded
by Seraphim, and praying to God in the graceful and rarified form.

<33>

Moving the site of innovation of the Baroque model to Italy, where Barocci worked as well,
naturally raises the question of influence. Suzanne Stratton suggested that Reni may have been
inspired by the simplicity of Wierix's engraving of the *Virgin of the Immaculate Conception* as

he set to paint the image.[71] Certainly such engravings were widely diffused in Italy. It is significant, however, that Reni was known as an admirer of Barocci, leading to the suggestion that he may have drawn direct inspiration from Barocci's own *Immaculate Conception*. But even works by Rubens' (Fig. 8; 1628–9, Prado) and Alonso Cano's (destroyed, formerly San Isidoro, Madrid; Museo Provincial, Alova) do not escape Barocci's influence. The painting of Rubens, another admirer of Barocci, has the same advancing left leg and overall orientation suggesting he departed from Thomassin's or Schiaminossi's print.[72] On the other hand, Cano's painting is equally strikingly reminiscent of Barocci's.[73]

<34>

Nor for that matter would I insist that Barocci understood the Immaculate Virgin as Reni did. Reni conceived of his *Immaculate* and *Assunta* Virgins in highly complementary terms, the first the Virgin existing without sin before time, and the second her existing at the end of time. The two look quite similar and the Assumption is removed from a narrative context. Barocci's late *Assumption* (Galleria Nazionale delle Marche, Urbino), left unfinished at his death in 1612, includes Mary still witnessed by the apostles, contrary to later trends that isolate her in time.[74] So it would appear that the complementarity of the *Immaculate Conception* and *Assumption* iconographies had not occurred to Barocci.

<35>

This connection between Reni and Barocci is not mentioned in the Reni literature and is a likely influence on the transference of the iconography to Reni. To be sure, Reni changed a blessing gesture to one of prayer and removed the company, demanded by Barocci's patrons. Much more important than the bare iconography, however, is what Reni might instinctively have appreciated in Barocci's image, where simplicity and painterly grace stand as an equivalent of the doctrine it supports. I began this article by considering the question of center and periphery in deciding the observation of different devotions. Against this backdrop we can understand the novelty of Barocci's *Immaculate Conception*. Because those in greater Umbria were habituated to Franciscan themes and beliefs, when the artist turned to represent the mystery of the Immaculate Conception he was able to do so in a particularly precocious way.

[1] For a recent review, see Simon Ditchfield, *Liturgy, Sanctity and History in Tridentine Italy: Pietro Maria Campi and the Preservation of the Particular*, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995, Francesco C. Cesareo, The Complex Nature of Catholicism in the Renaissance, in: *Renaissance Quarterly* 54, 2001, 1561–1573.

[2] Harald Olsen, *Federico Barocci,* 2nd edition, Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1962, 161–2; Andrea Emiliani, *Federico Barocci: 1535-1612*, 2 vols., Bologna: Nuova Alfa, 1985, 1:122–127; Andrea Emiliani, *Federico Barocci*, Ancona: Il Lavoro Editoriale/Ars Books, 2008; Judith Mann and Babette Bohn, eds., *Federico Barocci: Renaissance Master of Color and Line*, exh. cat., New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012, 134-143. Richard Spear has introduced Barocci into this discussion with his mention of the Urbinate's *Madonna del Popolo* (1579, Florence, Galleria degli Uffizi) as a semi-immacolata that is transitional in nature. But he takes it for granted Guido "invented a type;" Richard Spear, *The Divine Guido: Religion, Sex, Money and Art in the World of Guido Reni*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997, 140.

[3] On Urbino as a part of Umbria, see Federico Zuccaro, "Diporto per la Italia del Signor Cavallier Federico Zuccaro," where Barocci's contemporary states that he left, "Toscana, Stato di Fiorenza, et entrammo nell'Umbria, Stato di Urbino, e per Levante scendendo." On the idea of a "state church," see Richard Goldthwaite, *Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993, p. 102.

[4] For other instances of such an argument, in regard also to the Marche, see Alessandra Galizzi Kroegel, Quando il centro usa prudenza e la periferia osa: l'iconografia dell'Immacolata Concezione in Emilia e nelle Marche (con una postilla sulla *Vergine delle rocce* di Leonardo), in: Giancarla Periti (ed.), *Emilia e Marche nel Rinascimento. L'identita visiva della 'periferia'*, Bergamo: Edizioni Bolis, 2005, 215–251. In the background of this research is the now classic article by Enrico Castelnuovo and Carlo Ginzburg, "Centro e periferia," in *Questioni e metodi*, vol. 1 of *Storia dell'Arte italiana*, eds. G. Ballati and P. Fossati (Turin: Einaudi, 1979), 283–352

[5] Rene Laurentin, "The Role of the Papal Magisterium in the Development of the Immaculate Conception," in O'Connor, ed. *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception*, 276.

[6] On the Pauline chapel, see Steven Ostrow, *Art and Spirituality in Counter-Reformation Rome: The Sistine and Pauline Chapels in S. Maria Maggiore* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); on the Annunciation chapel, see Mann, 117.

[7] Galizzi Kroegel, "Quando il centro usa prudenza e la periferia osa," emphasizes the ubiquity of the theme in the Marche.

[8] Another remarkable example is Siena, which celebrated the Feast of the Immaculate Conception across the city; Mauro Mussolin, "The Rise of the New Civic Ritual of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin in Sixteenth-Century Siena," *Renaissance Studies* 20 (2006), 253–275.

[9] Gregory XIII reinstated the Feast of the Presentation (and St. Anne) with *Diplomatum et privilegiorum romanorum pontificorum*, 1585. Sixtus reinstated the Feast of the Name of Mary; Karl Kellner, *Heortology: A History of the Christian Festivals from their Origin to the Present Day*, London: Paul, Trench & Trübner, 1908, 266.

[10] Pius V, *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*, 1567; in Denzinger, 335: "Nemo, praeter Cristum, est absque peccatp originali: hinc Beata Virto mortua est propter peccatum ex Adam contractum, omnesque eius afflictiones in hac vita sicut et aliorum iustorum fuerunt ultiones peccati, vel originalis."

[11] Ludwig von Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 40 vols., London, Kegan Paul, 1923–1953, 17:205.

[12] In the same way that a partisan Pius could support Franciscan shrines, the Franciscan pope Sixtus V moved Pius's tomb into his own in Santa Maria Maggiore.

[13] Fernand Cabrol, Breviary, in: *Catholic Encyclopedia*, New York: Appleton, 1907–1922, vol. 2, 775.
Pius further prohibited any further existing offices of the Virgin Mary in *Bullarium Marianum* by *motu proprio* of 20 March, 1571.

[14] This is the *Aliæ Litaniæ Beatæ Mariæ Virginis* (Macerata, 1576); Angelo de Santi, Litany of Loreto, in: *Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: Appleton, 1907–1922), vol. 9, 289.

[15] Candiotti is an obscure figure but his having come from Senigallia, within the duchy of Urbino, makes it more likely that his writing reflected the wishes of Cardinal Giulio Feltrio della Rovere.

[16] De Santi, "Litany of Loreto," 289.

[17] On Cardinal Giulio, see Ian Verstegen, Cardinal Giulio Feltrio della Rovere: Reform and Renewed Ambition, in: *Power and Patronage: The Rise of the Della Rovere in Renaissance Italy*, ed. Ian Verstegen, Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2007.

[18] This ritual element always existed for images of the Immaculate Conception owing to the indulgences offered: Ringbom, "Maria is Sole." On practices contemporary to Barocci – especially those of the immaculist Jesuits – see David Freedberg, *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989, 178-188; Jeffrey Chipps Smith, *Sensuous Worship: Jesuits and the Art of the Early Catholic Reformation in Germany*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002, chs. 3 & 4.

[19] John Marciari, *Girolamo Muziano and the Art in Rome, circa 1550–1600*, Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 2001, dates the work ca. 1582-85. The painting is now in the Istituto Madonna del Carmine in Sassone and was the source of Nebbia's work mentioned above.

[20] For the church of San Francesco, see Bramante Ligi, *Memorie Ecclesiastiche di Urbino*, Urbino: S.T.E.U., 1938, 349–362; for the Compagnia della Concezione, see Biblioteca Universitaria Urbino, "Scuole e Compagnie di Urbino."

[21] On Franciscanism in the Marche, see Massimo Petrocchi, *Storia della Spiritualità italiana*, vol. II, *Il Cinquecento e il Seicento*, Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1978; and Callisto Urbanelli, *Storia dei Cappuccini delle Marche*, 2 vols., Ancona: Curia Provinciale dei Cappuccini, 1978–1984.

[22] On the religious politics of both Sixtus IV and Julius II, see Rona Goffen, Friar Sixtus IV and the Sistine Chapel, in: *Renaissance Quarterly* 39, 1986, 218-62; *Patronage and Piety in Renaissance Venice: Bellini, Titian, and the Franciscans* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986). Of course, even earlier, the Montefeltro dukes of Urbino had been close to Observant Franciscan belief.

[23] On Barocci's Franciscan patronage, see Stuart Lingo, *The Capuchins and the Art of History, Retrospection and Reform in the Arts in Late Renaissance Italy*, Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1998; and *Allure and Devotion in Late Renaissance Painting*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008, passim.

[24] Pietro Zampetti, *Carlo Crivelli*, Florence: Nardini, 1986, plate 105; Kroegel, 219.

[25] See Uffizi 11446, Emiliani, *Federico Barocci*, vol. I, p. 123, fig. 209, for the original Madonna of Misericordia (with no crescent moon) and Berlin Kupferstichkabinett 20493, Emiliani, vol. I, p. 125, fig. 214, a further development of the theme.

[26] See Stuart Lingo, Retrospection and the Genesis of Federico Barocci's *Immaculate Conception*, in: *Coming About…A Festschrift for John Shearman*, Cambridge: Harvard University Art Museums, 2001, 216–221; *Allure and Devotion*, 39–48.

[27] Conversely, Reni's *Assumptions* show Mary with crossed hands, a gesture also common to the Forlì *Immaculata*.

[28] Alessandro Zuccari, Cultura e predicazione nelle immagini dell'Oratorio, in: *Storia dell'arte* 85, 1995, 347.

[29] On the Immacolata as protection against plague, see Helen Ettlinger, The Iconography of the Columns in Titian's Pesaro Altarpiece, in: *Art Bulletin* 61, 1979, 63, n. 56. This is also clear from Stratton's examples, for example, those Virgins shielded by angels who repel arrows shot – in the iconography familiar from plague pictures – by demons.

[30] On Thomassin, see M. Edmond Bruwaert, *La Vie et les oeuvres de Philippe Thomassin* (Troyes: Paton, 1914). For Thomassin's Immaculate Conception, see *La Regola e la Fama: San Filippo Neri e l'Arte*, exh. cat. (Milan, 1995), no. 82, 524–525. On Schiaminossi, see Alessandra Giannotti, Documenti per Raffaello Schiaminossi, in: *Notizie da Palazzo Albani* 2, 1988, 87–102; and Alessandra Giannotti, ed. *Raffaello Schiaminossi Incisore*, exh. cat., Anghiari and Urbino: Vadese, 2000. For the Immaculate Conception, see Giannotti, 2000, 131 and Sebastian Buffa, ed. *The Illustrated Bartsch*, vol. 38, *Italian Artists of the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Abaris Books, 1983), 78.

[31] Mercati copied the figure as it is reversed in the prints, most probably that of his countryman Schiaminossi, discussed below. Mercati also copied the figure of *St. Agnes in Prison* (1598) from the Galleria Nazionale delle Marche, Urbino, which was not engraved and suggests direct knowledge of the original in Urbino; on Mercati, see Christopher Witcombe, Giovanni Battista Mercati: notizie sui dipinti e sulle incisioni, in: *Bollettino d'Arte* 76, 1992, 53–70.

[32] Walter Friedländer, *Mannerism and Anti-Mannerism in Italian Painting* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), 45-83. For Ludovico's work, see Andrea Emiliani, *Ludovico Carracci*, Bologna: Nuova Alfa, 1993, 64.

[33] The apocalyptic woman in Spain instead was standardized as the Assumption, leading to the incorrect assumption that these depictions indeed represented the *Immacolata*; Stratton, *The Immaculate Conception in Spanish Art*, 54. Stratton points out how as late as 1568, Johannes Molanus (*De picturis et imaginibus sacris*, Louvain, 1570) still noted the proper representation of the Assumption with the Apocalyptic woman.

[34] Levi d'Ancona, *The Iconography of the Immaculate Conception*; Vloberg, "The Iconography of the Immaculate Conception;" 463–502; Stratton, *The Immaculate Conception in Spanish Art*, 42. See Molanus' discussion, *De Historia*, 393-4; Stratton, 151, n. 17.

[35] Leonardo Nogarola, *Sicut Lilium*, 1476, reprinted in *Ephemerides Liturgica* 25 (1912): 431–6; Bernardo de' Busti, *Officium et Missa de Immaculata Conceptione*, 1480; reprinted in *Acta Ordinis Fratrum Minorum* 23 (1904): 400-420; see C. Bouman, The Immaculate Conception in the Liturgy, in: O'Connor, ed. *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception*, 151, n. 100. On 4 September 1483, Sixtus IV issued the *Grave nimis*, which forbade theological discussion of the doctrine.

[36] Stratton, *The Immaculate Conception in Spanish Art*, 53. An analogous Italian case would be the chapel of the Immaculate Conception in the Observant Franciscan church of Santa Maria in Aracoeli in Rome. It was decorated in the 1550s by Francesco Pichi and contains an apocalyptic woman in a lateral fresco while the lost altarpiece (perhaps also by Pichi) may also have. Fortunately, the documents refer to the altarpiece specifically as an Assumption: "Cappella Assumptionis beate Virginis" (4 June 1578); Johanna E. L. Heideman, *The Cinquecento Chapel Decorations in S. Maria in Aracoeli in Rome*, Amsterdam: Pers, 1982, 16. This might suggest that the lateral then carries the dedication, however, another lateral (right wall, lunette) shows the *Adoration of the Virgin as Immaculate*. The opposite lunette then is merely the *Virgin as Apocalyptic Woman*. Obviously, the immaculate woman in the church of the Aracoeli would also invoke strongly the vision of the Tiburtine sibyl to Octavion.

[37] *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*: Fifth Session Celebrated on the Seventeenth Day of June, 1546, Decrees Concerning Original Sin, "This holy council declares, however, that it is not its intention to include in this decree, which deals with original sin, the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, the mother of God, but that the constitutions of Pope Sixtus IV, of happy memory, are to be observed under the penalties contained in those constitutions, which it renews."

[38] Stratton, *The Immaculate Conception in Spanish Art*, 58, with reference to the writings of Alonso de Villegas (*Flos Sanctorum [Lives of the Saints]*); c.f., Wenceslaus Sebastian, The Controversy over the Immaculate Conception from after Scotus to the End of the Eighteenth Century, in: O'Connor, ed. *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception*, esp. 264–267.

[39] See, for example, of the 'scepter' type (God the Father exempting Mary from sin) Antonio Frediani, 1503, Museo Nazionale di Villa Guinigi, Lucca; and Francia, 1511-1519, San Frediano, Lucca. Of the 'cloaked' type (God the Father shielding Mary with a cloth of honor), see Giovanni Antonio Sogliani, c. 1521, Museo del Accademia, Florence; and Pier Francesco Foschi, 1544-6, Santo Spirito, Florence. Of course, Vasari's aforementioned painting should be mentioned here as well.

[40] In the period under discussion, many of these were heavily influenced by Vasari, forming a 'Tuscan' type, almost always showing Adam and Eve at the bottom; see Alessandro Casolani (San Francesco, Montalcino), Francesco Vanni (1602, Santa Margherita, Cortona), Niccolò Circignani (1580s?, Duomo, Volterra); and Battista Naldini (1585, San Francesco, Volterra) and, in the Marche, Ercole Ramazzini, San Francesco, Matelica; Kroegel, 200. Other non-Vasarian 'disputation' paintings of the period include; Scipione Pulzone (1580s, Capuchin church of San Bonaventura, now San Francesco, Ronciglione); see Federico Zeri, *Pittura e Controriforma. L'arte senza tempo di Scipione da Gaeta* (Turin: Einaudi, 1970), 34–35; and in the duchy of Urbino, Cesare Maggeri (Santa Maria Maddalena, Senigallia), reproduced in color in Paolo Dal Poggetto, *I Della Rovere: Piero della Francesca, Raffaello, Tiziano* (Milan: Electa, 2004), 358 and Giorgio Picchi (1582, San Francesco, Urbania); Catherine Monbeig Goguel, "Filippo Bellini da Urbino della Scuola del Barocci," *Master Drawings* 13 (1975): 353.

[41] Harald Olsen, *Federico Barocci* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1962), 213–214; Andrea Emiliani, *Federico Barocci (Urbino 1535-1612)* (Bologna: Alfa, 1985), 2:411.

[42] For Fra Valeriano, see Gauven Bailey, *Between Renaissance and Baroque: Jesuit Art in Rome, 1565–1610* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003); for Guido Reni's Quirinal fresco, see D. Stephen Pepper, *Guido Reni: a Complete Catalogue of his Works with an Introductory Text* (New York: New York University Press, 1984), n. 33, fig. 32B; and Judith Mann, "The Annunciation Chapel in the Quirinal Palace, Rome: Paul V, Guido

Reni and the Virgin Mary," *Art Bulletin* 75 (1993): 113–134; for the St. Petersburg painting, see Pepper, *Guido Reni*, n. 87, fig. 80; for Cortona, see Giuliano Briganti, *Pietro da Cortona, o, della Pittura Barocca*, (Florence: Sansoni, 1982), no. 122, 256; for Guercino, see David Stone, *Guercino: catalogo completo dei dipinti*, Florence: Cantini, 1991, n. 302, 311.

[43] Stratton, *The Immaculate Conception in Spanish Art*, calls this painting "the earliest appearance in El Greco's oeuvre of the Immaculist symbols in a landscape" (58–60); see also his *Virgin of the Immaculate Conception*, c. 1607-1613 (Toledo, Museo de Santa Cruz), Stratton, fig. 40.

[44] Stratton, *The Immaculate Conception in Spanish Art*, 60, 62, figs. 39, 41, 42. Gomez painted an earlier work, dated 1589, now in the Palacio Arzobispal of Seville; *Inmaculada: 150 Anos de la Proclamacion del Dogma* (Cordoba: Publicaciones obra Social y Cultural Cajasur, 2004), 222–224.

[45] The derivation of Velázquez's Virgin from the Wierix type is shown by the glance to her right.

[46] Benedetta Ponti and Carla Ponti, *Ascensidonio Spacca detto il Fantino* (Perugia" Effe Edizioni, 1998), fig. 20.

[47] Enzo Storelli, *Benedetto e Virgilio Nucci* (Todi: Ediart, 1992), plate XXI. See also the closely related composition with, however, the Christ child, in the Pinacoteca in Gubbio; plate XX. Another, later version, copies Pulzone's composition already mentioned; fig. 104.

[48] Claudio Strinati, *Quadri romani tra 500 e 600* (Rome: Palombi, 1979), fig. 8.

[49] See Bonita Cleri, ed. *Taddeo e Federico Zuccari nelle Marche*, exh. cat. (Sant'Angelo in Vado: Vadese, 1993), 146–147.

[50] Herwarth Röttgen, *Il Cavaliere d'Arpino*, exh cat. (Rome: De Luca, 1973), 113–115.

[51] The apse fresco is known through Cornelis Cort's engraving, illustrated in Bailey, *Between Renaissance and Baroque*, fig. 33.

[52] For Sixtus' Virgins *in sole*, see Sixten Ringbom, "Maria in Sole and the Virgin of the Rosary," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 25 (1962): 326–330; for the Franciscan's attachment to the same before it was exclusively associated with the Immaculate Conception, see Anthony Cutler, "The Mulier Amicta Sole and her Attendants: An Episode in Late Medieval Finnish Art," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 29 (1966), 117–134; for Parmigianino's painting, which Barocci probably saw in Città da Castello in order to borrow the Jerome figure for his Fossombrone *Madonna and Child* (Brera, Milan), see Mary Vaccaro, "Documents for Parmigianino's 'Vision of St. Jerome.'" *Burlington Magazine* 135 (1993): 22–27.

[53] In Parmigianino's case, documents prove that the lateral painting represented the "Concezione," making the altarpiece closer to the genre of John of Patmos' vision. In this case, immaculate content must be distinguished from a representation of the dogma *per se*.

[54] Franco Mazzini, *I mattoni e le pietre di Urbino*, Urbino: Argalia, 1982. The manuscript *Libro delle notizie del convento di S. Francesco* (Convento di San Francesco, Urbino) bears no mention of the chapel's decoration.

[55] Marc Fumaroli, *L'École du silence. La sentiment des images au XVIIe siècle*, Paris: Flammarion, 1994; On Barocci's 'school,' see Anna Maria Ambrosini Massari and Marina Cellini, eds. *Nel segno di Barocci: Allievi e seguaci tra Marche, Umbria, Siena*, Milan: Federico Motta Editore Spa, 2005.

[56] Giannotti, Documenti per Raffaello Schiaminossi, 90, suggests Schiaminossi "ebbe certo anche una conoscenza diretta."

[57] On Villamena, see Franca Camiz, The Roman 'Studio' of Francesco Villamena, in: *Burlington Magazine* 136, 1994, 506-516; on Ciamberlano, see Olga Melasecchi and Stephen Pepper, Guido Reni, Luca Ciamberlino and the Oratorians: their relationship clarified, in: *Burlington Magazine* 140, 1998, 596–603.

[58] Giannotti, *Raffaello Schiaminossi Incisore*, 73.

[59] Pietro Giacomo Bacci, *La vita di San Filippo Neri* (Rome, 1625); c.f., Melasecchi and Pepper, "Guido Reni, Luca Ciamberlino and the Oratorians."

[60] For an illustration, see *La Regola e la Fama*, no. 10, 362.

[61] Zuccari, "Cultura e predicazione nelle immagini dell'Oratorio."

[62] Spear, *The 'Divine' Guido*, 31, while painting in Ravenna.

[63] For Barocci and Reni, see Fumaroli, *L'École du silence*, 217; and Ian Verstegen, F*ederico Barocci and the Oratorians: Corporate Patronage and Style in the Counter-Reformation* (Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2015); for Barocci, see Dante Bernini, "La vita devota del pittore Federico Barocci." In *L'Immagine di San Francesco nella Controriforma*, exh cat. (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1982), 57–62; for Muziano, see Marciari, *Girolamo Muziano*, 334.

[64] Spear, *The 'Divine' Guido*, 27.

[65] Carlo Cesare Malvasia, *Felsina Pittrice: Vite de' Pittori Bolognesi*, ed. Giampietro Zanotti, 2 vols., Bologna, 1841, vol. 2, 17.

[66] Roberto Contini, *Il Cigoli*, Soncino: Edizioni del Soncino, 1991; Franco Faranda, *Ludovico Cardi detto il Cigoli*, Rome: De Luca, 1986.

[67] Ostrow, *Art and Spirituality*.

[68] To my knowledge this is not mentioned in the Cigoli literature. It is no matter that Cigoli's image precedes Schiaminossi's, since the buzz surrounding the image could have led to the issue of the print.

[69] See in addition to the Mercati mentioned already, the works of Ventura Salimbeni, *Coronation of the Virgin* (Santuario della Madonna dell'Incoronata, Arcidosso); and Grazio Cossali, *Immaculate Conception with Sts. John the Baptist and Appolonia* (1603; San Francesco, Brescia); Antonio Sabatucci, ed. *La Chiesa di San Francesco* (Brescia: Grafo, 2004).

[70] On these works, see Howard Hibbard, Guido Reni's Painting of the Immaculate Conception, in: *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 23, 1969, 18-32; Pepper, *Guido Reni*, nos. 123, 144; Spear, *The 'Divine' Guido*, 140–142.

[71] Stratton, *The Immaculate Conception in Spanish Art*, 66.

[72] Angelika Michae, *Rubens' Inmaculada im Prado: Zur Sinnkomplexität eines Marienbildes.* In: Kunstgeschichte. Open Peer Reviewed Journal, 2014 (urn:nbn:de:bvb:355-kuge-393-7). Alexander Vergara, *Rubens and His Spanish Patrons*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 94, notes that Rubens' Madonna "reveals a joyful and lighthearted vision of a religious subject quite different from the more austere images being produced in Spain at the time." On Rubens' debts to Barocci, see Erich Hubala, Eine Rubens-Paraphrase von Baroccis Jesuskind für Papst Clemens VIII Aldobrandini, in: *Bulletin-Nationalmuseum* 17, 1993, 31–41; Erik Larson, Ein unbekanntes Hauptwerk des Peter Paul Rubens aus seiner italienischen Zeit: die Flucht des Äneas aus Troja, in: *Bruckmanns-Pantheon* 52, 1994, 79–85; and Nicole Walch, Nicole and Herman Liebaers, Über die Radierung der Hl. Katharina und den Einfluss Baroccis auf Rubens Werk, in: *Rubens and His World: Studies*, Antwerp: Gulden Cabinet, 1985, pp. 171–78.

[73] *Alonso Cano: La modernidad del siglo de oro español*, Madrid: Fundación Santander Central Hispano, 2002, in color p. 16; Stratton, *Iconography of the Immaculate Conception*, 118, suggests that seeing Rubens' work led Cano to abandon all symbols of litanies and remarks how the Madonna "asserts her privilege rather than humbly accepting it."

[74] Emiliani, *Federico Barocci*, vol. II; Elaine Tlanowski, *The Icon of the Assumption of the Virgin in Italian Painting, 1480–1580* (Ph. D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1986). The most famous case is Domenichino's *Assumption of the Virgin* in Santa Maria in Trastevere, 1616/17, for Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini.